THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

pers.

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

Presented by
the Worshipful Company
of Goldsmiths.
1903.

620054

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_june-26-july-31-1868_193

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

31° & 32° VICTORIÆ, 1867-8.

VOL. CXCIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF JUNE 1868,

TO

THE THIRTY-FIRST DAY OF JULY 1868.

Fourth and Last Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,
23, PATERNOSTER ROW [E.C.]

1868.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, PRINTER, 23, PATERNOSTER ROW.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXCIII.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JUNE 26.

Page

New Peer Introduced—William Lord Brougham and Vaux—Was introduced by virtue of a special Limitation in the Patent dated 22d March 1860, 23d Vict., and sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Brother Henry Lord Brougham and Vaux; and took the Oath 1

Established Church (Ireland) Bill (No. 157)—

Order of the Day for resuming the Debate [June 24] on the Amendment to the Motion for the Second Reading, which Amendment was, to leave out the word ("now") and at the end of the Question to add the words ("upon this Day Six Months")—(*The Earl Grey*) read:—Debate *resumed* accordingly 2

After long debate, Debate *further adjourned* to *Monday* next.

Liquidation Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Westbury*); read 1ª (No. 181) .. 101

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JUNE 26.

Schools Inquiry Commission—Question, Mr. Beach; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 102

Ireland—Royal School of Banagher—Question, Mr. G. Morris; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 102

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 139]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Lord Robert Montagu*) 103

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the proposal to pass a permanent law, requiring that in order to prevent the introduction of the Cattle Plague into this Country from abroad, all foreign cattle and other animals imported into the Port of London shall be landed at one prescribed spot, and shall not be removed thence alive, ought not to be considered apart from the general policy of imposing legal restrictions on the foreign cattle trade in other ports of the United Kingdom,"—(*Mr. Milner Gibson,*)—instead thereof 138

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Debate adjourned till *Monday* next.

[*June* 26.] *Page*

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Telegraphic Communication with the East—Motion for Papers—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Correspondence which may have passed between the Secretary of State for India and the local authorities relative to the proposed Deep Sea Telegraphic Line from Bombay to Kurrachee, and the sanctioned lines from Gwadur to Jask, and from Jask to Bushire,"—(*Lord William Hay*,)—instead thereof 155

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

The Record Publications—Resolution—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the prices of the Record Publications ought to be reduced from fifteen shillings to ten shillings, and from ten shillings to six shillings, and that the Statutes of Ireland, from the first meeting of the Irish Parliament to the Union with England, ought to be published at the national expense,"—(*Mr. Pim*,)—instead thereof 165

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment and Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

Colonial Governors' Pensions Act Amendment Bill—Resolution *reported*:—Resolution *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Sclater-Booth*) 169

Medway Regulation Act Continuance Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Sclater-Booth*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 196] 169

LORDS, MONDAY, JUNE 29.

Established Church (Ireland) Bill (No. 157)—

Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Motion for the Second Reading, read:—Debate *resumed* accordingly .. 169

After long debate, on Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided*; Contents 97, Not-Contents 192; Majority 95.

Resolved in the *Negative*; and Bill to be read 2ª on *this Day Six Months*.

List of Contents and Not-Contents 298

Admiralty Suits Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Longford*); read 1ª (No. 182) .. 300

Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Marquess Townshend*); read 1ª (No. 185) 300

Lodgers Property Protection Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Marquess Townshend*); read 1ª (No. 186) 300

Children, &c. Protection Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Marquess Townshend*); read 1ª (No. 187) 300

COMMONS, MONDAY, JUNE 29.

Army—Shorncliffe Camp—Question, Mr. Vanderbyl; Answer, Sir John Pakington 301

Army—The 86th Regiment—Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Sir John Pakington 302

Clerks in the Customs Department—Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 303

Ireland—Public Records—Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 304

[*June* 29.] *Page*

THE LEOMINSTER MAGISTRATES—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 304

INDIA—THE MUTINY MEDAL—Question, Mr. Adam; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 305

REFINING OF SUGAR AT COLOGNE—Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave 305

ARMY—QUEEN'S REGULATIONS, 1868—Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir John Pakington 306

RELIGIOUS SERVICES IN THE INDIAN ARMY—Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 306

PATENTS OF QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND OF PRECEDENCE—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 307

METROPOLIS—ORNAMENTAL WATER IN REGENT'S PARK—Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Lord John Manners 307

DISINTEGRATION OF SEWAGE—Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 307

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN RIBBONS—Question, Mr. Eaton; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave 308

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT FOR IRELAND—Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 309

CEYLON—LIGHTHOUSE ON THE GREAT BASSES—Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave 309

ARMY—VOLUNTEER REVIEW AT WINDSOR—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Sir John Pakington 310

SURGEON IN CHIEF OF THE POLICE FORCE—Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Sir George Grey 311

IRELAND—ERECTION OF MILITARY STORES AND BARRACKS—Question, Colonel Greville-Nugent; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 312

EXEMPTION OF SCHOOLS AND CHARITIES FROM POOR RATES—Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 313

ARMY—OFFICERS OF DEPOT BATTALIONS—Question, Colonel French; Answer, Sir John Pakington 313

IRELAND—PROPOSED CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY—Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 313

STRAY DOGS—Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy .. 314

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

EMPLOYMENT OF DISCHARGED SOLDIERS—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is expedient to employ in Government situations non-commissioned officers and privates discharged from the Army with good character,"—(*Sir Charles Russell,*)—instead thereof 314

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

IRISH CHURCH COMMISSION—Questions, Sir John Gray, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; Answers, Mr. Clive 323

THE NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE—MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the recent appointment of Architects for the New Public Buildings in the Metropolis,"—(*Mr. Goldsmid,*)—instead thereof 324

THE NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE—Motion for a Select Committee—*continued.*

After debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 90, Noes 45; Majority 45.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee 343
Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

Metropolitan Police Funds Bill [Bill 132]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) 343
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)
After short debate, Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 192, Noes 22; Majority 170:—Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies Bill—Resolution *reported:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sclater-Booth*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 201] 352

Libel (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Pim*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 199] 352

Turnpike Trusts Arrangements Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 200] 352

LORDS, TUESDAY, JUNE 30.

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill—
Bill read 3ª, with the Amendments 353
Moved, "To leave out Clause 26,"—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)
After short debate, on Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*
On Question, "That the Bill do pass:"—Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill (No. 164)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 362
Amendments made; The Report thereof to be received on *Friday* next; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 192.)

Liquidation Bill (No. 181)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Westbury*) .. 366
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Judgments Extension Bill (No. 160)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Chelmsford*) .. 367
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Parliamentary Reform — Representation of the People (Ireland) Bill (No. 176)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Privy Seal*) .. 368
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JUNE 30.

Page

Committals (Scotland) — Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, The Lord Advocate 369

Loss of the "Garonne"—Question, Admiral Erskine; Answer, Mr. S. Cave 370

Metropolis — Hyde Park — Ride in Rotten Row — Question, Mr. Cowper; Answer, Lord John Manners 371

Overloading of Merchant Ships—Question, Mr. Weguelin; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave 372

Prison Ministers Act—Resolution—*Moved*,

"That, in consequence of the persistent refusal or neglect of the authorities having control over certain of the county and borough Prisons of Great Britain to put in operation the powers given to them by the Prison Ministers Act, it is necessary they should be compelled by Law to make adequate provision for the religious instruction and Divine Worship of Catholic Prisoners,"—(*Mr. Maguire*) 372

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Parliament—Divisions of the House—Resolution—*Moved*,

"That if any Member shall, by mistake, go out with the Ayes or the Noes (as the case may be) having intended to vote on the other side, he shall wait until the other Members in the same Lobby shall have passed out, and, on presenting himself to the Tellers, he shall desire that he may not be counted with them, he having entered the Lobby by mistake; and the Tellers shall thereupon come with such Member to the Table, and inform the House of the circumstance, and the Speaker or Chairman (as the case may be), shall thereupon ask such Member whether he was in the House when the Question was put, and, if he shall answer in the affirmative, the Speaker or Chairman (as the case may be), shall then ask such Member whether he desires to vote Aye or No on such Question, and the vote of such Member as then declared by him shall be taken by the Tellers in the House, and reported by them accordingly,"—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) 383

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Case of Adjouri—Motion for Papers—*Moved*,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of Papers and Correspondence relative to the absconding of Adjouri from Manchester, leaving large debts owing to the merchants of that city,"—(*Mr. Bazley*) 387

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal Bill [Bill 76]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Monk*) 389

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*,)—instead thereof.

After debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided*; Ayes 79, Noes 47; Majority 32.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*.

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported* without Amendment; to be read the third time upon *Thursday*.

Military at Elections (Ireland) Bill [Bill 95]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [12th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time;" and which Amendment was, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*The Earl of Mayo*.)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—Debate *resumed*. 410

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 55, Noes 96; Majority 41:—Words *added*:—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *put off* for six months.

[*June* 30.] *Page*

Municipal Corporations (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 105]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [17th June], "That the Bill be now read a second time;" and which Amendment was, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Bentinck.*)
Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—Debate *resumed.* 419
After short debate, Question put, and *negatived:*—Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *put off* for three months.

Assignees of Marine Policies Bill [Bill 147]—
Order for Committee read 419
After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee.
Bill *reported;* to be *printed,* as amended [Bill 203]; *re-committed* for *Thursday.*

BRISTOL WRIT—*Moved,*
"That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Bristol, in the room of John William Miles, esquire, whose Election has been determined to be void,"—(*Mr. Noel*) 420
Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Writ for the City of Bristol be not issued till seven days after the evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Bristol Election Petition has been printed,"—(*Mr. Bass.*)
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)
Moved, "That the Report of the Bristol Election Committee be read,"—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)
Report of Committee [25th June] read.
After short debate, Debate *adjourned* till *Thursday.*

Fairs (Metropolis) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 205] 423

COURT OF SESSION (SCOTLAND) [SALARIES]—
Considered in Committee:—Resolution to be reported *To-morrow* 423

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 1.

NAVY—NAVAL CHAPLAINS—Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox 424

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [Bill 44]—
After short debate, Order for Committee read, and *discharged:*—Bill *withdrawn* 425

Oxford and Cambridge Universities Bill [Bill 30]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [13th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time;" and which Amendment was, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Walpole*) .. ..
Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—Debate *resumed* 426
After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 198, Noes 140; Majority 58:—Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Wednesday* 22nd July.

[*July* 1.] Page

Libel Bill [Bill 3]—
Order for Committee read, and *discharged*:—Bill *withdrawn* .. 471

Libel (Ireland) Bill [Bill 199]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 471
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow*.

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*The Lord Advocate, Sir James Fergusson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 206] 472

Indorsing of Warrants Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 208] 472

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 2.

ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION—VOTE OF THANKS TO HER MAJESTY'S FORCES—
Resolutions *moved*, "That the Thanks of this House be given to Lieutenant General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., and to the Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Men of Her Majesty's Land and Sea Forces engaged in the Expedition into Abyssinia,"—(*The Lord Privy Seal*) 473
After debate, Resolutions *agreed to*.

Boundary Bill (No. 170)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 495
After short time spent therein, House to be again in Committee on *Monday* next.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 2.

HIGH SHERIFF FOR THE EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE—Question, Admiral Duncombe; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 515

TREATY OF COMMERCE WITH AUSTRIA—Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Mr. E. C. Egerton 515

MILITARY KNIGHTS OF WINDSOR—Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 516

PARISH MORTUARIES—Question, Mr. Goddard; Answer, Lord R. Montagu .. 516

WORKSHOP REGULATION ACT (1867)—Questions, Mr. Powell, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 517

ARMY—ARTILLERY PRACTICE AT PORTSMOUTH—Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Sir John Pakington 517

POST OFFICE—MAILS TO THE WEST INDIES—Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 519

EJECTMENTS SUSPENSION (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Disraeli 519

ARMY—EMPLOYMENT OF OLD SOLDIERS—Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answers, Sir John Pakington, Lord John Manners 520

CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Disraeli 520

ARMY ESTIMATES—Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Sir John Pakington .. 521

NAVY—CAPTAINS ON THE RESERVED LIST—Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Sir John Hay 521

ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION—VOTE OF THANKS TO HER MAJESTY'S FORCES .. 522
Resolutions *moved*, "That the Thanks of this House be given to Lieutenant General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., and to the Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Men of Her Majesty's Land and Sea Forces engaged in the Expedition into Abyssinia,"—(*Mr. Disraeli*) 522
After short debate, Resolutions *agreed to*.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

IRRIGATION WORKS IN INDIA—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy of any further Despatches, Telegrams, and Letters between the Secretary of State in Council and the Government of India respecting the proposed purchase of the works of the East India Irrigation Company, or the advance of funds for the works thereof since July 16, 1867,"—(*Mr. Bouverie,*)—instead thereof 529

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—NAVY ESTIMATES—*considered* in Committee 535

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £182,364, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Salaries of the Officers and the Contingent Expenses of the Admiralty Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £176,064, &c.,"—(*Mr. Lusk:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £163,926, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Salaries and Expenses of the Coast Guard Service, the Charges for the Royal Naval Coast Volunteers, and for the Royal Naval Reserve, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869" 539

(2.) Motion made, and Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £143,926, &c,"—(*Admiral Erskine:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to* .. 543

(3.) £63,565, Scientific Departments.

(4.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £823,562, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Salaries of the Officers and the Contingent Expenses of Her Majesty's Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869" 543

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £823,062, &c.,"—(*Mr. Samuda:*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Registration (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 167]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*) 561

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 3.

PUBLIC BUSINESS—Ministerial Explanation (*The Earl of Malmesbury:*)—Debate thereon 571

SOUTH AFRICA—MOTION FOR A PAPER—

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of Circular Despatch of 30th January 1868 from the Secretary of State for the Colonies relative to the Consecration of a Colonial Bishop in South Africa, and of a Despatch of 31st March on the same Subject,—(*The Earl of Carnarvon*) 587

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Bill (No. 144)—

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill,"—(*The Earl Russell*) 594

After short debate, Motion *agreed to;* House in Committee accordingly.

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 211.)

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 3.

COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION—REPORTS OF 1868—Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 608

ARMY—NON-COMBATANT OFFICERS—Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington 608

MEDICO-LEGAL INQUIRIES—Question, Mr. Clive; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy .. 609

CATTLE PLAGUE—RINDERPEST IN AUSTRIA—Question, Mr. Moffatt; Answer, Lord Stanley 609

SHERIFF OF THE COUNTY OF YORK—Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 609

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir S. Northcote .. 610

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 139]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [26th June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" and which Amendment was,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the proposal to pass a permanent law, requiring that in order to prevent the introduction of the Cattle Plague into this Country from abroad, all foreign cattle and other animals imported into the Port of London shall be landed at one prescribed spot, and shall not be removed thence alive, ought not to be considered apart from the general policy of imposing legal restrictions on the foreign cattle trade in other ports of the United Kingdom,"—(*Mr. Milner Gibson,*)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—Debate *resumed* 610

After debate, Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Headlam:*)—The House *divided;* Ayes 79, Noes 224; Majority 145.

Question again proposed: and, after further short debate, Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

FORCES IN NEW ZEALAND—Observations, Viscount Enfield; Reply, Mr. Disraeli:—Short debate thereon 640

SCOTLAND—MIDDLE CLASS SCHOOLS—Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, The Lord Advocate:—Short debate thereon 644

CARELESS USE OF LUCIFER MATCHES—Observations, Mr. Henniker-Major .. 654

IRELAND—WRITS OF ERROR IN CRIMINAL CASES—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House doth agree with the Resolution passed by this House on the 19th day of November 1689, and doth re-affirm that a Writ of Error for the reversal of a Judgment in Misdemeanor, Felony, or Treason is the right of the subject, and ought to be granted at his desire, and is not an act of Grace or Favour which may be denied or granted at Pleasure,"—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen,*)—instead thereof 655

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

NAVY—NAVAL MEDALS—Observations, Captain Mackinnon; Reply, Lord Henry Lennox 667

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

[*July* 3.] Page

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £87,615, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam" 668

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan* :)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the item of £6,000, for the Envoy and Chief Superintendent in China, be reduced by the sum of £2,000,"—(*Colonel Sykes* :) —After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Item of £500, for Salary of the Vice Consul at Taku, be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Colonel Sykes,*)—put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £36,314, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Extraordinary Expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad" 674

Motion made, and Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £33,814, &c.,"—(*Mr. Lusk,*) —put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £52,950, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Salaries and Allowances of Governors, &c., and for other Expenses in certain Colonies" 675

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Sir William Gallwey* :)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £3,072, to complete the sum for Orange River Territory and St. Helena.

(5.) £9,231, to complete the sum for Emigration.

Resolutions to be reported upon *Monday* next; Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

BRISTOL WRIT—*Moved,*

"That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Bristol, in the room of John William Miles, esquire, whose Election has been determined to be void,"—(*Mr. Neville-Grenville*) 675

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "no Writ be issued for the City of Bristol until seven days after the evidence taken before the Election Committee for that city shall have been in the hands of Members," —(*Mr. Bass,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 6.

NOVA SCOTIA—PETITIONS—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to appoint a Commission to proceed to Nova Scotia for the Purpose of examining the Causes of the alleged Dissatisfaction, with a View to their Removal,"—(*The Lord Campbell*) 679

After debate, Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Boundary Bill (No. 170)—

House again in Committee (according to Order) 710

The Amendment *moved* on Thursday last (*Earl Beauchamp*) (by Leave of the Committee) *withdrawn* :—Bill *reported,* without Amendment.

An Amendment *moved,* Clause 4, after ("Salisbury") insert ("South Shields,") —(*The Lord Ravensworth.*)

After short debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 9, Not-Contents 27; Majority 18:—*Resolved* in the *Negative* :—Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

List of Contents and Not-Contents 714

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill (No. 192)—

Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 715
After short debate, further Amendments made: Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow;* and to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 220.)

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 6.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS—Question, Mr. Parry; Answer, Lord John Manners .. 716

METROPOLIS—HYDE PARK IMPROVEMENTS—Question, Mr. W. B. Beaumont; Answer, Lord John Manners 716

IRELAND—IRISH RECORDS—Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 717

METROPOLIS—FINSBURY PARK—Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Mr. Tite .. 717

TURKEY—RAILWAYS—Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 718

ARMY—WINDSOR CAVALRY BARRACKS—Question, Colonel Leslie; Answer, Sir John Pakington 718

ARMY—ARTILLERY PRACTICE AT DOVER, &c.—Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Sir John Pakington 719

ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS BILL—Question, Colonel French; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 720

Registration Bill [Bill 190]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) 720
After short debate, Bill read a third time, and *passed.*

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 63]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 25th June*] 722
After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday*.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

THE NEW ZEALAND MEDAL—Observations, Sir John Pakington .. 760

ARMY—WARLIKE STORES—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in order to ensure economy in our Expenditure on Warlike Stores, it is advisable to have an annual Statement laid upon the Table of this House, showing the quantity and value of each description of Stores in the possession of the Troops, or in the Arsenals and Storehouses, the quantity issued and consumed during each year, and the replacements in consequence of a change of pattern or of the ordinary annual consumption; that in order to prevent the manufacture of Warlike Stores becoming a mere monopoly in the hands of the Government Establishments it is advisable to purchase a certain proportion of the articles required for Military purposes from the private trade; and to ensure accuracy of accounts, economy of production, and fair comparison of Government with trade prices, the Manufacturing Departments shall be treated as private firms, the Government purchasing the articles required at remunerative prices, to be provided from Army and other Votes, and the capital charges of the Establishments (whether for buildings, plant, or working capital,) being provided by advances at interest made by the Public Works Loan Commissioners,"—(*Major Anson,*)—instead thereof 760

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies Bill [Bill 201]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 781
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Wednesday*.

Registration (Ireland) Bill—
Motion for Leave (*The Earl of Mayo*) 782
Bill to amend the Law of Registration in Ireland, *ordered* (*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 213.]

Public Departments Payments Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 212] 783

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 7.

West Indies Bill (No. 135)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Duke of Buckingham*) .. 784
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Parliamentary Reform — Representation of the People (Ireland) Bill (No. 176)—
Order of the Day for the House to be put into a Committee on the said Bill, read 800
After short debate, House in Committee; Bill *reported*, without Amendment; and to be read 3^{a} on *Thursday* next.

Registration Bill (No. 218)—
Order of the Day for the Second Reading read 803
After short debate, Bill read 2^{a}, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill (No. 220)—
Bill read 3^{a} (according to Order), with the Amendments 803
Moved, at the end of the Bill to add the following clause:—
"That the Boundaries of the City of Glasgow shall, until otherwise directed by Parliament, be those specified in Schedule (K.) hereunto annexed,"—(*The Lord Redesdale.*)
After short debate, on Question? Their Lordships *divided*; Contents 13, Not-Contents 53; Majority 40:—*Resolved* in the *Negative*:—Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.
List of Contents and Not-Contents.

Railway Companies Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Duke of Richmond*); read 1^{a} (No. 226) 810

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 7.

ARMY—THE CONTROL DEPARTMENT—Questions, Colonel Jervis; Answers, Sir John Pakington 810

FRESCOES IN THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT — Question, Mr. Cowper; Answer, Lord John Manners 812

Public Schools (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 135]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 23rd June*] 812
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*; as amended, to be considered upon *Thursday*.

IRELAND—COMPULSORY PRESENTMENTS—Question, Colonel French; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 827

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.
(In the Committee.)
(1.) £67,380, to complete the sum for the British Museum.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 827
(2.) £1,024,653, Customs Department.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 831
(3.) £1,574,210, Inland Revenue Department.—Vote *agreed to* 831
(4.) £2,369,235, Post Office, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 831
(5.) £789,349, to complete the sum for Post Office Packet Service.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 835

Resolutions to be reported upon *Thursday;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Trades Societies and Combinations of Workmen Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Mr. Richard Young*) ; *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 219] .. 846

New Zealand Assembly's Powers Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Adderley, Mr. Sclater-Booth*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 216] 846

Vaccination (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 217] 846

Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*) ; *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 218] .. 846

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 8.

IRELAND—RAILWAYS—Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 847

Mines Assessment (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 127]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 848
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Friday,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 221.]

Promissory Oaths Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 113]—
Order for Committee read 853
After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee.
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* with an Amendment; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Government of India Act Amendment Bill [Bill 91]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 858
After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress ; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*) ; *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 223] 863

Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 222] 864

Tain Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—*Ordered* (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 224] .. 864

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 9.

HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS OF WALES—ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN—
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to congratulate Her Majesty on The Princess of Wales having happily given birth to a Princess, and to assure Her Majesty of the deep Interest felt by the House of Lords in all that concerns the domestic Happiness of Her Majesty and Her Family,"—(*The Lord Privy Seal*) 865
After short debate, *agreed to, Nemine Dissentiente* :—And the said Address Ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

SIR ROBERT NAPIER—MESSAGE FROM THE QUEEN—*Delivered* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) 865
Ordered, That the said Message be taken into consideration *To-morrow.*

Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill (No. 208)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Lord Cranworth*) .. 866

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

Uniformity of Public Worship Bill (No. 173)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) .. 868

Debate thereon:—Then a Question being stated thereupon, the Question was put, Whether the said Question shall be now put?—*Resolved* in the *Negative.*

Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Bill (No. 211)—

Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 896

After short debate, Bill to be read 3^{a} on *Monday* next.

Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill

Observations, The Earl of Malmesbury 903

Bill returned from the Commons, with several of the Amendments made by the Lords *agreed to;* certain Amendments *agreed to,* with Amendments; and One Amendment *disagreed to,* for which they assign a Reason: The said Reason, and Bill, with the Amendments, to be *printed;* and to be taken into Consideration *To-morrow.* (No. 235.)

District Church Tithes Act Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Bishop of Oxford*); read 1^{a} (No. 236) 904

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 9.

Representation of the People, 1867, Act—The Lodger Franchise—Stamper *v.* the Overseers of Sunderland—

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Candlish*) .. 904

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Cattle from Africa—Question, Mr. Barnett; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 908

Army—Military Expenditure—Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington 909

Army—Artillery Practice—Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Sir John Pakington 910

Collection and Payment of Rates—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 911

Army—Volunteer Review at Windsor—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Sir John Pakington 911

Assessment of Railway Property in Scotland—Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, The Lord Advocate 911

Reports of the Officers with the Prussian and Austrian Armies—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington 912

Ireland—Regulation of Irish Prisons—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 912

Primary Education (Ireland)—Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 913

Princess of Wales—Motion for an Address to the Queen (*Mr. Disraeli*) .. 913

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to congratulate Her Majesty on the Princess of Wales having happily given birth to a Princess, and to assure Her Majesty of our feelings of devoted loyalty and attachment to Her Majesty's Person and Family,—(*Mr. Disraeli.*)

Resolution *agreed to, Nemine Contradicente.*

Sir Robert Napier—Message from Her Majesty *brought up* .. 914

Committee thereupon *To-morrow.*

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill—

Ministerial Statement (*Mr. Disraeli*:)—Short debate thereon .. 915

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill [Bill 215]—

Lords Amendments *considered* 918

Amendments, as far as the Amendment in page 24, line 32, *agreed to.*

Page 24, line 32, the next Amendment, read a second time:—Amendment proposed, to add to the said Amendment the words "after the expiration of the present year and:"—(*Mr. M'Laren:*)—Question put, "That those words be there added:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 124, Noes 104; Majority 20:—Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Several other Amendments *agreed to:*—One *disagreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed:"—List of the Committee .. 920

Reason for disagreeing to Lords Amendment *reported,* and *agreed to:*—To be communicated to The Lords.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

ARMY—THE HORSE GUARDS—Motion for Papers (*Mr. Darby Griffith*) .. 920

ARMY—PROMOTIONS IN THE COLDSTREAM GUARDS—Observations, Sir P. O'Brien 922

ARMY—CONTROLLER-IN-CHIEF—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Controller in Chief should be an Under Secretary of State; and that the audit of the War Office accounts should be entirely independent of the War Office,"—(*Colonel Jervis,*)—instead thereof 922

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY—TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES—Observations, Sir Robert Anstruther .. 948

ARMY—INCREASE OF MILITARY EXPENDITURE—Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, Sir John Pakington 948

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—ARMY ESTIMATES.

(In the Committee.)

Page

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,291,400, be granted to Her Majesty (in addition to the sum of £200,000 already voted on account), towards defraying the Charge for Military Store Department, for the supply and repair of Warlike and other Stores, including Manufacturing Departments, which will come in course of payment from the 1st day of April 1868 to the 31st day of March, 1869, inclusive" .. 959

After short debate, Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,247,958, &c.,"—(*Major Anson:*)—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 31, Noes 100; Majority 69.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £119,300, to complete the sum for Military Education.

(3.) £93,600, to complete the sum for Surveys.—After short debate, Vote agreed to 962

(4.) £102,700, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Services.—After short debate, Vote agreed to .. 965

(5.) £154,600, to complete the sum for Administration of the Army.—After short debate, Vote agreed to .. 966

(6.) £13,700, to complete the sum for Rewards for Distinguished Service.

(7.) £36,000, to complete the sum for Pay of General Officers.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £389,800, be granted to Her Majesty (in addition to the sum of £81,000 already voted on account), towards defraying the Charge for Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, and Half Pay, which will come in course of payment from the first day of April 1868 to the 31st day of March 1869, inclusive" .. 967

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

(8.) £98,000, to complete the sum for Widows' Pensions, &c.

(9.) £11,800, to complete the sum for Pensions for Wounds.

(10.) £15,600, to complete the sum for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals.

(11.) £839,600, to complete the sum for Out Pensions.

(12.) £97,200, to complete the sum for Superannuation Allowances.

(13.) £8,700, to complete the sum for Militia, Yeomanry, Cavalry, and Volunteer Corps.

After short debate, Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. Bill [Bill 149]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) 968

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee,"—(*Colonel William Stuart,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee:—Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 10.

IRISH CHURCH COMMISSION — Question, Lord Dufferin; Answer, Earl Stanhope 972

SIR ROBERT NAPIER—THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE—

Order of the Day for the Consideration of the Queen's Message of Yesterday read:—Message read 973

An Address *moved* (*The Lord Privy Seal*); and, after short debate, *agreed to,* and Ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—

Ordered, That the Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill and the Bills appointed for Third Reading be taken before the Notices and the other Orders of the Day 974

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill (No. 235)—

Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendments and Commons' Reason for disagreeing to One of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to Order); One *disagreed to* 974

Moved, "That this House do disagree to the Amendment made by the Commons to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 24, line 32,"—(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Other of the Commons' Amendments *agreed to;* and Lords' Amendment to which the Commons disagree *not insisted on;* and a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords disagreeing to One of the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords to the said Bill; the Committee to meet *forthwith:* Report from Committee of a Reason prepared by them, read and *agreed to:* and a Message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill with the Reason.

Lodgers' Property Protection Bill (No. 186)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Marquess Townshend*) .. 976

After short debate, Order *discharged:*—Bill (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT—THE STATUES IN WESTMINSTER HALL—Question, Viscount Hardinge; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury:—Short debate thereon 978

COASTING TRADE OF FRANCE—ADDRESS FOR A PAPER—

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of any Correspondence that may have taken place between the Foreign Office and Her Majesty's Ambassador at Paris, and of any Communications from British Shipowners, in reference to the Exclusion of British Vessels from the Coasting Trade of France, and to the existing Treaties between France and Spain or any other Country relating to that Trade,—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) 980

After short debate, Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

University Elections (Voting Papers) Bill (No. 201)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Lord Clinton*) .. 981
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Bill (No. 228)—
Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 984
After short debate, Bill to be read 3^{a} on *Monday* next.

The Volunteer Review at Windsor—Question, Earl Spencer; Answer, Lord Truro:—Short debate thereon 988

Hudson's Bay Company Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*); read 1^{a} (No. 244) 998

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 10.

Poor Rate Assessment—Question, Mr. White; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 999

Battle of Königratz—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington .. 1000

House of Commons Arrangements—Question, Mr. Headlam; Answer, Lord John Manners 1000

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 63]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress July* 6] 1001
After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Workhouse Dietaries in Ireland—Resolution—Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland should establish a minimum scale of dietary for the Paupers in the Union Workhouses not less than that now in existence in the Irish County Gaols, and which was recommended by the Commission appointed to report on the County Prison Dietaries, 'as necessary for the preservation of the health of the prisoners,'"—(*Mr. Blake*,)—instead thereof 1020
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Consular Courts in Turkey and Egypt—Observations, Mr. Layard; Reply, Lord Stanley:—Short debate thereon 1024

University Education in Ireland—Resolution—Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, Catholics, Presbyterians, and other inhabitants of Ireland, will not be placed in a position of equality, in reference to University education in that country, with those who are members of the Established Church, until all religious disabilities are removed from the fellowships, scholarships, and other honours and emoluments of Trinity College, Dublin,"—(*Mr. Fawcett*,)—instead thereof 1054
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Army—Royal Gun Factory—Motion for a Committee— .. 1065
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

PENSION TO SIR ROBERT NAPIER—RESOLUTION—

Message from Her Majesty *considered* in Committee 1066

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That the annual sum of Two Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to be settled upon Lieutenant General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., and the next surviving Heir Male of his Body, for the term of their natural lives.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday* next.

Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill—

Lords' Reason for disagreeing to one of the Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendments *considered* 1067

After short debate, *Resolved,* That this House doth not insist upon the Amendment made by this House to the Amendment made by their Lordships, to which The Lords have disagreed.

Danube Works Loan Bill—Resolution *reported :*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Lord Stanley, Mr. Sclater-Booth*) ; *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 227] .. 1067

Militia Pay Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Sclater-Booth*) ; *presented,* and read the first time 1067

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, The Earl of Mayo*) ; *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 229] 1067

Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London, Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Alderman Lawrence*) ; *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 228] .. 1067

LORDS, SATURDAY, JULY 11.

Their Lordships met ; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— House adjourned.

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 13.

PRIVATE BILLS—RAILWAY BILLS—INCREASE OF RATES—RESOLUTION—

Moved, to resolve, That no Railway Bill that proposes to increase the Rates now payable on the Conveyance of Goods or Passengers shall be read a Second time until a special Report from the Board of Trade on the Subject shall have been laid upon the Table of the House,"—(*The Lord Taunton*) 1067

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*

Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal Bill (No. 204)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Abinger*) .. 1078

After short debate, Motion *agreed to :*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS OF WALES—

The QUEEN'S Answer to the Address of Thursday last [July 9], *reported* .. 1090

MARRIAGE LAWS COMMISSION—Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde ; Answer, Lord Chelmsford 1090

Ecclesiastical Commissioners Bill (No. 221)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 1091

Motion *agreed to :*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Burials (Ireland) Bill (No. 212)

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Kimberley*) .. 1093

Motion *agreed to :*—Bill read 2ª accordingly.

Then it was *moved,* That the Bill be *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House.

An Amendment *moved* to leave out from ("Bill") to the end of the Motion, and insert ("be referred to a Select Committee,")—(*The Archbishop of Armagh.*)

After short debate, Amendment (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn :*—Then the Original Motion was *agreed to ;* and Bill *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Bill (No. 211)—

Bill read 3^{a} (according to Order), with the Amendments 1098
After short debate, Amendment *agreed to* :—Further Amendments made.
Then it was *moved*, That the Bill do pass.
After further short debate, on Question ? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative* :—Bill *passed* accordingly, and sent to the Commons.

West Indies Bill (No. 135)—

House in Committee (according to Order) 1101
Amendments made ; The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next ; and Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 249.)

Hudson's Bay Company Bill (No. 244)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Duke of Buckingham*) .. 1101
Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2^{a}, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 13.

VAGRANCY—Question, Mr. Floyer ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. 1102
SURVEY OF INDIA—Question, Mr. Akroyd ; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote .. 1103
ALLEGED CRUELTIES IN NEW ZEALAND—Question, Mr. Gorst ; Answer, Mr. Adderley 1103
INDIA—RAJA OF KUPURTHULLA—Question, Lord William Hay; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 1104
CONCENTRATION OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS—Question, Mr. Gregory ; Answer, Lord John Manners 1105
PARLIAMENT—PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—Question, Mr. Cowper ; Answer, Lord John Manners 1105
ARMY—STORING OF AMMUNITION—Question, Mr. Hayter ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1106
ARMY—HALE'S WAR ROCKETS—Question, Mr. Otway ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1106

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read ; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair :"—

NAVY—IRON-CLAD FLEET—Observations, Captain Mackinnon .. 1107
NAVY—FUTURE CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a scientific inquiry be instituted, to take into consideration the leading characteristics that should be adopted in the future construction of the vessels of the Navy,"—(*Mr. Seely*,)—instead thereof 1111
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."
After debate, Question put :—The House *divided* ; Ayes 47, Noes 37 ; Majority 10.
VANCOUVER'S ISLAND AND BRITISH COLUMBIA—Question, Viscount Milton ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth :—Short debate thereon 1140
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*.
PRINCESS OF WALES—HER MAJESTY'S Answer to the Address [9th July], *reported* 1140

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—NAVY ESTIMATES.

(1.) £87,179, Victualling Yards and Transport Establishments at Home and Abroad.

(2.) £64,824, Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad.

(3.) £20,709, Marine Divisions.

(4.) £592,908, to complete the sum for Naval Stores, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1143

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £742,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Expense of Steam Machinery for Her Majesty's Ships and Vessels, and for Payments to be made for Ships and Vessels building or to be built by Contract, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869" .. 1148

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £742,000, &c.,"—(*Mr. Samuda*) 1154

The Committee *divided;* Ayes 59, Noes 92; Majority 33.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(6.) £564,237, to complete the sum for New Works, Buildings, Machinery, and Repairs. — After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1155

(7.) £78,164, Medicines, Medical Stores, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1155

(8.) £20,365, Martial Law.

(9.) £175,800, Naval Miscellaneous Services. — After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1156

(10.) £500,166, to complete the sum for Half-pay, &c. Navy and Royal Marines.

(11.) £400,447, to complete the sum for Military Pensions and Allowances.

(12.) £123,498, to complete the sum for Civil Pensions and Allowances.

(13.) £200,600, to complete the sum for Freight of Ships.

(14.) £42,079, Greenwich Hospital and Schools.— After short debate, Vote *agreed to.* 1156

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Sir Robert Napier—

Resolution from the Committee upon Her Majesty's Message [9th July] *reported:*—Resolution *agreed to, Nemine Contradicente:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Disraeli, Sir Stafford Northcote*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 230] .. 1157

BRISTOL ELECTION—

Ordered, That the Evidence taken before the Bristol Election Committee having been delivered, Mr. Speaker do not issue his Warrant for a New Writ for the City of Bristol until three days' Notice of a Motion for the Writ shall have expired,—(*Mr. Bass.*)

Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Sir James Fergusson*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 231] .. 1157

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 14.

NEW PEER INTRODUCED—Alexander Nelson Baron Bridport of that Part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland, Major General in Her Majesty's Army, having been created Viscount Bridport of the United Kingdom—Was (in the usual Manner) introduced.

Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill (No. 208)—

House in Committee 1158

After short time spent therein, House to be again in Committee on *Friday* next.

Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland) Bill (No. 224)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Devon*) .. 1162

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

District Church Tithes Act Amendment Bill (No. 236)—

House in Committee 1163

Amendments made; The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 251.)

Courts of Justiciary (Scotland) Bill (No. 232)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 1163

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 14.

Army—Invalid Officers from India—Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1165

"Running his Letters" in Scotland—Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, The Lord Advocate 1166

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 63]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 10th July*] 1166

After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday*, at Twelve of the clock.

Supply—Report—Resolutions *reported* 1185

First Thirteen Resolutions read a second time, and *agreed to.*

Fourteenth Resolution read a second time, and *re-committed* to the Committee of Supply.

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Civil Service Estimates—Observations, Mr. Childers; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1185

Departments of Public Health, &c.—Resolution—*Moved,*

"That it is expedient that the Departments of Public Health, Cattle Plague, and Quarantine should cease to exist as Establishments, due regard being had to all personal interests and to all individual claims,"—(*Sir J. Clarke Jervoise*) 1194

After short debate, Motion *negatived.*

Courts of Appeal—Assessed Taxes—Question, Mr. Treeby; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1199

Circular Delivery Company and the Commissionaires—Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave 1200

Ireland—Royal Irish Academy—Observations, Mr. Gregory; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1200

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—Civil Service Estimates.

(In the Committee.)

Page

(1.) £35,609, to complete the sum for the Treasury.

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £28,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for Her Majesty's Foreign and other Secret Services" 1201

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £18,000, &c."—(*Mr. Lusk*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £56,410, to complete the sum for Home Office.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1202

(4.) £52,453, to complete the sum for Foreign Office.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1203

(5.) £19,990, to complete the sum for Colonial Office.

(6.) £65,725, to complete the sum for Board of Trade.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1203

(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,176, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Salaries of the Officers and Attendants of the Household of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and other Expenses" 1206

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item of £1,574 6*s.* 2*d.* for Queen's Plates to be run for in Ireland, be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Mr. Lusk*) 1207

After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(8.) £14,927, to complete the sum for Chief Secretary, Ireland, Offices.

[*July* 14.]

Supply—Civil Service Estimates—*continued*.

(9.) £12,646, to complete the sum for Paymaster General's Office.

(10.) £4,136, to complete the sum for Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, &c.

(11.) £22,700, to complete the sum for Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works, England.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1208

(12.) £17,546, to complete the sum for Board of Works, Ireland.

(13.) £36,354, to complete the sum for House of Commons' Offices.

(14.) £28,585, to complete the sum for Privy Council Office.

(15.) £1,918, to complete the sum for Privy Seal Office.

(16.) £6,407, to complete the sum for Civil Service Commission.

(17.) £25,500, to complete the sum for Exchequer and Audit Department.

(18.) £16,958, to complete the sum for Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1209

(19.) £14,926, to complete the sum for Public Record Office.

(20.) £140,183, to complete the sum for Poor Law Commission.

(21.) £30,820, to complete the sum for Mint.

(22.) £13,294, to complete the sum for Copyhold Inclosure and Tithe Commission.

(23.) £7,200, to complete the sum for Inclosure and Drainage Acts; Imprest Expenses.

(24.) £27,961, to complete the sum for General Register Office.

(25.) £11,132, to complete the sum for National Debt Office.

(26.) £3,429, to complete the sum for Public Works Loan Commission, &c.

(27.) £2,820, to complete the sum for Lunacy Commission.

(28.) £1,449, to complete the sum for Registrars of Friendly Societies.

(29.) £12,438, to complete the sum for Charity Commission.

(30.) £19,071, to complete the sum for Patent Office, &c.

(31.) £215,909, to complete the sum for Printing and Stationery.

(32.) £11,867, to complete the sum for Poor Law Commission, Scotland.

(33.) £4,608, to complete the sum for General Register Office, Scotland.

(34.) £3,206, to complete the sum for Lunacy Commission, Scotland.

(35.) £9,223, to complete the sum for Fishery Board, Scotland.

(36.) £2,296, to complete the sum for Public Record Office, Ireland.

(37.) £63,267, to complete the sum for Poor Law Commission, Ireland.

(38.) £14,722, to complete the sum for General Registrar Office, &c. Ireland.

(39.) £250, Boundary Survey, Ireland.

(40.) £1,188, to complete the sum for Charitable Donations and Bequests, Ireland.

Re-committed Resolution, reported this day, read, as followeth :—

"That a sum, not exceeding £42,079, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Greenwich Hospital and Schools, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869" .. 1210

Whereupon—

(41.) *Resolved*, That a sum, not exceeding £127,600, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Greenwich Hospital and Schools, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869.

(42.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Compensation granted to the Portpatrick Railway Company in consequence of the Abandonment of Mail Communication between Donaghadee and Portpatrick" 1210

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again," —(*Mr. Neate:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

(43.) £7,500, Compensation, Explosion at Clerkenwell.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1212

(44.) £10,000, Registration Expenses 1213

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £389,800, be granted to Her Majesty (in addition to the sum of £81,000 already voted on account), towards defraying the Charge for Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, and Half Pay, which will come in course of payment from the first day of April 1868 to the 31st day of March 1869, inclusive."

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again," —(*Colonel Jervis,*)—put, and *agreed to*.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*; Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

Colonial Shipping Bill—Resolution *considered* in Committee :—Resolution *reported* :—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Adderley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 236] 1213

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4) Bill—
Ordered (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, The Earl of Mayo*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 235] 1213

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 15.

Ireland—Royal Irish Institute—Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1214

Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 181]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 1214
After some time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Friday,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 238.]

Mines Assessment Bill [Bill 221]—
Moved, "That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into Consideration" .. 1220
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day fortnight,"—(*Sir Robert Collier.*)
After debate, Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived:*—Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Consideration, as amended, *deferred* till *Wednesday,* 29th July.

Sir Robert Napier's Annuity Bill [Bill 230]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 1225
Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 16.

Private Bills—Railway Bills—Increase of Rates—Standing Order—
Standing Order No. 179. amended by inserting after Section 3. the following Section:—
Section 4. That no Bill which proposes to increase the Rates now payable on the Conveyance of Goods or Passengers on any Railway shall be read a Second Time until a Report from the Board of Trade on the Subject, made after the Bill has been read a First Time in this House, shall have been laid upon the Table of the House .. 1226
Ordered, That the said Standing Order, as amended, be *printed.*

Promissory Oaths Bill (No. 243)—
Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order) 1227
After debate, Commons' Amendments *agreed to.*

The War Office—Department of Control—Question, Observations, Earl De Grey and Ripon; Reply, The Earl of Longford:—Short debate thereon 1233

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 16.

South-Eastern and London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Companies' Bill (*by Order*)—
Lords' Amendments *considered;* several *agreed to;* and, after short debate, one *disagreed to,*—(*Mr. Watkin*) 1248
Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed:"—List of the Committee 1250

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—
Petition of S. A. Goddard—Observations, Mr. H. B. Sheridan .. 1250

SUPPLY—Order for Committee—*continued.*

ARMY—ROYAL GUN FACTORIES—MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Committee of Five Members be appointed by the Committee of Selection to inquire into the following allegations:—That in 1864 the Royal Gun Factories, on being applied to by the Ordnance Select Committee for Estimates for cheaper 9-inch guns than those that were being made at that time, sent in erroneous comparative Estimates, on the strength of which the Ordnance Select Committee decided in favour of the gun proposed by the Royal Gun Factories; that a sample 9-inch gun was then made by the Royal Gun Factories, the details of the cost of which, on being compared with the details of the cost of similar guns manufactured two years afterwards, show great and apparently inexplicable discrepancies; and that like errors have been made by the Royal Gun Factories with regard to the comparative cost of new wrought-iron and converted guns, thereby entailing a heavy and unnecessary expense upon the country,"—(*Major Anson,*)—instead thereof .. 1254

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Amendment moved, to add the words,

"That Sir John Pakington and Major Anson be added to the Committee, for the purpose of examining witnesses, and taking part in the proceedings, but without the power of voting,"—(*Captain Vivian.*)

After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Another Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Committee of Seven Members be appointed, &c,"—(*Major Anson*) .. 1260

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived:* — Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Ordered, That a Committee of Seven Members be appointed to inquire into the following allegations:—That in 1864 the Royal Gun Factories, on being applied to by the Ordnance Select Committee for Estimates for cheaper 9-inch guns than those that were being made at that time, sent in erroneous comparative Estimates, on the strength of which the Ordnance Select Committee decided in favour of the gun proposed by the Royal Gun Factories; that a sample 9-inch gun was then made by the Royal Gun Factories, the details of the cost of which, on being compared with the details of the cost of similar guns manufactured two years afterwards, show great and apparently inexplicable discrepancies; and that like errors have been made by the Royal Gun Factories with regard to the comparative cost of new wrought-iron and converted guns, thereby entailing a heavy and unnecessary expense upon the country,—(*Major Anson*)

And, on July 18, Select Committee *nominated:*—List of the Committee .. 1261

SUPPLY—*Resolved,* That this House will immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

ARMY—SOLDIERS' ORPHANS—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to direct that an Institution shall be established to receive and educate the Orphan Daughters of Non-commissioned Officers and Soldiers of our Army,"—(*Colonel North,*)—instead thereof 1261

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY—CONTROL DEPARTMENT—MOTION FOR PAPERS—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Draft Regulations for the Control Department originally sent in by the War Office to the Treasury, together with any memoranda thereupon by the Assistant Under Secretary of State for War, together with the reply thereto by the Controller in Chief,"—(*Colonel Jervis,*)—instead thereof 1265

After debate, Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Observations, Mr. Disraeli:—Short debate thereon 1273

SUPPLY—Order for Committee—*continued.*

BRISTOL ELECTION—Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, The Solicitor General 1275

NATIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION (IRELAND)—Observations, Sir John Gray; Reply, The Earl of Mayo 1276

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—ARMY ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

Question again proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £389,800, be granted to Her Majesty (in addition to the sum of £81,000 already voted on account), towards defraying the Charge for Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, and Half Pay, which will come in course of payment from the first day of April 1868 to the 31st day of March 1869, inclusive" 1278

After debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

IRELAND—CASE OF MICHAEL O'HANLON—Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 1280

NATURALIZATION AND EXPATRIATION—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Stanley 1280

METROPOLIS—NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Lord John Manners 1281

IRELAND—FENIAN PRISONERS, WARREN AND COSTELLO—Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 1282

IRELAND—INEQUALITY OF TAXATION—Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1283

METROPOLIS—PARK LANE—Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Tite .. 1283

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN CATTLE—Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Lord Stanley:—Short debate thereon 1284

APPOINTMENTS IN THE CUSTOMS, &c.—Question, Mr. A. Russell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1286

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN SHEEP—Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 1287

DISTRIBUTION OF TROOPS IN THE NORTH OF IRELAND—Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 1287

FIRES FROM RAILWAY ENGINES—Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave 1287

CATTLE PLAGUE COMPENSATION—Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 1288

POST OFFICE—VANCOUVER'S ISLAND—Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. Adderley 1289

TURKEY—EMBASSY HOUSE AT THERAPIA—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1289

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET BILL—Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1290

IRELAND—BARRACKS AT MULLINGAR—Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 1290

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 139]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [26th June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" and which Amendment was—

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill—continued.

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the proposal to pass a permanent law, requiring that in order to prevent the introduction of the Cattle Plague into this Country from abroad, all foreign cattle and other animals imported into the Port of London shall be landed at one prescribed spot, and shall not be removed thence alive, ought not to be considered apart from the general policy of imposing legal restrictions on the foreign cattle trade in other ports of the United Kingdom,"—(*Mr. Milner Gibson,*)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—Debate *resumed* 1291

After long debate, Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 241] 1343

Woods and Game Assessment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Read, Mr. Jasper More*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 242] 1343

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 17.

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill — Observations, Lord Redesdale 1344

Coronation Oath—Address for a Paper—

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for a Copy of the Oath taken by Her Majesty at Her Coronation:

Agreed to.—(*The Lord Redesdale*) 1345

Army—Organization of the Reserved Forces — Question, Lord Truro; Answer, The Earl of Longford:—Short debate thereon 1350

The Blockade of Mazatlan—Question, The Earl of Denbigh; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury 1359

Burials (Ireland) Bill (No. 212)—

House in Committee (according to Order):—Amendments made .. 1361

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 269.)

Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill (No. 208)—

Order for the House to be again in Committee on the said Bill, read .. 1363

After short debate, House again in Committee.

Amendments made; The Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 270.)

Larceny and Embezzlement Bill (No. 245)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Chelmsford*) .. 1364

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

Marriages Validity (Blakedown) Bill [H.L.] — *Presented* (*The Lord Lyttelton*); read 1ª (No. 271) 1365

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 17.

Queensland—Polynesian Islanders—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley 1365

School Inquiry Committee—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1366

Collection of Assessed Taxes in the South of London—Question, Mr. Thomas Hughes; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1367

Supply—Report—Resolution [July 16] *reported* 1367

After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 63]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress* 14*th July*] 1369
After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Motion for Adjournment—*Moved,* "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next,"—(*Mr. Baillie Cochrane*) .. 1387

Navy — Greenwich Hospital—Observations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Reply, Mr. Du Cane:—Debate thereon 1387

Customs Extra Clerks — Observations, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Reply, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1407

Ireland—Tenure of Land—Question, Observations, Mr. O'Beirne; Reply, The Earl of Mayo 1411

Parliament — Public Business—Observations, Mr. Dillwyn; Reply, Mr. Disraeli:—Short debate thereon 1419

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Poor Relief Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 186]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1421
After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

COMMONS, SATURDAY, JULY 18.

Customs-House Officers' Grievances—Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1426

Army—Experiments at Shoeburyness—Observations, Mr. O'Beirne; Reply, Sir John Pakington:—Short debate thereon 1426

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 63]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress* 17*th July*] 1439
After long time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Wednesday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 243.]

Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London, Bill—Read a second time, and *committed* to a Select Committee of Eight Members:—List of the Committee 1458

Tenure and Improvement of Land, &c. (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Rearden, Mr. Michael Bass*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 244] 1458

Schools and Training Factories (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Rearden, Mr. Leader*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 245] 1459

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 20.

Army of Abyssinia (Vote of Thanks)—

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That he had received a Letter from Lieut.-General Lord Napier of Magdala, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., in return to the Thanks of this House and to the Resolutions of the 2d Instant, communicated to him in obedience to an Order of this House of the said 2d Instant: The said Letter being read—Was Ordered to lie on the Table, and to be entered on the Journals. 1459

The Canning Statue — Question, Lord Campbell; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury 1460

Public Schools Bill (No. 262)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Derby*) .. 1461
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Burials (Ireland) Bill (No. 269)—
Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 1473
After short debate, Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—
Ordered, That for the Remainder of the Session the Bill or Bills which are entered for Consideration on the Minutes of the Day shall have the same Precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays .. 1475

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 20.

ASSESSED TAXES—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1475
METROPOLIS—INCLOSURE IN REGENT'S PARK—Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Lord John Manners 1476
ARMY—MANUFACTURE OF HALE'S ROCKETS—Question, Major Anson; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1476
NAVY—THE "ACHILLES" AND "MINOTAUR"—Question, Captain Mackinnon; Answer, Sir John Hay 1477
AFFAIRS OF CEYLON—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Adderley .. 1477
NAVY—ROPEMAKERS IN CHATHAM DOCKYARD—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox 1478
RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN SPAIN—Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Lord Stanley 1478
CAPTAIN PIM'S ELECTORAL ADDRESS—Question, Mr. Neate; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox 1480
NAVY—COALING HER MAJESTY'S SHIPS—Question, Mr. H. Edwards; Answer, Mr. Du Cane 1481
MONITORS IN THE FRENCH NAVY—Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox 1481
IRELAND—CORONER'S INQUEST AT MONAGHAN—Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 1482
IRELAND—DIETARY IN WORKHOUSES—Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 1482
ARMY—EMPLOYMENT OF SOLDIERS—Question, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1483
SCOTLAND—PAROCHIAL ASSESSMENT—Question, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell; Answer, The Lord Advocate 1483
METROPOLIS—FLOWERS IN THE PUBLIC PARKS—Question, Colonel North; Answer, Lord John Manners 1484
IRELAND—QUEEN'S PLATES—Question, General Dunne; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 1485
ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION—VOTE OF THANKS TO LORD NAPIER—
Mr. SPEAKER acquainted the House, that he had received a Letter from Lord Napier of Magdala, dated the 18th day of this instant July, acknowledging the Thanks of this House to himself and other Officers for the success attending the Abyssinian Expedition:—Letter read 1485

Registration (Ireland) Bill [Bill 213]—
Order for Committee read 1486
After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee.
After some time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Wednesday*, and to be *printed.* [Bill 248.]

[*July* 20.] Page

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 139]
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress July* 16] 1514
After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday*.

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 21.

South Eastern and London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Companies Bill—
Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to One of the Amendments made by the Lords, *considered* (according to Order) 1543
Moved, "To insist upon the Amendment made by the Lords to which the Commons have disagreed,"—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)
After short debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 11, Not-Contents 30; Majority 19:—*Resolved* in the *Negative.*

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill (No. 253)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 1549
An Amendment made; The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next.

FORESHORES—MOTION FOR PAPERS—
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to request that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to order that there be laid before this House by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, Copy of each of the following privately printed Papers; namely,
"Report on the Right to Foreshores and the legal Decisions affecting the River Thames and the Rights of the Citizens of London from the Time of Henry III.; by J. W. Pycroft, F.S.A., M.R.A.S.; Reg. Sept. Antiq. Reg. Soc., pp. 161:" [and other Papers,]—(*The Duke of Buccleuch*) 1550
After short debate, Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn*.
Then, Motion for an Address for—
"Statement of all legal Proceedings which have been instituted by the Law Officers at their Instance in the Name of the Crown, or in the Behalf of Her Majesty, with respect to the alleged Title claimed by the Crown to the Bed or Shores of the Sea or the Foreshores or Beds of Navigable Rivers against Corporate Bodies or Private Individuals from the 1st Day of January 1843 to the present Time:" [and other Particulars,]—(*The Duke of Buccleuch.*)
Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

BED OF THE SEA, &c.—Motion for an Address for—
"Statements: Of all legal Proceedings instituted by the Law Officers or otherwise on Behalf of the Crown, with respect to the Title of the Crown to the Bed or Shores of the Sea or the Beds or Shores of Tidal Navigable Rivers against Corporate Bodies or Private Individuals, from the 21st Day of July 1863 up to the 31st December 1866:" [and other Particulars,]—(*The Duke of Richmond*) 1552
Motion *agreed to.*

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 21.

NAVY—ADMIRALTY CIRCULARS ON MEDALS OF 1847, 1848, AND 1858—Question, Captain Mackinnon; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox 1553
IMPRISONMENT FOR COSTS ON A DISMISSED CHARGE—Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1553
INDIA—FURLOUGH REGULATIONS—Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 1554
ARMY—THE 36TH REGIMENT—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1556
IRELAND—FENIAN PRISONERS, WARREN AND COSTELLO—Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. J. Stuart Mill 1556
NAVY CHAPLAINS—Question, Mr. Carnegie; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox .. 1557

[*July* 21.] Page

Electric Telegraphs (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 239]—
Order for Committee read :—*Moved,* " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 1557
After debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill *considered* in Committee.
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported* ; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Poor Relief Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 186]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress July* 17] 1605
After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon *Thursday.*

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 22.

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill [Bill 243]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 1615
After long debate, further Consideration *deferred* till *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Electric Telegraphs Bill [Bill 239]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 1651
After short debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 23.

Public Schools Bill (No. 262)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 1651
After short time spent therein, further Amendment made ; The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow* ; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 285.)

Explosive Materials in War—The Russian Circular—Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury ; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury 1661

The Canning Statue—Question, Lord Campbell ; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury 1664

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 23.

Metropolis—The New Courts of Justice—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1665

India—Sale of Girls—Question, Mr. Bazley ; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 1666

Navy—Reports on Turret-Ships—Question, Mr. Seely ; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox 1666

British Factory at St. Petersburg — Question, Mr. Clay ; Answer, Lord Stanley 1666

Navy—Sheerness Dockyard—Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen ; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox 1667

Army—Manufacture of Cartridges—Question, General Dunne ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1667

Army—Artillery Practice at Portsmouth—Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1668

Post Office—The West India Mail—Question, Mr. Bouverie ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1669

Ireland—Eel Weir at Roosky—Question, Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1669

India—The Budget—Question, Mr. J. B. Smith ; Answer, Sir S. Northcote 1670

Scotland—Bridge at Dunkeld—Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, The Lord Advocate .. 1671

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market—Question, Mr. Milner Gibson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1672

Poor Law—Case of James Austin—Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy .. 1673

Navy—The "Research" and the "Enterprise"—Explanation, Mr. Seely 1673

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill [Bill 243]—

Further Proceeding on Consideration, as amended, *resumed* .. 1675
After debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 24.

Electric Telegraphs Bill (No. 282)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Duke of Montrose*) .. 1692
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

Public Schools Bill (No. 285)—

Amendments *reported* (according to Order) .. 1701
After short debate, further Amendments made:—Bill to be read 3ª on *Monday* next; and to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 288.)

Registration (Ireland) Bill (No. 281)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Malmesbury*) .. 1709
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 24.

Court of Chancery and County Courts—Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, The Attorney General .. 1711

Metropolis—Park Lane—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Colonel Hogg 1711

Agents at the Foreign Office—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1712

Case of James Bell—Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 1713

Navy—Old Ships and Sheerness Dockyard—Question, Mr. Pemberton; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox .. 1713

Navy—Turret and Broadside Ships—Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox .. 1714

Case of Charles Pennel Measor—Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy .. 1714

Outbreak of Cattle Plague—Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu .. 1715

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill [Bill 243]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Disraeli*) .. 1715
Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now read the third time," in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of a Clause providing for returning officers' expenses out of rates,"—(*Mr. Fawcett*,)—instead thereof.
After short debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided*; Ayes 102, Noes 91; Majority 11:—Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

Regulation of Railways Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 142]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 1733
After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *this day*.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT—*Moved*, "That the House at its rising do adjourn till Monday,"—(*Mr. Jacob Bright*) 1737
BRISTOL ELECTION—Observations, Mr. Neate ; Reply, The Attorney General 1744
CRETAN INSURRECTION—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1747
THE METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET—Questions, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Liddell; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Robert Montagu 1748
FOREIGN CATTLE TRADE—Observations, Mr. Headlam; Reply, Lord Robert Montagu:—Short debate thereon 1749

Question put, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next,"—(*Mr. Jacob Bright*:)—The House *divided;* Ayes 38, Noes 105; Majority 67.

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 139]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress July* 20] 1756
After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Bill—
Lords' Amendments *considered* (according to Order) 1773
After short debate, Lords' Amendments *agreed to* [Special Entry].

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET BILL—Question, Mr. Henniker-Major; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1773

COMMONS, SATURDAY, JULY 25.

INCOME TAX COMMISSIONERS—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1774

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 139]—
Order for Committee read 1775
After short debate, Order *discharged*:—Bill *withdrawn.*

Regulation of Railways Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 142]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 1781
After debate, Amendments made:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 27.

NEW PEER INTRODUCED—Sir Robert Cornelis Napier, a Lieutenant General in Her Majesty's Army, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., Commander-in-Chief of the Army of Bombay—Having been created Baron Napier of Magdala in Abyssinia and of Caryngton in the County Palatine of Chester, was (in the usual Manner) *introduced* 1793

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill (No. 287)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Privy Seal*) .. 1793
After debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Electric Telegraphs Bill (No. 282)—
Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read .. 1813
After short debate, House in Committee :—Bill *reported,* without Amendment ; and to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

ABYSSINIA —THE ENVOYS—Question, Lord Houghton ; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury 1814

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 27.

ARMY—FORTIFICATIONS—Question, Colonel Sykes ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1817

ARMY—M. CHARLIER'S METHOD OF SHOEING HORSES—Question, Mr. St. Aubyn ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1817

NAVY—OLD UNARMOURED SHIPS—Question, Captain Mackinnon ; Answer, Admiral Seymour 1818

SIERRA LEONE — APPOINTMENT OF MR. HUGGINS—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan ; Answer, Mr. Adderley 1818

EXPENSES OF WITNESSES—Question, Mr. Beach ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. 1819

CLERGY ACT OF BRITISH GUIANA — Question, Mr. Candlish ; Answer, Mr. Adderley 1819

CLERGY ACT OF JAMAICA—Question, Mr. Candlish ; Answer, Mr. Adderley .. 1820

SPAIN—CASE OF THE "TORNADO"—Question, Mr. Candlish ; Answer, Lord Stanley 1820

ARMY — RETIREMENT OF ARTILLERY OFFICERS—Question, General Dunne ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1821

ARMY—MEDICAL DEPARTMENT — Question, Mr. O'Beirne ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1821

FEES ON ORDINATIONS—Question, Mr. Monk ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. 1822

INDIA—INDIAN SERVICE MEDALS — Question, Mr. Kinnaird ; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 1822

THE CIRCUITS IN YORKSHIRE—Question, Viscount Milton ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1823

ARMY—7TH SURREY VOLUNTEERS—Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1823

BRITISH FACTORY AT ST. PETERSBURG — Question, Mr. Clay ; Answer, Lord Stanley 1824

RELATIONS WITH MEXICO—Question, Mr. Kinglake ; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1825

CASE OF MR. CASTLE—Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1826

ARMY — STOREHOUSES FOR THE WAR OFFICE—Question, Mr. Adam ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1826

ARMY—KNAPSACKS FOR THE TROOPS—Question, Mr. Warner ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1827

ARMY—MARCH OF TROOPS FROM ALDERSHOT TO SANDHURST—Questions, Mr. Osborne, Mr. Buxton ; Answers, Sir John Pakington 1828

SMALLPOX AMONG SHEEP IN SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN—Question, Colonel North ; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 1828

THE LATE LORD BROUGHAM—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT—
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Roebuck*) .. 1829
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

INDIA—EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS—*Considered* in Committee .. 1837

After long debate,

Resolved, That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1867 was £42,122,433 ; the total of the direct claims and demands upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium, was £7,637,527 ; the charges in India, including Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £29,848,640 ; the value of Stores supplied from England, was £873,363 ; the charges in England were £5,549,345 ; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £731,049, making a total charge for the same year of £44,639,924 ; and there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £2,517,491.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

Government of India Act Amendment Bill [Bill 91]—

Order for Committee read 1870

Moved, "That the Order of the Day to go into Committee on this Bill be discharged,"—(*Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Order *discharged* :—Bill *withdrawn.*

Poor Relief Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 186]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1871

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported,* with Amendments, and an amended Title ; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

West Indies Bill [Bill 124]—

Lords' Amendments *considered* 1886

Moved, To leave out the words "as such coadjutor, continue to act in the same manner as at present as Archdeacon of Middlesex," in order to insert the words "and exercises episcopal functions therein, continue to receive out of the Consolidated Fund the annual payment of two thousand pounds which has been hitherto made to him in part by the Bishop of Jamaica out of the stipend of three thousand pounds paid to the said Bishop from the Consolidated Fund under the before recited Acts, and in part out of the stipend appropriated to his Archdeaconry of Middlesex out of the Consolidated Fund, under the said Acts: Provided, That during his receipt of such annual payment no payment shall be made to him out of the Consolidated Fund in respect of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex,"—(*Mr. Russell Gurney,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of The Lords' Amendment."

After short debate, Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

Prisons (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 256] 1888

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 28.

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill (No. 287)—

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read .. 1889

After short debate, House in Committee accordingly.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment ; Amendments made ; and Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

Electric Telegraphs Bill (No. 282)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Duke of Montrose*) .. 1895

Bill read 3ª :—On Question, "That the Bill do pass ?"

Moved, to insert in Clause 8, line 35, after ("Company") ("any Sum so voted having been approved of as fair by the Arbitrator herein-after named,")—(*The Lord Redesdale.*)

After short debate, Amendment *negatived* :—Bill *passed.*

BABY FARMING—Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury ; Answer, The Duke of Marlborough 1896

Registration (Ireland) Bill (No. 281)—
Order of the Day for the Third Reading read 1897
After short debate, Bill read 3^a; Amendments made; Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 28.

UNITED STATES—LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF PHILADELPHIA — Questions, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. 1901

ARMY—WIMBLEDON MEETING—Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1902

ARMY—MARCH OF TROOPS FROM ALDERSHOT TO SANDHURST—Observations, Sir John Pakington 1902

Public Schools Bill [Bill 135]—
Lords' Amendments *considered* 1903
Page 9, line 10, Amendment, read a second time.
Moved, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment,"—(*Sir Stafford Northcote.*)
After short debate, the House *divided;* Ayes 28, Noes 18; Majority 10:—Other Amendments *disagreed to*:—Subsequent Amendments *agreed to.*
Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:"—List of the Committee 1908

Poor Relief Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 186]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 1908
Clause (Greater uniformity in treatment of casual poor,)—(*Mr. Neate,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.
Moved, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."
After short debate, Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*
After further short debate, Amendments made:—Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

District Church Tithes Act Amendment Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 246]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 1917
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered*; read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

West Indies Bill [Bill 124]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [27th July] proposed to be made to the Amendment made by the Lords to The West Indies Bill; and which Amendment was—

To leave out the words "as such coadjutor, continue to act in the same manner as at present as Archdeacon of Middlesex," in order to insert the words "and exercises episcopal functions therein, continue to receive out of the Consolidated Fund the annual payment of two thousand pounds which has been hitherto made to him in part by the Bishop of Jamaica out of the stipend of three thousand pounds paid to the said Bishop from the Consolidated Fund under the before recited Acts, and in part out of the stipend appropriated to his Archdeaconry of Middlesex out of the Consolidated Fund, under the said Acts: Provided, That during his receipt of such annual payment no payment shall be made to him out of the Consolidated Fund in respect of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex,"—(*Mr. Russell Gurney,*)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of The Lords Amendment:"—Debate *resumed* 1918
After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 30, Noes 29; Majority 1.
Lords Amendment *agreed to.*

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 29.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the business on the Paper, without debate, House adjourned.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 29.

Army—Ordnance Survey Maps—Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1921

The Post Office and Circular Delivery Companies—Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1922

Army—Colonels in the Royal Artillery—Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1922

Army—Senior Staff Officers of Pensioners—Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1922

Army—Preaching in the Army—Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1923

Weights and Measures—Observations, Mr. Thomas Hughes; Reply, Mr. Stephen Cave 1924

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Thomas Hughes.*)

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Patent Office Inquiry—Motion for Papers—*Moved*,

"That there be laid before this House, a Copy of all the Proceedings and Evidence in the Information in Chancery, Attorney General v. Edmunds; together with the Papers relating to the Patent Office Inquiry,"—(*Mr. Bentinck*) 1929

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 30.

The New Palace of Justice—Question, Lord Denman; Answer, The Lord Chancellor 1934

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 31.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

The Royal Assent was given to several Bills; And afterwards a Speech of The Lords Commissioners was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by The Lord Chancellor.

Then a Commission for Proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Thursday* the *Eighth* Day of *October* next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Thursday* the *Eighth* Day of *October* next.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 31.

France, Belgium, and Holland—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Lord Stanley 1940

Metropolis—The Parks—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Lord John Manners 1941

Poor Law Assessment—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1941

Metropolitan Improvements—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1941

[*July* 31.] *Page*

THE CIRCUITS IN YORKSHIRE—Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 1942

LORD NAPIER'S PENSION—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Disraeli 1942

CASE OF MR. GEORGE F. TRAIN—Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, The Earl of Mayo 1943

TAXATION OF MORTGAGES—Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1944

ARMY—HOUSEHOLD BRIGADE—Questions, Mr. Neate, Mr. Otway; Answers, Sir John Pakington 1944

ARMY—INSUBORDINATION AT THE WINDSOR REVIEW—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1945

DEATHS IN COLDBATH FIELDS PRISON — Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1945

UNITED STATES — ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN—RESOLUTION—Observations, Mr. Speaker 1946

Moved, That this House accepts, with much gratification, the Volume transmitted to them in pursuance of the Resolution of the Congress of the United States, and hereby directs that the said Volume be placed in the Library of the House; and that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to Mr. Secretary Seward with a request that he will communicate the same to the Congress of the United States,—(*Lord Stanley.*)

Resolution *agreed to.*

ITALY—CONSULAR CHAPLAIN AT NAPLES—Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, Lord Stanley 1947

CHINA — TREATY OF TIEN-TSIN — Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Lord Stanley 1947

Repeal of the Union with Ireland Bill

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Rearden*) 1948

[No hon. Member seconding the Motion, it was not put from the Chair.]

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS in the House of Peers .. 1948

LORDS.

NEW PEER INTRODUCED.

FRIDAY, JUNE 26.

William Lord Brougham and Vaux—Was introduced by virtue of a special Limitation in the Patent dated 22d March 1860, 23d. Vict., and sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Brother Henry Lord Brougham and Vaux.

COMMONS.

NEW WRIT ISSUED.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 8.

For *Clitheroe*, *v*. Richard Fort, esquire, deceased.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

THURSDAY, JULY 16.

Clitheroe—Ralph Assheton, esquire.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*
APPOINTED TO MEET 1 FEBRUARY, 1866, AND THENCE
CONTINUED TILL 19 NOVEMBER, 1867, IN THE THIRTY-
FIRST YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FOURTH AND LAST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, June 26, 1868.

MINUTES.]— PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Representation of the People (Ireland)* (176); Petroleum Act Amendment* (178); Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (177); Liquidations* (181).

Second Reading—Established Church (Ireland) (157); Debate *resumed* and *further adjourned.*

Committee—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) Act Amendment* (156).

Report — Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) Act Amendment* (156); City of London Gas* (168).

Third Reading—Local Government Supplemental (No, 2)* (119); Voters in Disfranchised Boroughs* (153); Municipal Rate (Edinburgh)* (167), and *passed.*

NEW PEER INTRODUCED.

William Lord Brougham and Vaux—Was introduced by virtue of a special Limitation in the Patent dated 22d March 1860, 23d Vict., and sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Brother Henry Lord Brougham and Vaux; and took the Oath.

ESTABLISHED CHURCH (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 157.)

(*The Earl Granville.*)

SECOND READING.

DEBATE RESUMED. [SECOND NIGHT.]

Order of the Day for resuming the Debate on the Amendment to the Motion for the Second Reading read.

Debate *resumed* accordingly.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, so many, so various, and so important are the questions connected with this measure, and so many considerations of right and statesmanship enter into it, that it is impossible for anyone to approach the subject without a feeling of very considerable anxiety. At the outset I must be permitted to express my regret that this question should have come before your Lordships this year. I am bound to express my regret both as to the period at which and the manner in which the measure has been brought before your Lordships. I do not desire to impute motives to anyone and I will not therefore enter into the recriminations which occupied a considerable part of last night's discussion; at the same time I do regret deeply that in a case of this nature and in a question of this vital magnitude there should be anything like an appearance of party action. I think it is unfortunate for parties generally in this country, it is unfortunate also for individuals, and, lastly, it is unfortunate for Ireland herself; because Ireland learns now, as she has learned on previous occasions, that she apparently gains more by partizanship and vehemence, than she does by fair argument and reason. With regard to the Bill which is the immediate question before us, I am not here to defend it, and I thought that the objections urged against it last night were in many respects very powerful. It is uncertain and irregular in its operation, and though I am not prepared to go as far as my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) and suppose it possible that by a series of continual renewals this Bill might be made to destroy the Irish Church inch by inch, yet it must be admitted on all hands that assuming, for the sake of present argument, the object of the promoters to be fair and reasonable, the Bill is not a satisfactory mode of compassing that object, and that to a certain extent it cripples for the time being the organization of the Irish Church. I conceive, however, that I am relieved from entering into a discussion of the particular clauses of this Bill by the statement which has been made on both sides of the House. It has been affirmed in the broadest language, both by my noble Friend opposite (the Earl of Clarendon) and by my noble Friend the Lord Privy Seal, that this Bill is not to be considered in reference to its details, its technicalities, and its clauses, but that its real object and intention are the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Now we enter on that ground more fairly than on any other into a controversy upon this subject, and it is the ground upon which I, for one, own that I should wish to discuss the question. There are a great many persons who believe that the disestablishment of the Irish Church will prove a panacea for all the evils of Ireland. I take the liberty of expressing great doubt as to that. We admit that Ireland is in an unsatisfactory condition, and I fear that the evil goes much deeper than these persons suppose. After 700 years of rule—after nearly seventy years of Parliamentary Government, Ireland still remains disaffected to us, and in any great national emergency she and her resources must be deducted from the estimate of our national strength. From time to time, indeed, there have been gleams of a brighter prospect—hopes of a coming reign of contentment and order. Such was the Accession of her present Majesty, when from one part of the country to the other there was a universal outburst of loyalty. Such again was the time when O'Connell's case came before this House for trial. O'Connell's course had arrayed against him even in this House all the political passions and prejudices of the time; but this House rose superior to passions and prejudices and by its decision O'Connell became free. Men said then that it was the triumph of O'Connell; but the truth was that it was the triumph of English justice. From that moment O'Connell's cause never prospered; his influence was broken, and again the hope was entertained that Ireland might be reconciled to our rule. Such once more was the time of the Irish famine, when not so much English justice as English charity and munificence were poured forth in an unstinted stream. And now once more we hope for a satisfactory conclusion; and we are told that when the Irish Church is disestablished, existing evils and grievances will disappear, and Ireland will be reconciled to us. My Lords, I hope against hope; I am not so sanguine as to share this opinion, and I feel bound to say that when once the Irish Church is disposed of, your last political card of this kind will be played out, and you will stand in this controversy face to face with, if possible, still larger and graver social questions.

I listened attentively to all the different objections which were urged last night against this measure. With some I agree — with others I disagree. I heard the arguments founded upon the compact supposed to have been entered into by Parliament on this subject at different times, and upon the Articles of Union, the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, and the Church Temporalities Act; but I have learnt this truth, and many of your Lordships have learnt it too—that Parliamentary securities, Parliamentary professions, Parliamentary (so-called) compacts are of very little value indeed when once the balance of political power is reversed. I heard also the objection—and I admit its full force—that when the Irish Church is disestablished great hardship will result to all those Protestants, members of the Church, who are scattered in different parts of Ireland in the thick of a Roman Catholic population, and who have settled there in the belief—almost upon the faith—of the existence of the Established Church. I think that hardship is undeniable. Again, I heard the argument, that by this measure you may—I will not say "alienate," because I hope and believe that to be impossible, but may—tend to alienate that part of the population which is so true and loyal to this country. That argument — and many other arguments of the same nature — really justify the remark of a distinguished Member of the Opposition (Sir George Grey) three or four years ago—that the disestablishment of the Irish Church was tantamount to a revolution. Lastly, I heard the argument hinted at—though not, perhaps, brought out quite so plainly as it deserved—namely, that the Ultramontane tendency, both in this country and abroad, is on the increase; that, as the most liberal-minded men must admit, this Ultramontane tendency is not friendly to civil government and constitutional liberty; and that by disestablishing the Irish Church you are, if not advancing that tendency, at all events favouring it. These were some of, if not the main objections as they struck me during the course of last night's debate. I say once more I regret that this measure should have come before your Lordships. It is not my intention to impute motives and find fault with those who have brought forward this measure. It involves grave questions of the highest constitutional import; the responsibility of bringing it forward rests with its promoters, and they and their own consciences must be the judges. But we have reached a stage in this controversy when we, and particularly any one of your Lordships who, like myself, has the misfortune to stand rather without the lines of each of the two great parties at this moment, must seriously consider our present condition. There are two points of view from which I have looked at this question. I have looked at the question itself and I have looked at the position in which it is placed. The position is doubtless in a great measure owing to noble Lords and right hon. Gentlemen now in Opposition. But the position is also due in a great measure—to my mind in a much greater measure—to the course which Her Majesty's Government have thought fit to adopt. My Lords, allow me to state briefly what the facts are as they present themselves to those who stand somewhat without the actual sphere of party politics at this moment. I cannot forget the promise which, on the retirement of my noble Friend not now in the House (the Earl of Derby) and the formation of the present Government, was then given by the right hon. Gentleman at its head. It was a promise to the right hon. Gentleman's own supporters of a truly Conservative policy; it was a promise to the House of Commons of a "truly Liberal policy;" and of all the questions which either a Conservative or a Liberal policy, or both combined, would comprehend, the question of the Irish Church was admitted to stand in the very van. My Lords, how was that promise redeemed? Before long my noble Friend the Secretary for Ireland (the Earl of Mayo) redeemed that promise by a speech which in point of length and copiousness left nothing to be desired. I do not pretend to quote his words; I am simply giving now the impression which that speech left on my mind, and I believe on the mind of every impartial reader. In that speech my noble Friend, after stating what had been the past and what was the present condition of Ireland, went on to intimate, I think in the plainest language, that it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to endow a Roman Catholic University—a University, I say, endowed at the public cost, but emancipated from all public control. He went on further to say that it was desirable to promote the cause of religious equality, and with that view he proposed a process of "levelling up." Now, the interpretation which was placed on those promises was certainly not such as to satisfy either party. Both were discontented. The Roman Catholics were not attracted by the programme; the Irish Protestants heard it with dismay, and I think reasonably with dismay, because, if words have any meaning, those words were in direct contradiction to almost everything which had ever fallen from that side of the House before. But a few weeks passed and a change took place. The Roman Catholic University was abandoned; religious equality was explained by the Prime Minister himself to mean simply that religious position and *status* in the eye of the law which is enjoyed by every religious denomination not only in Ireland but in England; and the process of "levelling up" was reduced to this, that the *status*, or the salary, or the position—I know not what—of the Roman Catholic chaplains of prisons and workhouses in Ireland was to be improved. My Lords, this was not all. It is not much more than two or three weeks since we read the account in the newspapers of a deputation from the North of Ireland, consisting of all that party whom, without offence, I may call—for associated with their history are many great and honourable traditions—the Orange party, who waited upon the Prime Minister. They laid down a programme with three distinct points. First of all, that no alteration should be made in the *status* of the Established Church in Ireland; secondly, that there should be an increase of the *Regium Donum*; and thirdly, that under no pretence and for no conceivable reason should any money be allowed or any provision made from the public funds for the Roman Catholic population of Ireland. And the answer which the right hon. Gentleman gave was acknowledged by the noble Marquess who headed that deputation to be in all respects satisfactory. My Lords, the Prime Minister's answer was not confined to words—it went on to political acts; and, subsequently, we have heard with every form of reiteration, over and over again, the one and self-same cry that the Church was in danger. Now, my Lords, that is a cry which has been heard before in this country, and which may be heard again; but I take the liberty of saying that it is a cry which is warranted by nothing short of the greatest and the direst political necessity. It is a cry, moreover, which I think is only politic for those politicians to use who are satisfied that the country can trust and confide in what they say. But, my Lords, if there is one single act of Her Majesty's Government which I feel compelled to condemn more strongly than another it is the course which they have taken in binding up by every possible tie the fortunes of the English and Irish Churches. I conceive there is nothing more wanton, nothing more reckless—I go further and I say nothing more criminal—than such a proceeding. My Lords, there is no sort of analogy between the circumstances and condition of the two Churches. They are both it is true Churches professing the same doctrine, Churches connected by Acts of Parliament, Churches under the same organization and discipline; but they are wholly distinct in the circumstances and the conditions under which they exist. My Lords, it is most disagreeable and painful to draw a contrast between two such Churches, but Her Majesty's Government drive me to do it. What is the position of the Church of England? Year by year she has expanded; year by year she is building more churches, opening more schools, carrying her spiritual ministrations lower and lower down among the masses of ignorance and poverty and crime in our own population, spreading far and wide her missionary work and her teaching into distant lands—in one word, reigning in the hearts and minds of the people. I do not wish to contrast with all this the position of the Irish Church; but, doing full justice to it—as I hope to do—I will say that its position is unhappily different from that which I have just described. But this at least we might have expected—that when Her Majesty's Government used this language, when they denounced disestablishment in every form as the violation of principles the most sacred and holy, at least they would have been able themselves to come into court with clean hands. Now, my Lords, the noble Earl who moved the second reading of this Bill last evening (Earl Granville) alluded to the suspension of ecclesiastical offices in Jamaica. The noble Earl was probably unaware how much stronger the case really is than he stated it. If it was simply the suspension of those ecclesiastical offices we might say there was some inconsistency; but when I tell your Lordships that at this very moment Her Majesty's Government have themselves introduced into and passed through the House of Commons a Bill which does not suspend but which absolutely disendows the Church of England of every fraction of pecuniary assistance that this country, through Parliament, has ever granted in the West Indies, my Lords, I ask you, was there ever such an instance of gross—of glaring inconsistency as that which Her Majesty's Government have thus exhibited? The cases are as parallel as they can well be. You have a Church connected with the State by the direct ties of Acts of Parliament, and receiving emoluments from the State; you have the clergy of the Church of England established in the West India Islands, and who, like the Irish clergy, are performing the parts of educated clergymen, raising, refining, and educating the lower classes among whom they live; you have, again, the hardship of the members of the Church of England being scattered in the West Indies among a negro population as the members of the Church of England are scattered in Ireland amongst the Roman Catholic population. They have gone there and settled and colonized—upon what? Upon the faith of those State endowments which have lasted very nearly half a century. And, lastly, you have a Church which, inasmuch as there are few rich or no rich, when this disendowment occurs will be in a far more helpless position than the Church would be the moment it was disestablished in Ireland. Now, I ask your Lordships, on what principle is this distinction made? Is it that there is a vital difference between the latitude of Dublin and the latitude of Jamaica; or is it merely that it is a smaller sum that we have been in the habit of granting to the Church in the West Indies—a sum, by the way, which amounts, within a few thousand pounds, to that which is paid to the Presbyterians in Ireland under the name of the *Regium Donum* than to the Church in Ireland? What is the principle on which Her Majesty's Government can discriminate between the two cases? Why is it that while they are the defenders of the faith in Ireland they disestablish the self-same Church in the West Indies? My Lords, there are several courses open to Her Majesty's Government, any one of which they might have taken, and which if pursued fairly and consistently would have commanded a certain amount of assent. But to endeavour to combine them all—in one and the same breath to court the Roman Catholics and Orangemen, to promise religious equality, and to intimate Protestant ascendancy—is a course which has not brought, and cannot bring either credit or success with it. Again I ask in this matter whom are we to believe and to trust? In the House of Commons we have had the edifying spectacle night after night of one Minister answering another. My noble Friend the Foreign Secretary, in a speech of singular intellectual frigidity, shadowed out the adoption of a policy at no distant day of disestablishment or disendowment. He intimated that no mere modifications of the existing system were likely to find favour with Parliament. Well, he was followed by my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary (Mr. Gathorne Hardy), who affirmed that the light of the Reformation was kindled and maintained in Ireland by the Established Church, and that for his part he would never suffer that Church to be touched in the smallest particle of its power and influence. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, if I remember rightly, assured the House of Commons in rather mystical language that he was going to heal the sorrows of afflicted centuries. And how was that promise redeemed? Why, by my noble Friend Lord Mayo proposing the curative process of raising the *status* of Roman Catholic chaplains in prisons and workhouses. There is an old Italian proverb which says, "May God keep me from those in whom I put my trust; my own right hand will keep me from those whom I distrust;" and I am bound to say with sorrow that I have come painfully but deliberately to this conclusion — that it is safer for the Irish Church, safer for her fortunes, safer for her doctrines now, while she still retains no small portion of her power, while she is unbroken by defeat, to make terms with her open opponents rather than to commit herself to the protection of her professed friends.

So much as regards the position in which this question stands; now let me say two or three words as to the question itself. Some of my noble Friends cheer that statement. I hope, however, that I have been speaking to the question. Anyhow, I am prepared to fulfil my promise as plainly and briefly as I can. The question, as everyone will see, resolves itself with this Bill before us into disestablishment and disendowment; for it was truly said by more than one speaker last night that the two things were very distinct in their nature. You may have disestablishment without disendowment, you may have disendowment without disestablishment, and you may have both. First of all as to disestablishment, I believe myself that we have now come to that state of things in which, whether we like it or not, we must accept this as a political canon,—that every institution in the country, no matter what it be, no matter how long and how traditional has been its existence, must when challenged be prepared, as lawyers say, to "show cause" why it exists. And if this was true a year ago, it is doubly, trebly, quadruply true now, since the legislation of last year. Now, I freely admit, with regard to the Irish Church, that she has always had what I may call a very scant measure of justice meted out to her. I think the State has placed upon her a burden which she could with difficulty bear. The task assigned to her has been an almost impossible one. It might have been otherwise, indeed if her Bishops had been resident — if her clergy had been compelled to learn and speak, as some of the best Bishops confessed they should, the Irish tongue—if pluralities had been discountenanced. But we treated Ireland ecclesiastically very much in the same way in which we treated her politically. There is a passage which some of your Lordships may have read in the writings of Dean Swift—himself holding a high ecclesiastical office in Ireland—a passage I think in his *Letter on the Sacramental Test*, in which he speaks of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland as the mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. Now, it is quite true that there have been from time to time great names in the Irish Church—such names as Bramhall, Usher, Berkeley, and Taylor — these have all illustrated and reflected honour on her; but I am bound to say, after viewing this matter very anxiously, that I cannot conscientiously come to any other conclusion than that the Irish Church has failed in the mission which was assigned her. I can conceive no other conclusion to be drawn from the facts before us. You have the admission on all sides—an admission not confined to the opposite side of the House but shared by this—that no sane man would dream, if it were a *tabula rasa*, of creating such an institution as the Irish Church. You have also the fact that in 1834 it was felt necessary to pass the Church Temporalities Act, cutting down with a most unsparing hand the temporalities of that Church, and that even last year Her Majesty's present Government thought it right to issue a Commission to inquire into the revenues of the Church, both parties admitting that legislative action is necessary with regard to them. My Lords, as a Missionary Church she has failed, for she has made no converts; as a garrison Church she has failed, for she has not conciliated the disaffected portion of the Irish people: I cannot, therefore, conscientiously maintain that she has fulfilled her mission. It is true, indeed, that she is not the cause of all the evil which has been so often unfairly and calumniously charged upon her; but at the same time she has not done the work which a national Church, according to my judgment, ought to do. I am not insensible to the value of the principle of a national Church, providing free religious comfort and instruction to men below, touching men's hearts, standing intermediate between earth and heaven, and, if I may so say, offering up the incense of prayer and repentance for the whole people. It is a great office; but at the same time every reasonable person must admit that in the case of a national Church there must be some proportion existing—some reasonable proportion—between the population of the country and the Church which represents that population. Why, my Lords, no man in his senses would argue that it was right to invest the Scotch Episcopal Church with the attributes of a national Church. No man would say that it was right to invest the Protestants in France with any attributes of a national Church. But I will go further; I will not flinch from the full force and extremity of my own argument, because if it will not bear that the argument is rotten and worthless. I venture to say that if, in the course of time—which God forbid!—the Church of England herself were so to dwindle down in numbers as to become a mere fraction—a tenth, or a twelfth part of the whole people—I could not, though I must still love that Church, though I should believe in her truth, in her doctrines, in her spiritual ministrations, and though I should, if possible, follow her with a deeper reverence, affection, and obedience in adversity than in the day of her strength—I could not, I say, in common sense, with any conscience, maintain that she was entitled any longer to that predominancy which now of justice and right belong to her. Were I to do otherwise I should contradict as it seems to me the whole mission of the Church of England. I should contend for the accident instead of the essence; I should fight for the name instead of the thing; I should consent to place justice in one scale and the interests, or supposed interests, of the Church of England in the other. If I might venture to apply some of the noblest lines ever written to the Church of England, I would say—

> "Yet my inconstancy is such
> That you, too, shall adore;
> I could not love thee, dear, so much
> Loved I not justice more."

My Lords, I am not insensible to the value of State aid. It was argued last night that with regard to the colonial Church State aid had been dispensed with to advantage. State aid has it is true been dispensed with in the colonies, and the Church of England has prospered there; but it has been, no doubt, in spite of difficulties that it has prospered. I do not therefore in any degree under-rate or under-value the importance of State aid. But I do say this, that State aid is not everything, and when I hear advocates of the Irish Church say, "Take away State aid and we perish," I ask whether it is possible for the bitterest enemies of that Church to say anything more bitter than that? The right rev. Prelate who presides over the diocese of London told us last night that there would be a difficulty in providing the necessary bounty, and that they would have to look to England for help; but if the Bishops of the Irish Church know, like that right rev. Prelate, how to touch the hearts of the people, to appeal to them, and to draw forth those secret springs which I believe exist in that Church as much as in ours, no such apprehension need be entertained. I do not believe, my Lords, that under such circumstances the right rev. Prelate will have a different answer on one side of the Channel from that which he has received on the other. In the same way the right rev. Prelate urged an argument which appeared to me to be scarcely in point. He said that if the Irish Church were disestablished the power of the Roman Catholic Pontiff would be much increased in Ireland, and that by the distribution of ecclesiastical honours and titles he would place the Anglican Church at a great disadvantage. Now, my Lords, in a legal point of view those titles would have no value. In a moral point of view, any value they might have would arise from the spontaneous feeling of the people, which no Act of Parliament could bind or loose. The right rev. Prelate also referred to the Canadian Church. He said it was still connected with this country, and that therefore in a vague and undecided manner it still possessed the functions and attributes of an Established Church. As the right rev. Prelate has founded an argument on that view of the case, I will venture to explain in one or two words what I believe to be the real state of things in respect to the Canadian Church. It is perfectly true that the names of the Bishops to be consecrated are, as a matter of pure form, submitted to the Crown; but there is no mandate for the consecration of those Prelates, and no appeal lies to the Privy Council in this country except as a civil case from a Civil Court. And lastly, in the very Act in which the Canada reserves are set aside there is a plain and unequivocal statement that it is to abolish all semblance of connection between Church and State. Therefore I say that as far as the Canadian Church is any warrant to us in this matter it is not as an Established Church or as exercising any of the attributes or functions of an Established Church. The right rev. Prelate, in answer to the noble Earl who moved the second reading of this Bill, said the Canadian Church had suffered little from the loss of the Canada reserves, and he maintained that the bargain itself was a very favourable one for the Canadian clergy, inasmuch as they were allowed eighteen years' purchase for those reserves. I doubted the accuracy of that view of the matter, and I have since referred to the Act. I find that only vested interests were preserved, and that they were commuted at a rate of interest which, looking back to the transaction, appears to me to have been a very low rate. Therefore I say that whatever argument is to be drawn from the Canadian Church we may safely draw in reference to the Church in Ireland.

My Lords, I will say one word on another argument which I heard made use of last night. It was said "we are, by maintaining the Irish Establishment, defending the outworks in order to save the citadel." There was once a time, and not very distant one, when I myself might have recognized the force of that argument; but I have since learnt a very different lesson, and one which I shall not easily forget—a lesson which teaches me that when resistance is carried to the uttermost point and all concessions are refused, at last the inevitable crash comes, and everything is swept away—everything is given up, when you can no longer grace the gift by conciliation or regulate it by deliberative wisdom.

And now a few words only on the second point to which I alluded—disendowment.

I must, my Lords, observe that for my own part disendowment presents itself in two forms. There is first, secularization, by which there would be an appropriation of funds originally devoted to the service of God and His worship to some lower and more worldly purpose. I must say that whilst I disagree from some of the arguments which fell from my noble Friend the Chairman of Committees the other night, on the other hand, I shrink from appropriating property which by application is connected with the highest, best, and most religious purposes to any—I will not say lesser, because the object may be a good one—but to any lower purpose. The conversion of property from religious to secular uses in this country at the time of the Reformation, and more recently in France and Italy, has been spoken of. The experience of what has been done in that way in France and Italy has not, I think, yet been so satisfactorily carried out as to warrant us in adopting it; and with regard to what was done at the time of the Reformation the case is not analogous. The case of property held by the monasteries is in many important respects dissimilar to that of property held by the Irish Church. But there may be a disendowment which would be a mere abstraction of property from the Irish Church without necessarily being a conversion of it to lower uses. This is so obvious that it must command the assent of all that hear me. My Lords, there is property held by the Irish Church which she may claim by every title at law; there is other property, where her claim is founded on every consideration of equity; and there is again other property which she may claim by every reason of policy and liberality. I believe, my Lords, that men on both sides of the House and of all shades of opinion looking at the matter dispassionately and fairly would agree with me in thinking it would be cruel, monstrous, and iniquitous to turn the Irish Church out in the cold, amid rival and competing denominations which have for many years been accumulating property, and would therefore start with great advantages against the Irish Church. My Lords, let us not forget that for 300 years that Church has been trained and nourished as an exotic — fostered by the State. What more has any State ever done for a Church—where has there ever been any Church more dependent on the State? If it was wrong in the first instance to establish this Church, it was the fault of the State. If, incumbered by State legislation, it has made but few converts, it is the fault of the State. If, again, it is hated by the Roman Catholics, and has become a political offence in their views, still it is the fault of the State. And therefore while I say that on an examination of the whole case I am ready, though unwillingly, to accept disestablishment, and while I am prepared to accept disendowment partially, I think we have a right to say and to earnestly contend that on every principle of reason, logic, justice and policy, there ought to be most ample and generous consideration shown in dealing with the Irish Church. To do anything else than give it that consideration would be a most grievous wrong. To do anything else would be a piece of iniquity on the part of the State; and allow me to say also that it would be a piece of great impolicy on the part of the Roman Catholic Church.

My Lords, on a great question of this kind there ought to be an absence of personal feeling; but I must confess that it is not without considerable pain I find myself in this position. It is painful to me to find myself alone; I know that I can be supported by scarcely one of my political Friends; and it is more painful to me still to find myself acting on such a question in opposition to the most rev. Primate the Head of the Church. Occupying, indeed, this position, I speak more for the purpose of discharging my own conscience than in the hope of influencing anyone else, though well satisfied that before long events will justify me; but I do so in in the interest of the Church of Ireland, united up to this by statutable connection, but inevitably, as I believe, to be disunited before long, though still to be bound, as I trust, in a spiritual union not less closely than before—I say that in the interest of these two Churches though I would not have brought forward this measure, yet, having it before me, I cannot take the responsibility of rejecting it.

Lord REDESDALE: My Lords, I will not detain your Lordships long; but the noble Earl who moved the second reading of this Bill having alluded in somewhat pointed terms to a pamphlet which I have published, and to a speech delivered by me the other night, perhaps your Lordships will allow me to say a few words. I have no complaint to make of the noble Earl for stating what he did in regard of the argument in my pamphlet, except that he did not state the whole of that argument. Perhaps he stated as much of it as he thought would serve his own purposes; for the noble Earl said I held that a dealing with corporate property would shake the security on which private property is based. What I stated in my pamphlet was that although corporate property stood to a certain extent in a different position as regards Parliamentary interference from private property, that the reasons given for dealing with the property of the Church in the manner proposed would endanger the security of private property. I showed that

Parliament, in dealing with corporate property, hitherto had invariably dealt with it so as to make it more productive for the purposes to which it was to be applied, and so as to make it more effectively promote those purposes. I also stated that when, from the great improvement in corporate property, the income raised was far too large for the purposes for which it was originally granted, arrangements had been made by which, after providing in the fullest degree, and even going somewhat beyond what was necessary for the objects to which the property was originally devoted, the surplus had been applied to some cognate purpose ; but that corporate property had never been applied in any other manner, except in cases where the purposes to which it was originally devoted had become either obsolete or mischievous. This was stated in connection with the argument as to the two grounds upon which the Church is attacked — that it is the Church of the minority and that it is a badge of conquest. As regards the purposes for which that Church was created and for which the property is held, nobody can allege that they are obsolete or mischievous. Those purposes were the providing means of worship for members of the Established Church in that country, and no person who holds that the Established Church is the true Church, and that persons in this country are entitled to receive its ministrations, can deny that people in Ireland are also entitled to receive them. But the Established Church is attacked because it belongs to a minority. Why, all property belongs to a minority. If you attack the Church upon that ground, you at once assail the principles upon which property is founded. I also said in the pamphlet to which the noble Earl referred, that if you attacked the Church on the ground that it was a badge of conquest, you at the same time attacked certainly two-thirds of the property of Ireland. For the lands now in the hands of Protestant proprietors were for the most part lands received by them as lands confiscated from the original owners, whose descendants to this day consider that they have a right to claim them, and some of whom, now in America, have sold those rights to others. I say that when you take all these matters into consideration you furnish an argument in favour of attacking property—other than corporate property in Ireland—of a most dangerous character. You cannot read the accounts of what occurs at meetings of the priests and others in Ireland, and the arguments addressed to the people of that country upon the land question as it is called, without seeing this—that the only way, in their opinion, by which the country is to be pacified is by obtaining possession of the land from those who now hold it, and by getting rid of a large portion of the Protestant proprietors of the country. That was what I stated in the portion of the pamphlet which has not been noticed by the noble Lord. I have not heard any answer to those arguments in the course of this debate, nor do I believe it would be easy to furnish them. You can ignore them certainly, but in point of argument I believe them to be unanswerable. Another ground taken in the pamphlet, upon which the noble Earl based a portion of his remarks, was that I did not think the Church in Ireland was objected to by the population of Ireland. Now, that I believe to be distinctly the fact. I believe that the whole of this agitation against the Irish Church is of recent origin. We know most distinctly that it was never put forth as a grievance at the time of the Roman Catholic Emancipation, or for a considerable time afterwards. We know latterly that a movement has been got up among the ecclesiastics, but there has been no movement whatever among the common people of the country. Then as to its being a badge of conquest and therefore objectionable, I take the argument further, and say that if everything which is a badge of conquest is to be got rid of, you must get rid of the Protestant succession, which, at least, is as much a badge of conquest as the Church Establishment in Ireland. But we all know the manner in which His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales was received when he went to Ireland. His Royal Highness there represented the conquest of Ireland ; but certainly there was no feeling of that kind in the minds of the people of Ireland who received him so cordially. I do not believe that the Irish Church is objected to by the people of Ireland in the manner which it is convenient to allege for the purposes of political agitation and of this debate. The noble Earl referred to another point, which he said was not contained in my pamphlet, but was noticed by me in a speech a few nights ago on the occasion of the presentation of a petition from certain clergymen, when I made some remarks about the Coronation Oath. Now, my Lords, I said I certainly did entertain the opinion, partially shared by my noble Friend who has just spoken (the Earl of Carnarvon), that to deal with property which has been devoted for hundreds of years to the service of God, which is still required for the purpose to which it was so devoted, and to take it away and apply it to any other and lower purpose, is sacrilege. I do not know what else is sacrilege if that is not. I also declared that I considered sacrilege sinful. Depend upon it it is very necessary in all these matters to use plain words. We have got too much into the habit of covering over things with mild terms, so that we really do not see the whole bearing of the case. I have said before, and I repeat, that I neither know, nor pretend to know, nor can I know, what may be the opinions of Her Majesty upon this subject. But I said, and I do say, that I think it the duty of all those who may be in the position of advising Her Majesty, to be prepared to give an answer to her, supposing that when they proposed some such measure for Her Majesty's acceptance she were to entertain the same opinion that I do, that the matter was sacrilege and sin. Now, there is nothing unconstitutional in supposing that a man, if he means to be a Servant of the Crown, ought to prepare himself to answer such a question if it were put to him by his Sovereign, and that he ought to be prepared to give an opinion upon such an important matter with a full sense of the responsibility resting upon him. The noble Earl alluded to the fact that the opinion entertained by George III. with regard to the Coronation Oath had impeded for a long time the passing of Roman Catholic Emancipation. The case with regard to the Oath on that point and the present is very different. The question at that time was, whether the admission of Roman Catholics would be injurious to the Protestant religion and the Protestant institutions of this kingdom.

EARL RUSSELL: The admission of Protestant Dissenters.

LORD REDESDALE: Yes, the admission of Protestant Dissenters came first, followed by that of the Roman Catholics. A great many persons entertained a decided opinion that instead of being disadvantageous such a change would be decidedly advantageous in those respects; that it would remove a great deal of animosity and bitterness; and that it was, on that account, most desirable that Roman Catholics and Dissenters should be admitted to Parliament. The argument was one which a Minister might fairly urge upon a Sovereign, even though the Sovereign held a strong opinion to the contrary, and some circumstances, it may be observed in passing which have since occurred and are now occurring, may fairly raise a doubt whether George III., in spite of all that has been said and written, did not take a sounder and clearer view of the consequences which would attend the change than those who urged him strongly to abandon the opinion which he had formed. Upon the present occasion I do not think there is any Member of your Lordships' House who will assert that the terms of the engagement entered into by the Crown and embodied in the Coronation Oath would not be seriously affected by the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Now, Mr. Pitt and other Ministers of the Crown in that day supposed that the Sovereign had a conscience, and they respected it. It seems to be the opinion in the present day that the Sovereign has no right to have a conscience. It is said that the King can do no wrong, that his Ministers advise him, and that he acts upon their responsibility, and not upon his own. Again, we must use plain words in speaking of these things. Does anybody hold that in the Day of Judgment Ministers can stand between God and the Sovereign and say that the act was theirs, that the Sovereign is not responsible, and that he did right in acting on their advice in opposition to the dictates of his own conscience? I say that to use language of this kind—to say that "the King can do no wrong," and to apply that phrase in such a way as to mean that the King ought not to observe an Oath which he has taken if his Ministers advise him otherwise—is tantamount to saying that God does not reign over him. Remember the words of Scripture, "God is not mocked!" I distinctly say that such is my opinion, and I believe that no one can speak plainly or think plainly upon the subject without coming to the same conclusion. You may wrap up all these matters in a very delicate covering; but when you draw aside the veil which political expediency has placed over them, you will find that there lies the truth, and that you cannot say that the Sovereign is not to be allowed to have a conscientious opinion upon such matters, and that he ought not to refuse his assent to propositions put before him, if he honestly believes that he is bound by that Oath to do so. These are the words which I have wished to address to your Lordships, because I do not like anything that I may say or any opinions that I may hold at any time to be misunderstood. I am very plain and open in all that I say. I entertain the opinions that I hold honestly, and I never shrink from declaring them. I have given utterance to these views, because I thought the noble Earl (Earl Granville)—not intentionally of course, but still to a considerable extent—had misinterpreted the opinions which I avowed, and not fairly represented the arguments which I advanced.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH: Your Lordships have listened to many speeches of great power, lucidity, and eloquence during the course of this debate, which engages your Lordships' attention for the second night. For my own part I must say that from any of the speeches delivered last evening I had no difficulty in ascertaining what were the views of the noble Lords who spoke, or in ascertaining in what sense they intended to give their votes. But my noble Friend who opened the debate this evening (the Earl of Carnarvon) was an exception, for he did so in a speech of remarkable ingenuity, so that until he arrived at the latter portion of his remarks it was impossible to tell in what way he intended to give his vote. The noble Earl began by stating very cogent reasons why the Irish branch of the Established Church should not be disestablished; he stated that it could not be denied the Liberal party had played its last political card in proposing this measure, and that behind this question there remained others which would yet arise of a far more momentous character; he stated also that he fully concurred in many of the opinions which had been delivered in the debate of last night relating to the character and position which the Ultramontane clergy of Ireland were assuming; and he added that we have at present in Ireland a scattered population enjoying material benefits from the faithful discharge of their duties by the clergy of the Establishment, and that this population would inevitably be deprived of those benefits to a great extent by disestablishment, and, in all probability, would be merged in the Roman Catholic community. My Lords, I cannot conceive of three arguments of a stronger character than those against the measure before us; and yet, as I understood my noble Friend, he said at the close of his speech that these being the objections he conscientiously entertained against the measure, he nevertheless felt it his duty to give it his support. But the greater part of my noble Friend's speech consisted first in observations on the position of the Church in the colonies, and, secondly, in an attack upon Her Majesty's Government. My Lords, I can well understand the cause of his assuming both these positions. My noble Friend cannot forget that he once belonged to the Government of Lord Derby, and I shall be within your Lordships' recollection when I say my noble Friend has not lost a single opportunity since his separation from that Government to bring as much odium on it as he can, and to cast political dirt upon those who were once his Colleagues. But I think my noble Friend should confine himself to facts when he brings charges against the Government; at all events if he finds his memory not sufficiently retentive to enable him accurately to detail what has occurred in the House of Commons he should follow the commendable example of the Speaker when he has to read the Queen's Speech, and provide himself with a copy. My noble Friend stated as his first charge against the Government that Her Majesty's Ministers proposed to endow a Roman Catholic University. This is not the first time that charge has been brought against us; and as the correspondence on the subject has been laid before Parliament it is hardly necessary for me to detain your Lordships by a statement of the facts and a defence of the policy. But I wish distinctly to state that no proposal has ever been made on the part of the Government to endow a Roman Catholic University. My Lords, profiting by the errors of my noble Friend, I have provided myself with a copy of *Hansard*, and I will read you the words of the Chief Secretary with regard to the endowment of the proposed University, which would be essential if Parliament agreed in the first instance to the principle of providing for the necessary expenses of the University. I refer to the expenses of providing Professors, and also of making some provision for the buildings if Parliament approved. The Earl of Mayo said—

> "With regard to endowment it will be essential, of course, if Parliament agrees to the proposal, in the first instance to provide for the necessary expenses of the University—that is to say, the expenses of officers of the University, of the University Professors, and also to make some provision for a building. It is possible that if Parliament approves the scheme, it may not be indisposed to endow certain University scholarships."

[" Hear!"] Well, my noble Friend the Chief Secretary said that it was possible Parliament might hereafter do it ; but the Government did not propose it. [" Hear!"] The intentions of the Government I submit are only to be drawn from their own declarations. ["Oh, oh!"] The Chief Secretary said further—

> "But with regard to the endowment of Colleges, it is impossible we could make any proposal of that nature at present; and to that extent the question will be left open to future consideration. It is not therefore contemplated to submit any scheme for the endowment of the Colleges in connection with the University."—[3 *Hansard*, cxc. 1386, 1387.]

Thus we see the proposal was not to endow a University; it was simply to provide a small limited sum for the professorial and tutorial expenses of the University; and if that would constitute an endowment of the University I do not know what an endowment is. The second charge of my noble Friend is that we brought in a measure for the abolition of the ecclesiastical endowments of the West India Colonies. I will shortly explain the state of the case—and I think that my noble Friend before he left the Colonial Office must have become cognizant of the circumstance.

The Earl of CARNARVON: I beg your pardon ; as far as I remember I saw the Bill on the subject for the first time on the table of the House.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH: Well, the facts of the case are these—At the time of the abolition of slavery an annual grant of £20,000 was ordered to be set apart by the 6 & 7 *Geo.* IV. for the support of the Archbishops, Bishops, and Ministers of the Established Church in the West India Islands. In the year 1842 Sir Robert Peel made a new arrangement; and recently a Bill has been introduced annually in the House of Commons to take the charge from off the Consolidated Fund. The measure has been carried by the Opposition, and the House having approved it in so unmistakeable a manner in two successive years the Government has adopted the principle, and now sanctions the proposal to remove the £20,000 from the Consolidated Fund, and has brought in a Bill with that object. I am informed that this was known in the Colonial Office when my noble Friend presided there; but of course if he states he was not aware of the fact I must accept his denial.

The Earl of CARNARVON: I should be glad if the noble Duke would permit me to explain, and so prevent any misapprehension on the subject. I stated that I was perfectly well aware that it would be necessary to take into consideration the whole question of the West Indian Church, and I was fully prepared myself to undertake the task, though not in the fashion now proposed by the Government. I do not find fault with the measure; I find fault with the Government, because, while it deprecates disestablishment in Ireland, it is promoting disestablishment in the West Indies.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH: My noble Friend is not quite accurate. The West Indian proposal does not amount to disestablishment. Ample funds are provided in the colonies themselves for the Church, and this removal of the £20,000 from the Consolidated Fund simply corresponds with a Resolution to take away the *Regium Donum* from the Dissenters. I will, however proceed to the main question of the evening. The noble Earl next proceeded to attack the Government, in which he has been assisted by the noble Lords opposite. The old proverb tells us we should never look a gift horse in the mouth, and, my Lords, it is not perhaps at all astonishing that noble Lords opposite do not like to have their motives for promoting this measure too narrowly canvassed, considering how closely it is connected with the political exigencies of their situation. That situation has some very remarkable features; and I would recall your Lordships' attention to what occurred in 1866. The Session of that year opened with a Liberal Government in Office, supported by a united Liberal party, strong under the Leadership of one who had successfully led that party for many years ; strong in the House of Commons, and powerful in the nation. But what was the result ? In that year we saw the Liberal majority dissipated, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that day surrendered the conduct of the affairs of the country into the hands of us his opponents almost on a casual plea. My Lords, what was the state of the Liberal party after that event ? I need not detail its lamentable condition to your Lordships; suffice it to say it was split up into fragments, and that it was well described by a right hon. Gentleman of the party (Mr. Bouverie) as an undisciplined rabble. That being the state of the case it became positively necessary that a cry should be found to unite the scattered fragments of the party and enable it to act. And what was the method of proceeding that was adopted? Putting these matters aside for the time, I wish to call attention to some striking features attending the movement. My Lords, early in this Session the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) brought forward, without much notice and without having referred to the subject in his remarks on the Queen's Speech, certain charges against the Prime Minister. Those charges were to the effect that he had stated one thing at a particular time whereas he believed another—that he had boasted he had been "educating his party" —in short, that while professing one set of opinions he had been holding a different set. Now this charge of political dishonesty was followed up afterwards by the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll), who sits next to the noble Earl, in one of those oratorical displays to which your Lordships always listen with pleasure and gratification. At the same time I must say that some of the statements that fell from the noble Duke on that occasion were of rather a remarkable character. The noble Duke had been at the pains during his leisure hours of reading up the speeches which have been delivered from time to time by the right hon. Gentleman, and, comparing them one with another, he exposed, with all the powers of eloquence and force of imagery, their various faults and inconsistencies. The noble Duke might, I think, have remembered the old proverb, "that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." The noble Duke might I think have remembered too that if you were to institute a similar scrutiny into the careers of any of our leading public men, you would find that they have in the course of their lives frequently been compelled, by the exigency of political situations, to alter or at all events to modify the views which they had formerly expressed. But, my Lords, I think that if any malicious spirit had brooded over the right hon. Gentleman who is the author of the measure now before your Lordships' House, and if that spirit had endeavoured with the utmost acumen of his malevolence to prompt the right hon. Gentleman to do something which should give the lie to the whole of his past life, and should serve as a denial of all those principles which he had held most sacred, and for which he has contended with the greatest fervour and conviction, that malevolent spirit could not have selected a more fitting opportunity than the present, or have suggested a plan more certain to have that effect than that of prompting the right hon. Gentleman to become the author of the Bill now before your Lordships' House. Now, my Lords, Mr. Gladstone has made use of some remarkable expressions with regard to the subject of the Irish Church. I have already stated that many statesmen in the exigencies of political situations may be compelled to alter their opinions and to adopt different views as to expediency and the possibility of carrying on a Government on certain principles; but I have scarcely ever seen an instance in which opinions hitherto firmly adhered to on the score of absolute truth have been so ruthlessly cast to the winds—an instance where all that has been hitherto held sacred has been so unhesitatingly devoted to destruction. Let me read a very short statement from his Work upon *Church and State*, made by the right hon. Gentleman so far back I believe as 1840 or 1841—

> "Upon us of this day has fallen (and we shrink not from it, but welcome it as a high and glorious, though an arduous duty) the defence of the Reformed Catholic Church in Ireland, as the religious Establishment of the country. . . . . However formidable at first sight these admissions, which I have no desire to narrow or qualify, may appear, they in no way shake the foregoing arguments. They do not change the nature of truth, and her capability and destiny to benefit mankind. They do not relieve Government of its responsibility if they show that that responsibility was once unfelt and unsatisfied. They place the Legislature of this country in the condition of one called to do penance for past offences; but duty remains unaltered and imperative, and abates nothing of her demands on our services."

These, my Lords, are the words of the right hon. Gentleman who is the author of this Bill—a Bill which is acknowledged by noble Lords opposite to aim at nothing short of the complete disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. I cannot help thinking that in the progress of this measure we have strongly brought into light the political dishonesty of the process which has been resorted to. Now, my Lords, a very good test as to whether a measure is well devised and well conceived, whether it is such a measure as ought to be promoted for the public benefit, is that great men and leading statesmen have had their minds long made up on the subject, and, without any vacillation of purpose, have persistently and consistently endeavoured to attain the result for which they are striving. But has this been the case in relation to the measure of which the noble Lords opposite are now so greatly enamoured? But, my Lords, as the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) stated in the brilliant address which he delivered last evening, Sir George Grey, in 1865, on the part of the Whig Government of the day, expressly declared, with a full knowledge of all the facts before him, and with a full knowledge of the grievances of which the Irish people complained, that it was not the intention of the Government to deal with the Established Church in Ireland, and that the attempt to do so would be little short of a revolution. What was the reply which the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) made to the noble Earl who sits on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) two years ago? And, in passing, I may remark that if therei s any noble Earl whose opinions are entitled to command the respect of us all, as they certainly do mine, it is the noble Earl who sits on the cross-Benches. I certainly do not agree with the plan which he proposed, because I do not think that it would meet the requirements of the hour, or conduce to the prosperity of the people of Ireland; but the noble Earl has been the consistent advocate of his particular views, and has enforced them from time to time with a consistency and pertinacity that certainly entitle him to our respect. When the noble Earl brought forward his proposal as lately as two years ago, what was the reply he received from the noble Earl opposite? As I have already stated, a great change has since come over the spirit of the noble Earl's dreams; and, finding himself no longer in power, his party scattered, and its members disunited, this plan has been devised with a view to once more bringing his party into harmony and cooperation. We find that the noble Earl addressed a letter to Mr. Chichester Fortescue. Having, in reply to the noble Earl on the cross-Benches, stated that in his belief the proposal which the noble Earl advocated would be fraught with ruin and danger to Ireland, in that letter to Mr. Fortescue he adopts the proposal made by the noble Earl on the cross-Benches, and puts it forward as his own. And was this the only change in the opinion of the noble Earl? No; soon afterwards the noble Earl finds himself in another political exigency, and, after the statement of Lord Mayo in the other House of Parliament, and the exposition of the remedial measures which the Government proposed for the benefit of Ireland, the noble Earl, with all the impetuosity for which he is so remarkable, rushes headlong into the fray and declares that the time is past for all such half measures and puny proposals. He discards the plan of the noble Earl on the cross-Benches with as much facility as he adopted it, and not only gives his adherence to the plan suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the author of this measure, but advocates its adoption in public. But, my Lords, I would ask whether this is the way in which great questions are to be dealt with? Has not this measure been introduced because the management of the Reform question—which the noble Earl opposite might to a certain extent have regarded as his property—was taken out of the hands of the party opposite, and because it was therefore necessary to find a new cry? But is this the way in which a great question like this is to be treated?—that a plan rejected one day should be adopted the next, only in turn to give way to another of a still more dangerous and extravagant character.

The Duke of Marlborough

My Lords, we have certainly heard a somewhat novel argument in the course of this debate. A noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Clarendon) last night laid considerable stress on the opinion that foreign countries entertain respecting the Irish Church. Now, I do not think that it is desirable that your Lordships' legislation should be in accordance with the opinions of foreign nations. It has hitherto been our custom to be guided by what we deemed to be right, by what we conceived to be just and politic, undeterred by fears or taunts, and uninfluenced by our neighbours. But I must say that, whatever the opinions abroad may be, and whether they be favourable or adverse to the existence of the Irish Church, the noble Earl opposite is to a considerable extent responsible for them. I find that the noble Earl, in a work he published in 1823—his *Essays on the British Constitution*—gave an account of the revenues of the Irish Church. In 1865 the noble Earl re-published that book, and in the preface he stated that he found things had so much changed he should be obliged either to re-write his work or append such copious notes as would interfere very much with the convenience of his readers. He preferred to write a preface, and as a specimen of political honesty how did the noble Earl deal with the Irish Church? He gave in the edition of 1865 a statement of the Bishops and Archbishops forming the Establishment of the Irish Church as it existed previous to the Irish Temporalities Act; indeed, he rather exaggerated the income as it existed at that day, and instead of appending a note, as he might easily have done in five lines, at the bottom of the page, that the whole had been altered by the Irish Church Temporalities Act, we are obliged to go back to the Introduction, which extends to 108 pages, where we find this notice relating to the Irish Church—

> "At the same time the Irish Church was reformed, the number of Bishops reduced, and the Establishment rendered more efficient."

That work, no doubt, had a large circulation; but unless the reader was very careful in looking back to the Introduction he would have gone away from the perusal of the re-publication of 1865 with the idea that the Irish Church remained in the same state in which it existed previously to the Church Temporalities Act. My Lords, I believe the noble Earl was so conscious of the great unfairness of this representation that in the following year he published a new edition, from which all mention of the Irish Church was excluded; but no sort of explanation was given of the extraordinary mistake in the edition of 1865. Therefore, my Lords, I say that if foreign countries do look upon the Irish Church as an overgrown Establishment—a great anomaly, justifying reprobation and indignation — the noble Earl is very justly chargeable with responsibility on that account by reason of his very unfair representations of the condition of that Church. But, my Lords, I have another answer to any opinions of foreign countries with regard to the Irish Church, and the words I would quote to your Lordships for that purpose are these—

> "When foreigners express their astonishment at finding that we support in Ireland the Church of a small minority, we may tell them that we support it on the ground of a high conscientious necessity for its truth."

These, my Lords, are the words of Mr. Gladstone in his book on *Church and State.*

My Lords, I will now make a few remarks on the action of the Bill itself. I can conceive nothing more unnecessary, even supposing this to be a question fit for your Lordships' consideration; but I hope your Lordships will agree with me that it should be referred to the general opinion of the country. Nothing could be more objectionable than the mode in which the measure proposes to deal with the question should it be adopted. The Bill simply proceeds on the feeling which seems to have been engendered in the mind of its author, that it was necessary to take some action on the Resolutions that had been passed. It is said that the Bill will not interfere with vested rights; but, to a great extent, it will interfere with vested rights. The patronage of a Bishop is considered as much a vested right as the house in which he lives. The Bill, suspending all ecclesiastical patronage, will deprive the Bishops of a portion of their vested rights. And how will it affect the case of deserving curates? There are many such who have laboriously earned preferment, and are only waiting for some contingency to receive their reward; but who will be visited with injustice and injury should this Bill receive your Lordships' sanction. As regards parochial interests also, it may be very well to introduce the provisions of the Church Temporalities Act where a vacancy occurs, the neighbouring clergyman being appointed for the interval and being remunerated accordingly; but unless some additional strength be given such a provision will be quite inadequate in many populous parishes. Are we, then, for the sake of this Bill, to throw the whole course of parochial work into confusion?

It seems to me that a very great diversity of opinion is entertained with regard to this Bill. The noble Lord who moved the second reading (Earl Granville) said the Government might and ought to accept it as part of the plan it would be necessary for them ultimately to pursue. But the noble Earl who addressed your Lordships at a later period of the evening on the same side (the Earl of Kimberley) declared that it was a Bill which had for its object disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. My Lords, I need not detain you any further with reference to the objections to this Bill, and which I trust will induce your Lordships to reject it on the second reading. Neither will I detain your Lordships by following my noble Friend (the Earl of Derby), who spoke last night, into the ancient history of the Irish Church. But it cannot be denied that the Church of Ireland and the Church of England have from the most ancient times always been considered one Church. I will give a single instance by reference to the Council of Constance in 1414—

> "It is a fact well worthy of note that at the Council of Constance the Ambassadors of the French King, having objected that the English

Church was not entitled to vote as a separate national Church on account of the fewness of its Bishops, the English Ambassadors replied, 'That the Church in England and Ireland was one national Church, and that the number of their Bishops together exceeded the number of the French Church.'"

The case was minutely inquired into and decided by the Council in favour of England. So far back, then, as the Council of Constance the English and Irish Church were looked upon as one national Church. Neither will I detain your Lordships by narrating the various submissions which have been made by the Irish Church to the Royal supremacy further than to mention that the Royal supremacy was acknowledged by the Irish Church in the reign of Henry VIII., again in the reign of Edward VI., and again in the reign of Elizabeth. The identity of the Churches is patent and irrefragable. It is not a question of three centuries, but of many centuries. It ante-dates the existence of Parliaments themselves. True, the Reformation did not spread in Ireland as in England, and there was a large body of Dissenters from the Irish Church; but though these preponderate in numbers, there are other and higher considerations on which we may rest the support of the Irish Establishment.

My Lords, the noble Earl who moved the second reading put the issue of the question upon two very distinct grounds, and to those grounds I will now briefly advert. He said that he rested his first objection to the Established Church in Ireland on the ground that it had not fulfilled the objects for which it had been established. His second objection was, that it was an injustice and offence to the Irish people. With regard to the first point, I would ask the noble Earl, What are the objects which it has not fulfilled? Does the noble Earl, whose opinions on most subjects I greatly respect, contend that the Church ought to have been a proselytizing institution? My Lords, there is no one who has done more to defend the religious convictions of the Queen's subjects than the noble Earl; I believe there is no greater friend of civil and religious liberty, and the noble Earl has signalized his sentiments on this subject by being a strenuous advocate for the introduction of the Conscience Clause into the schools of this country almost at the risk of a breach with the Established Church. So much has the noble Earl insisted upon the rights of conscience, that he is himself the originator of the Conscience Clause. Is it, then, from the noble Earl that we hear the complaint that the Church has failed in its objects? Does the noble Earl mean that the Church should have been a Missionary Church—that it should have done violence to the religious feelings and prejudices of the Irish people and lighted up the flame of religious discord in every parish throughout the land? If that had been the case we should have had Ministers arguing in an exciting way in order to gain over the Catholic population, and should have had discord and enmity in every parish in Ireland. I ask, again, has not the Church fulfilled its objects? It ministers to its own Protestant congregations, which are very considerable in number, and also to many of the Protestant Dissenters; and, if so, I am at a loss to know why it has not fulfilled its duties. And here another question also arises—Is the Church at all on the increase in Ireland? I say it is. If we look to the population Returns, and compare the proportions of Protestants and Roman Catholics, we find that the Protestant population has decreased considerably less than the Roman Catholic. But then there is another very adequate test—namely, the test of subscriptions. According to a Return which has been presented to the House of Commons, it appears that in 1834 there were 35 churches originally contracted for by parishioners towards which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of Ireland made grants. The total approximate value of these 35 churches was £50,890. Deducting £11,233, the amount granted by the Commissioners, it appears that on an average £1,133 was contributed in each of these 35 instances by voluntary subscriptions. There were besides 187 churches re-built by the Commissioners between 1834 and 1865, at a total cost of £271,916 4*s.* 9*d.*, or at an average amount per church of £1,454 1*s.* 11½*d.*; but these sums include voluntary subscriptions. Therefore there is no reason to suppose that voluntary subscriptions are not given to the same extent as before.

But, my Lords, I now come—and I shall not trespass on your Lordships' patience much longer—to what appears to me to be really the most important consideration that I shall have to lay before you. The second objection that my noble Friend has to the Established Church of Ireland is that it is an offence to the Irish people. Now, if it be an offence to the Irish people, and this be the one thing to remove offence from the Irish bosom—if this be the one thing needed to produce those halcyon days of peace and good-will in Ireland, when every man will sit under his own vine and fig tree—if we are to have those blessed days of loyalty, happiness, truth, virtue, and religion which are required to make the world happy, I say, let us make the sacrifice. But, my Lords, because I do not believe anything of the kind—because I am sure there are other greater difficulties which the noble Earl below the Gangway has admitted to exist, and of the existence of which we have the best proofs—I conjure your Lordships to throw out this Bill, and to relegate this great question to the country with the recorded opinion of your Lordships as to its magnitude and importance. And here I will confess that, although great fears have been expressed as to the effect of this measure upon the Established Church of this country, I myself do not very much share those fears. My Lords, I say that the Established Church in this country is rooted and founded in the affections of the people, and that it is an institution which I trust and believe will last for many generations. My Lords, so much is it in accordance with the feelings and general consent of all parties, so deeply is it felt to be the bulwark of the public liberties, that I have no fears whatever for it. Therefore, I dismiss that consideration altogether. But what I do fear is this — not the effect of this measure upon England, but upon Ireland. It is that which is to be deprecated. My Lords, there are great questions upon which the Liberal party have been long united, and on which Her Majesty's Government are agreed with them—I allude, in the first place, to the question of National Education, which was placed upon an enduring basis by my noble Friend the late Prime Minister. That measure, introduced by my noble Friend, has been of the greatest benefit to Ireland, and it has received the support and defence of the party whom the noble Earl opposite represents. My Lords, does that measure give satisfaction generally to the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland? I will take the words of Dr. Manning as evidence of what may be supposed to be the views of the Roman Catholic hierarchy on the subject of National Education. Dr. Manning says—

> " The other measure of pressing importance to Ireland, which may be passed at once if any Government have the will to do so, is such a modification of the National Education Board as shall make the existing schools *bonâ fide* denominational schools of the Catholic and of the Protestant populations respectively. It is a keen irony to call a system of education national where the religion of the nation may neither be taught nor exhibited in its schools. If the people of Ireland had been consulted at its foundation, it would never have come into existence."

The very argument which my noble Friend below the Gangway urged, and which has been frequently urged, with respect to the Irish Church.

> " If they were polled now, it would not survive a day. It is not a national but a Government education, distasteful to almost the whole population of Ireland, to Catholics and to Protestants alike. Both would be glad to see it resolved into denominational education. It would promote peace, contentment, and good-will, to give over the schools in each place to the majority, be it Catholic or Protestant. The Catholic minority would gladly provide its own Catholic school. The Protestant minority would be easily provided for out of the wealth of the Protestant clergy and landlords."

That, my Lords, is the opinion of Dr. Manning, and that represents the views of the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland. Now, I will ask the noble Lords opposite whether, having given up the Church which has produced peace, contentment, and good-will in Ireland, they are prepared to give up the national system of education also, which they have so long, ably, and stoutly defended? The next question which appears looming in the distance, or rather I will say showing itself in very distinct outlines, is the subject of University Education. The Queen's Colleges in Ireland are undenominational, and I believe the Liberal party, as well as the party which supports Her Majesty's Government, have sustained the principle on which these Colleges exist, and consider that, on the whole, they have been beneficial and conducive to the advantage of the country. What is the opinion of the Roman Catholic hierarchy with respect to these Colleges? My Lords, I will state it in Dr. Manning's own words—

> " When the Irish ask for a Parliament in Dublin they are reminded that it would reduce them from the dignity of an integral part of the mother country to the level of a colony. But England treats its colonies, in education as well as in religious equality, better than it treats Ireland. If the dignity of belonging to the mother country is to be purchased by the grievance of religious inequality, and of education stripped of the national religion, Ireland may be forgiven for asking for the portion of a daughter and to be treated as a colony. The British Government has chartered and endowed Colleges at Sydney and Melbourne, in Australia, and a Catholic University in Canada.

But in Ireland the Catholic University has neither charter nor endowment."

The mixed Colleges in Ireland have been named the "godless" Colleges; and you may depend upon it that that opinion, formed by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, has not been taken up in a hurry, nor will it be abandoned in a hurry. It has been taken up after grave consideration, and they will continue to make these demands. Are noble Lords prepared to concede to them? Then, a very serious question—the land question—has been touched on. When we have given up our system of National education and the undenominational Colleges, we shall be called upon to review this question. I do not say we shall ever come to that which will be tantamount to a revolution—the confiscation of the land and a change of proprietorship; but looking at the aspect which this question is assuming, and at the demands which this measure is likely to increase and encourage, I think that a proposal is likely to be made which, if entertained, will so far change the proprietorship of the land as to give the tenant an indefeasible right to it, subject to certain rent-charges payable to the present proprietors. Let me quote another extract from the same eloquent writer with reference to the land. Dr. Manning says—

> "The 'Land Question,' as we call it, by a somewhat heartless euphemism, means hunger, thirst, nakedness, notice to quit, labour spent in vain, the toil of years seized upon, the breaking up of homes, the miseries, sicknesses, deaths, of parents, children, wives; the despair and wildness which spring up in the hearts of the poor when legal force, like a sharp arrow, goes over the most sensitive and vital rights of mankind. All this is contained in the land question. It is this which spreads through the people in three-fourths of Ireland with an all-pervading and thrilling intensity. It is this intolerable grief which has driven hundreds of thousands to America, there to bide the time of return. No greater self-deception could we practise on ourselves than to imagine that Fenianism is the folly of a few apprentices and shopboys. Fenianism could not have survived for a year if it were not sustained by the traditional and just discontent of almost a whole people."

These are the words of incitement — of almost revolutionary incitement—addressed by this writer to an excitable people. Behind all this lies another, and, perhaps, the greatest question of all—I mean the Union of England with Ireland;—and on this point I must say that I was thunderstruck with the argument used by the noble Earl (Earl Russell) in his second letter to Mr. Chichester Fortescue. The noble Earl, in this publication, calls to mind what occurred when the Irish Parliament voted for union with England; and assuming that the Irish Church is an essential part of the Act of Union, he endeavours to undermine the authority of the Act by recalling the corruption and artifices used to procure the assent of the Irish Parliament, in order to show how invalid and worthless was the legislative provision for uniting the Churches of the two countries. But if such an argument is good against the Irish Church, it is good against the Union; and when the noble Earl employs his vigorous pen and powerful intellect in advocating such changes on such grounds, I ask whether it is clear that, making one concession after another, the final demand will not be made for a dissolution of the Union between the two countries?

My Lords, in conclusion I will only refer to a remarkable argument which has been made use of in this House, in order to deter, if possible, your Lordships from giving an independent vote on this question. We are told that we should beware what line we take in opposition to the House of Commons. Now, I do not think that such an argument ever has had, or ever will have, any weight in this House. Not that your Lordships are indifferent to the expressed will of the people of England. I trust that that day never will come, as certainly it never has come. But I have yet to learn that your Lordships' House does not represent the mind and will of the people of England. It is true that the other House of Parliament may represent more nearly the external fervour, the declamatory power, and the first impulses of the people; but I believe that your Lordships do represent, in an eminent degree, the inner feelings of the English nation, and, perhaps, that "still small voice" which counsels prudence, moderation, and delay. By rejecting this Bill your Lordships will be giving an opportunity which I think should be given to the people of England, of quietly and calmly considering this question, and the course which the noble Earl opposite and his Friends are pursuing. I trust that when the appeal is made the verdict they will give will be such as to promote the peace and prosperity of the country. In my heart and conscience I believe that noble Lords opposite are pursuing a policy dangerous to the best interests of the Empire; that by making these concessions they are only inviting further demands, and are laying a foundation and adding story by story to a structure which will eventually become of most portentous and dangerous dimensions. I will only quote, in conclusion, the words of the great satirist of old—

> "Numerosa parabit
> Excelsæ turris tabulata, unde altior esset
> Casus, et impulsæ præceps immane ruinæ."

LORD DUFFERIN: My Lords, I assure your Lordships that I shall not trespass long upon your attention. So many opinions have been expressed, and the question is one which, after all, must be determined by such simple considerations, that I should have been willing to confine my share in to-night's proceedings to a silent vote. But, connected as I am with Ireland, and with the most Protestant province in Ireland, and yielding as I do to no one in affectionate devotion to that institution whose welfare is supposed to be at stake, and whose doom we are told will be pronounced if you give a second reading to this Bill, I am anxious to state in a few brief sentences why it is that, with a perfectly clear conscience and unfaltering judgment, I am prepared to adopt a method of procedure with reference to the Established Church of Ireland which has been so vigorously deprecated by so many distinguished persons in this House and elsewhere. In confining my observations to a simple statement of the reasons which have induced me, as an Irish Churchman, to form the opinions at which I have arrived, it will not be necessary for me to enter the wider field of argument which has been the scene of conflict between most of those who have preceded me in this debate. Of course, I am perfectly aware that a question of this kind must, in a great measure, be determined by those larger considerations of statesmanship and policy by which the internal organization of a great Empire is regulated:—I am duly sensible of the weight and cogency of these considerations; and I subscribe to the admirable exposition of them made by those noble Lords who have spoken on this side of the House; and especially to all and every word used by the noble Earl who moved the second reading of this Bill, in a speech which, though it may be presumptuous in me to make such an observation, I think is one of the noblest speeches I ever had the pleasure of listening to. But, though I perfectly agree with the noble Earl in every argument which he employed, it is not my intention to reiterate those arguments, or attempt to dwell upon them. Although cordially adopting the aspirations of the great Liberal party in this country—aspirations which, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, they have never ceased to entertain—to take the first opportunity of introducing into Ireland perfect religious equality, it is not as a partizan, as an adherent of any political party, or as a politician that I venture to assert an opinion on this question. I shall leave it to my noble Friends on this Bench, to whose minds the responsibility of administration may have brought even more vividly than to my own the dangers and mischiefs arising out of the present connection between Church and State in Ireland, to prefer the statesman's view of the question. They have told you already, and probably you will be told again, that history affords no precedent, that reason suggests no justification for a Government like ours—a Government which boasts of being founded on a recognition of popular rights—making a nation, or such a majority of it as is entitled to be so called —a nation co-equal with Great Britain, and sharing with her a sovereignty extending over great part of the habitable globe —that there is no precedent in history for making such a nation the victim of an ecclesiastical system which usurps the power, the revenues, and the prestige of the State for the sake of introducing into every corner of Ireland a privileged corporation connected in the minds of seven-eighths of the inhabitants with bitter memories of religious persecution and civil tyranny. I am aware that this view of the aspect in which the Established Church in Ireland is regarded by the people at large will be denied, and that the picture I have drawn will be called exaggerated. Well, of course, I can only appeal to my own experience in that case. We have heard from the noble Duke who has just sat down (the Duke of Marlborough), that the Established Church in Ireland is the real representative of the ancient Church of that country; that it is the Protestant landlords who pay the tithes. Again, we are told that we are to accept the greater wealth and the high social status of the Protestant community as the real representative of the nation, and that the numerical disproportion which exists between the adherents of the two religious communions in Ireland is to be overridden and reversed by the greater numerical strength of Protestantism as compared with Catholicism over the whole United Kingdom. It is not my intention to dwell at any length on such processes of reasoning as these. I merely notice them in order to deny, first, the accuracy of the facts on which some of them are founded; and next, the justice of the conclusions that are drawn from them. I will submit to the House that view of the case of the Irish Church which presents itself to my own understanding as a zealous and faithful adherent of her communion, jealous of her honour, anxious to extend her influence and enlarge her boundary, and, above all things, desirous that in the sight of all men she should be blameless and free from stain. I hold that a Christian Church is bound in its corporate capacity to represent and exemplify those virtues and characteristics which are professed by its individual members, and which it has been constituted in order to promote. If we try to ascertain what position the early Christian Church assumed with respect to those who were not of her communion, but after whose salvation she yearned with a mother's self-sacrificing devotion, what do we find? Do we find that that was originally the case of the Established Church in Ireland? Do we not see a haughty priesthood identified in all its social interests with a military aristocracy, grasping with unrelenting tenacity all the social dignity, the civil pre-eminence, and those material advantages which the secular authority—always ready to gratify its spiritual associate—had to bestow, and presenting even now, in regard to those bitterer characteristics which have since then disappeared, if not in the person, at all events in the office of every one of its ministers, an epitomized representation of an obnoxious domination? St. Paul was undoubtedly not only a great Apostle, but one of the wisest men who ever lived, with a thorough knowledge of human nature and the human heart. Well, let us ask ourselves—if such a thing be possible—what that great Apostle's precept and example would counsel on a question and in a case like this. If he had found that his connection with a Government, and that the various attributes with which he was compelled to invest himself, rendered him an object of suspicion, not to say of aversion, towards those whom he was commissioned to evangelize, can anybody doubt that he would have besought your Lordships to divest him of such impediments to his usefulness?—and, if you had refused to do so, is it not probable that his eager nature would have prompted him to fling them at your feet? It may be denied that its connection with the State has made the mission of the Protestant Church of Ireland as obnoxious to the people as I have ventured to assert. This, of course, must always remain a matter of opinion. But there is one fact to which I can appeal of a very pregnant character. Not very long ago there were evident symptoms of public opinion in England tending to the proposal of some kind of composition between the State and the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland. Well, how did the Roman Catholic hierarchy encounter those preliminary advances? Why, by refusing altogether, in the most complete and positive terms, to accept any composition from the State, or to avail themselves in any manner of State assistance. Why did that hierarchy discourage and repudiate an arrangement with England to which they assent in almost every other country? Simply because they felt that if they entered into such a transaction, and connected themselves in any such manner with the State, they would be likely to lose their influence with their flocks; and that, instead of being regarded, as they now are, as the champions and the fathers of their congregations, they would incur the danger of being looked upon as the mere creatures and agents of the Government. But if ever there was a priesthood that was identified with its people in sentiment and in race—that was ever united to them by a traditional veneration, on the one hand, and by centuries of devotion to their interests on the other—it is the Roman Catholic hierarchy and priesthood of Ireland. Well, if they in their wisdom and their knowledge of the nature of the Irish people think that they could not afford to incur the taint of such a connection with the Government, how is it possible to suppose that we can afford to do so with impunity? But the noble Duke has told us that the Established Church in Ireland must not be regarded as a Missionary Church, and that we must not consider its spiritual responsibilities to extend to the Roman Catholic population. Well, if this be the doctrine which is upheld, then at once, *cadit quæstio*—you are not the National Church of the country; you have no right to expend the National Revenue, no right to assume territorial titles, no right to clothe yourselves with that dignity and prestige which are only legitimate as the reflection of a national communion. But I deny that this view of the question can be sustained. As the ministers of the Irish Established Church are Christian ministers, their mission extends to all. If there is no immediate opportunity of establishing pastoral relations towards those among whom they dwell, they are bound to adopt such a position and assume such an attitude towards them as is most likely to conciliate their affection and good-will. And this cannot ever be done until the Protestant Church ceases to be identified in the minds of a large portion of the population with a sinister and gloomy institution, and with principles hostile in their opinion not only to their religion but to their civil rights. But it is not only the odium and discredit attaching to the Irish Established Church which causes me as a member of her communion constant shame and confusion. I do not wish at all, my Lords, to exaggerate the state of the case. I do not wish to assert that all the disaffection and discontent which exist in Ireland are to be attributed to the presence of the Established Church. With Fenianism I never have thought that Church had any immediate connection. Although I entirely agree with the view of the case taken by the noble Earl who brought in this Bill, and with the late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in thinking—which is quite a different matter—that the attention of this country and the conscience of England with respect to this question were much stimulated, if not altogether awakened, by the fact of Fenianism. The growing amenities of religious opinion in Ireland even among enthusiastic Protestants, the purity and kindliness of the Protestant clergy, and, I will venture to add, the feeling entertained by the Protestant laity towards their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, have reduced to a minimum the natural irritation and discontent which the presence of such an institution must necessarily create; but making every possible concession in this direction, looking at the case from the calmest point of view, I think it must be admitted that by every educated Irishmen the Established Church must be regarded as a relic of a hateful history and as a symbol of an unjust domination; while by the less educated the undue pretensions and prerogatives of that Church must be regarded as a reflection on their own faith and their own clergy. Now, if this be the case, can it be a matter of surprise that in the presence of such a state of things there should exist ill-blood and discontent, and that the Government which persists in maintaining such a state of things should be viewed with dislike? There is nothing, we know, which a man so keenly resents as a reflection upon his religion or its ministers, and it is vain to tell the Roman Catholic community that the status of the Protestant Church is no reflection upon their own communion. In the first place, it is not true to say so; and in the next place, they see and feel every day that the contrary is the fact. In every parish in the kingdom the Protestant Church and clergyman stand out lustrous and resplendent in the full sunshine of Government patronage and recognition, while the Catholic chapel and priest are relegated to the cold shade. Every time a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic is compelled to veil his dignity and surrender his precedence in the presence of the Protestant ecclesiastic, the whole Catholic community feel as a nation would feel whose self-love had been wounded by some disrespect offered to the person of its Ambassador. But if what is called the sentimental aspect of the grievance is calculated to provoke so much irritation and discontent, what may be expected to be the case when the additional grievance of iniquitous taxation gives a point to the injustice? No matter how ingeniously the question may be argued, the upshot of the arrangement is simply this:—I, the Protestant, who am in no degree entitled to a greater share in the benefits of the commonwealth than my Roman Catholic fellow-countryman, who equally with myself contributes to its defence and support, find religious requirements supplied to me in great splendour and profusion, free of all expense, while he is compelled to pay for them out of his own pocket. Now, we know that nothing excites more indignation, even when unaccompanied by any of those external circumstances which are calculated to render it more obnoxious, than unjust taxation; but, in addition to this, the wrong here complained of in every parish carries back the mind to a yet greater wrong committed in the past, by the light of which the present injury is interpreted, and which invests it with an obnoxious and pernicious meaning which otherwise might not attach to it; it is a wrong endured not by the wealthy and powerful, but by the struggling and indigent; it perpetuates memories of discord; it separates class from class; it infuses a bitter venom into all political controversy; it surges up on every occasion when the hearts of the whole nation should be knitted together in the closest sympathy, for no State ceremony can take place without the whole Catholic community being reminded of Protestant ascendancy; and even the Heir to the Throne cannot pay a visit to his Sovereign's subjects without the obtrusive status accorded to the Established Church becoming a stumbling block and offence to thousands upon thousands of men on whose industry we have to depend for the prosperity and future welfare of the realm, and to whose valour we must look for its defence. We have thus a combination of circumstances so intolerable in themselves, so dangerous to the State, so discreditable to Parliament, so humiliating to the religious communion to which I belong, so full of shame and mortification to me as a fellow citizen of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, that I, for one, have long determined, despite every contingency, even despite the conviction of the noble Duke opposite that if we yield to the popular demands on this question we shall have to deprive the present Irish proprietors of their estates, to take the first opportunity of doing my best to get rid of so great a reproach. For this reason, I shall vote for the second reading of this Bill.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: The noble Earl who moved the second reading of this Bill (Earl Granville) found fault with one of my right rev. Brethren for imputing motives to a distinguished statesman in the other House of Parliament, and said, with a countenance more of sorrow than of anger, that other clergymen of high position had followed that bad example. My Lords, that reproach could not apply to me; but I take occasion at the outset to say that in any remarks I shall offer, I shall impute no motives but those which are honourable to any man. Still, as one who has followed with great admiration the course of that great statesman, who has benefited by his labours, who has for long years assisted not merely by his vote to place him in the position which he holds in the Parliament of this country, but also by the most active exertions on his behalf, I think it allowable for me to express a certain amount of regret that a great question, requiring, if ever any question required, the calm, deliberate wisdom of the highest minds in the country, should have been approached in connection with a party struggle, and that the clear vision which otherwise might have helped us to a solution of our difficulty, has been somewhat impaired by the clouds and mists of party passion and strife. I am struck very much with that feeling as I have followed the course of this debate. I almost seem to myself to aspire to originality when I remind your Lordships that what we are debating is simply a Bill for suspending the operations of the Irish Church in many important particulars; and I take leave to remind your Lordships that there is in this House a class of persons who look with comparative indifference on the question which body of noblemen sit on the right side and which on the left, but who come here to-night to consider not those party changes which are things of the hour, but rather a question of the deepest importance—namely, the question whether this country shall for the future be governed by a Sovereign who is able to express sympathy with one form of religion as on the whole good for the people, or whether the Sovereign is to be the head of the police of the country, regulating carefully and justly the struggles and strivings of different parties of religionists in the State. I, for one, should desire that a Suspensory Bill should be instantly passed, suspending for a limited period—say till Monday night—the use of those volumes of *Hansard* with which none of us are entirely unacquainted. Somebody, it appears, in the other House has got an "historical conscience"—but what that means I am at a loss to comprehend. I am not accustomed, moreover, on any occasion to call any body of gentlemen an "undisciplined rabble;" and consequently it is no great amusement to me to sit in a House where that epithet is applied to a body of Gentlemen in "another place." We want to devote our entire attention to this question—whether it is in the highest sense expedient to disendow and disestablish the Irish Church, or whether you may so modify the existing institution and so remove crying abuses that the principle of Church and State may still be preserved, and yet the legitimate scruples of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen be respected. Now, I am going—not to quote from the pages of *Hansard*, but to do what in the course of this debate has only been done for a very few minutes at a time, and only, indeed, by two speakers in the whole—namely, to see what will be the effect upon the Irish Church if this Suspensory Bill should become law. I hold myself perfectly free hereafter to consider any measure for the disestablishment or disendowment of the Irish Church. I have my prejudices on the subject; but I am confining myself to-night to the consideration of this particular measure, and I want to show you that, instead of being a measure of trifling importance, it is of very great reach and compass, that its operation will be in the last degree shamefully oppressive and cruel, and that it will injure men in that which they feel most deeply—namely, their conscience, their religion, and their liberty of worshipping their God. In the first place, how long is this Act to last? It is said only for a year. But we know perfectly well that if this Bill should pass you could not hereafter go back to an interdicted parish and say, "This experiment does not do; we shall set you free." This measure, if passed, will be renewable. I observe that a noble Earl opposite signifies his dissent; but I take it that the Suspensory Bill will be renewable till Parliament finally disposes of the Irish Church. Without referring to all the various Reform Bills that have been introduced of late years, I think I may say that the discussions relating to the measures of Reform which are about to come to an end in your Lordships' House have been carried on for about fourteen years. During this period the question of Reform has caused the fall of Governments, and it has been put aside from time to time in consequence of war and from other causes. I believe, therefore, that it is not an unfair inference to draw that years will have passed before this business shall have been developed into a plan, and before the wisdom of Parliament with respect to it shall have been arrived at. In 1865, I think, a Suspensory Bill was passed with reference to the Public Schools. No one thought that this Act would be wanted for more than one year; accordingly, it was introduced and passed with remarkable unanimity, there having been only one division, and that upon a minor question relating to the extent of the power of the Commissioners. No voice was raised against the propriety of the measure; but the Bill for the Public Schools still struggles through Committees, and I take it, therefore, that we shall have the Suspensory Bill for five years. I shall not take that particular term if any one objects to it; but for myself I should be disposed to say five years. A noble Lord on the opposite side said to me, out of this House, "Of what consequence are four or five vacancies?" Now, my Lords, I have looked into some figures on this matter, and of two classes of livings I find that 4 per cent become vacant every year. There are 1,500 benefices in Ireland, and therefore no fewer than 300 of those benefices would become vacant in the course of five years. There are twelve Irish Prelates, and during the last five years no fewer than five out of the twelve, or nearly one-half, have been called from among us. At this rate of mortality, we should have five vacant dioceses in five years. I venture to ask in what portion of the Bill is provision made for the performance of the duties which would be discharged by Bishops filling those sees? The noble Earl who moved the second reading pointed out that there is a clause in the Bill empowering the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to provide stipends for 300 curates whom the Bishops may license. Unfortunately, the Bishops may go in the meantime. Is that a rational proposition? Why, it means an impossibility. I would ask, where do you expect to find 300 young men to take parishes under these anomalous and unsatisfactory conditions? If I proposed to a young man with a right heart in his bosom to take any one of these parishes pending the decision of Parliament on its fate I should expect him to say, "No; disendow it at once, and, perhaps, I may try to struggle on with it; but I shall not assist Parliament in a process of suffocation." I say it will be impossible to find young men to take charge of the parishes under such circumstances. I think that most young clergymen would prefer to go to New Zealand rather than take charge of parishes in such an equivocal position. It is true that provision is made by one clause for giving half a clergyman to a parish, because the clergyman of an adjoining parish may do the duty in one where the benefice is vacant. Now, it is impossible that such a provision can be beneficial. Much is said about the Church of England population in Ireland being only about 700,000; but those members of the Church of England would have good ground for saying, "Here is an existing endowment by means of which the Christian religion is to be taught, and we have a right to share in it." It is proposed to take away this money from the Established Church in Ireland; but what do you want with it? Unfortunately, nobody wants the money. All the information we can get on the subject of its proposed disposition is that it is to be applied to Irish purposes; but that is rather a vague statement. Before five years there may be five dioceses without Bishops. Some may think that five Irish Bishops might be spared. I see a smile on the face of some noble Lords opposite which seems to indicate that to be their opinion; but bear in mind that by this Bill you would be putting the Irish Church in a worse position than if she were totally disestablished and disendowed, because there is no provision in the Bill for any Bishop being substituted when the diocese has become vacant. You cannot speak of sending in the Bishop of another diocese, because it would be a breach of ecclesiastical law for him to perform episcopal functions in a diocese other than his own without a commission. It is true that the Vicar General would have much greater power than a Vicar General in England; but he could not confirm, and confirmation is a very important ceremony, being the one at which children renew the obligations of baptism. Again, ordination is essentially an Episcopal act. You might have ten benefices vacant in one diocese, and the Bishop might be gone also. Under such circumstances, how could you have clergymen ordained for those benefices even supposing you get young men to accept them? The duty of a Bishop towards his clergy consists more in a constant watching of their zeal, and in a standing by them in cases of difficulty, rather than in preaching or in writing. Are you going to leave the Irish clergy to some haphazard assistance in that way? Then, all proceedings under the Church Discipline Act, should any become necessary, will probably be suspended, because you have no power to compel the Vicar General to proceed in such cases. I showed just now that I did not think these safeguards would be effectual. But will you just remember that the Church does not consist of the clergy alone? The Church consists of the clergy and the laity. [" Hear, hear! "] I am glad of that cheer, for it shows that perhaps we may get a little mercy for the laity, if we do struggle into Committee. Upon the death of an incumbent in any parish the whole thing will stand still. There may be a devoted Churchman in the parish paying the whole tithe out of his own pocket; yet he will see the clergyman swept away, and find to his astonishment that there exist no means whatever of appointing a successor. These may be spoken of as mere incidental details; but is it right that details of this kind, affecting the religious well-being of communities and districts, should be brought into this House and mixed up with party warfare? In the midst of a political warfare involving the issue whether or no parties shall change sides, no one cares to pay attention to such essential details as these.] No; the Bill is unjust in every feature.

I must now offer a few remarks on the terms "disestablishment" and "disendowment." The noble Earl who moved this measure himself fell into some confusion on the subject, for he referred to the Australian colonies as cases in all of which the Church had been disestablished, whereas the participation of the Bishop in the acts of the local Legislature does amount to an establishment. But I ask your Lordships to observe that these words "disestablishment" and "disendowment" do really represent two distinct ideas. There may be some who think that disestablishment alone might happen to the Irish Church without any great harm or loss, whereas it would be obviously unfair to inflict upon them total disendowment. Disestablishment means, I suppose, something of this kind:—that the four Prelates who now sit in your Lordships' House should cease to sit there, and in all high functions when questions of precedence arose that those whom the Queen of England honours should give place to those who are honoured by an Italian Prince. Be it so. There are some who might think disestablishment a question open to argument. But this Bill is framed upon the assumption, not only that there will be total disestablishment, but total disendowment as well. And let me assure your Lordships that, in my belief, the great majority which in "another place" supported this Bill was in favour of disestablishment alone; and I say, of my own knowledge, that several of those who swelled that majority will cease to swell it the moment they understand that you are going to strip the Irish Church naked—to disendow as well as disestablish it. It is said, I know, that this is not a Bill really for disendowment, because when all the facts are fully ascertained and parties have made up their minds in what manner the revenues of the Church are to be applied some fragments of the original amounts may find their way back to particular parishes. But what else can it be in the case of a parish which should have no clergyman for five years? When you say to these parishes, "We have reconsidered the matter, and you may have the clergyman back again," what will be the indignant answer? "You have wrecked our system, you have broken up our congregations—most of the God-fearing persons among us have gone to where they could hear the blessed sounds of the Gospel, while some have fallen into the only place of worship that was open, the Roman Catholic chapel; and now you come to us with money in your hands, unfaithful stewards of a great trust, and offer to set up the Church again. Go—we can trust you no more." That is one of the consequences of the Bill, and it applies equally to poor and remote as to large and populous parishes; for I say that once you have shut up a church for a long time, even though you may wish to open it again, you will be unable to do so; the thing is impossible. And it is for those reasons, and not because of any blind and bigoted hatred of the words "disestablishment" and "disendowment" that I shall vote without hesitation, when the time comes, against a Bill which is rank with foul injustice, against this crude and ill-considered measure. I do not challenge the motives of those promoting this Bill, for the motives of mankind are mixed; but I say that this Bill was not drawn by any one having at heart the true interests of the Irish Church or the Irish clergy. The revenues, we are told, are to be applied to "Irish purposes." What are they? The Irish purposes to which they were intended to be applied were to guide the steps of men heavenward, and to teach children to remember their Creator in the days of their youth; and, Irish or English, those were very good purposes. But, if these revenues are now to be applied in building roads at the end of which there ought to be bridges, or bridges to which there are no roads leading — such as I myself saw in Ireland in 1849 after a lavish expenditure of public money—then I have no hesitation in saying that these "Irish purposes" will not prove satisfactory. They will offend the legitimate prejudices—if you like to call them prejudices—and they will shock the religious feelings of many in this country; they will shock the Roman Catholics themselves—they will shock us, and they will shock the Dissenters. For everybody knows—however you may refine upon it, and however the noble Earl may strive to point out different purposes to which Church revenues have been applied—that there exists a very strong feeling of this kind—that when once money has been given and applied to religious uses you had better, upon the whole, keep it there, and by so-doing you will please nine-tenths of the population, who would rather that such funds continued to be applied to holy purposes than to any baser or lower object. I can perfectly understand the difficulty which there may be in dividing a particular income between opposing sects, each striving for the largest share; but there must be some reason very much stronger than any I have ever heard in the case of the Irish Church to justify men who do not know what in the world to do with the money, except to do something Irish with it, in saying we will denude you of this money at once while we are waiting to make up our minds. I venture to say there has never been a case of this kind before.

The noble Earl opposite gave as one reason for the course now proposed that the Irish Church has not fulfilled the design of its institution. Now, what was that original design? It was never designed as the Church of the majority. It was designed as a mark of the disapproval of the Crown and the rulers of the country of the Roman Catholic religion. It went along with most oppressive measures, and it was, if you like, at the outset one of those oppressive measures. But it was part of a whole system. But you have altered that system; you have altered it for the better, and I am very glad that those oppressive measures have been removed. But when you come to deal with this corporation, and say that it has not fulfilled its design, why it is you who have changed the design. It was originally meant as part of a system by which we expressed our belief that the Roman Catholic religion was a foreign thing, a thing hostile to civil government, and a thing untrue. You now believe that you can mark your sense upon these points without the help of these oppressive regulations, and they have been repealed. But what has the Irish Church done? Does anybody seriously put it forward as a reproach to the Irish Church that its ministers have not gone about to every house in every parish to make proselytes? That is missionary work and not parochial work. You must live among them and love them, and so compel them to come in. No doubt that in a great measure the Irish Church has not gained over the population. But, my Lords, where is the sin? The sin lies in the old system, of which this is the remnant; and I want you now to consider whether it is necessary to do so much as in your thoughtlessness, perhaps, you promised to do, and whether you cannot remove the legitimate objections of the Roman Catholics without resorting to this extreme measure. It has been said again and again that the object of the measure is peace. Will peace be insured in Ireland because of this measure? No; it is out of the question. The very persons who are recommending this measure—the ecclesiastics—have been tampering already with, and putting their fingers upon, the land. Depend upon it, the moment this measure is passed you will be asked likewise to deal with the land. There is another consideration which I must not forbear to mention. The position of the Irish Church has compelled us to look towards it for the supply of parochial clergymen, while a large missionary agency, spending some £30,000 a year, in Ireland is supported principally from this country. Sweep away the Irish Church, and then tell me what is my duty. I do not hold with the Roman Catholic religion. I think it shuts up the Bible from the poor; and I feel that there is nothing wise but the Bible. I think the Roman Catholic religion is, after all, a foreign element, and that it strains the jurisdiction which it claims in a preposterous manner we have all seen within the last few days. What, then, is my duty if the Irish Church be disestablished? Am I to send my little tribute to missionary efforts in foreign countries and not to send my share of it to Ireland? You may depend upon it that the whole attitude of the Church in Ireland will be altered the day you disestablish and disendow it. The clergy, we are told, are to have their vested rights respected. The right hon. Gentleman who conducted this debate in "another place" told us that three-fifths of the endowments would be saved to the members of the Established Church — I think he used the words, "three-fifths of the income will remain to the Church as a corporation." Was there ever a more transparent fallacy than this? The truth is, we are dissolving the corporation, or whatever it is; we are confiscating the patron's right, representing two-fifths, and we are giving the remaining three-fifths to the present holders. The figures themselves are wrong, because

it must not be forgotten that some of the older clergy are also the richer; and therefore it makes it more convenient to say that the interests are divisable into two equal parts. The Irish clergy are a very poor body of men—little better off than English curates; and look what an unhandsome proposal you are making to them. You say political necessity requires that you should confiscate their revenue; you add, "We leave you one half of your income in order to raise a permanent fund which exists already." Now, will you give this half to the incumbents? If so, you leave nothing for the perpetual corporation. And if the incumbents are to convert the half into an annuity, we shall have to look to a very poor body of men to provide us with another at a sacrifice of half their income. After this, you have the satisfaction of saying that you do them no harm, and have left them in full possession of their vested interests. I am sorry to say this is by no means the worst of it; we have propositions here so ridiculous that I cannot fully place them before your Lordships. The Irish Church is, in fact, to be put through the process of being "run out." To show what an Irish layman thinks of this proposal, I will read a passage from a pamphlet by Mr. W. Bence Jones, who writes—

> "It has been said that to let the present incumbents go on as they are till their parishes become vacant by death will be favourable to the Church, because it will make the change more gradual. This is wholly a mistake. Such a course will hinder all enthusiasm. It will never be clear when the right time for an effort has come. In truth, the bitterest malice could contrive no plan more hurtful to the Church."

In charity we must assume it was not meant in malice. This, however, is quite a mistake; such a system would get rid of all enthusiasm, and the state of things will become worse and worse. Let us consider the case of small and large parishes in process of being "run out." Suppose several parishes, with very small congregations, lying side by side, and that one of them had an incumbent who lived to be ninety, ninety-five, or even 100 years old, and he remained just able to go through the service. The parishes round would say, "We must club together for a clergyman, for we cannot afford to have one for each parish;" but the other parish would say, "No; we have a clergyman who may last four or five years longer, and we will not join you," and thus the arrangement would be broken up. Then take the case of a large and crowded parish ministered to by an aged clergyman whom we should desire to move to a less laborious work, that a younger man may take his place. But the parish says, "No; the endowment dies with our incumbent; so we will feed him up and keep him at work as long as the life is in him." That is not all; a constant jealousy will exist between parishes, and can you expect poor populations to pay tithe and give voluntary contributions for a curate besides? It is not at all likely. My Lords, the Bill is a crude, unequal proposal for regulating unjust violation.

Something has been said about hostility between the two Houses of Parliament. My Lords, if I knew that the penalty of voting against this Bill were that I should never sit in this House again, and never be allowed to listen to those interesting party discussions such as have enlivened us to-night, I would give my voice against it. To do otherwise would be tantamount to a declaration that I had not one spark of honesty left in my nature. The measure, my Lords, is palpably unjust. Of course, it is possible to conceive that this House, by persisting in unreasonable conduct, of which at present there is no prospect, would bring about consequences the gravity of which cannot be exaggerated; but when we are told that this Bill is a trifle, and that it will do no good, and when we know it will do a great deal of harm, and create a feeling of rankling injustice difficult to wipe away, I say we are bound to turn a deaf ear to those alarmists and mark our sense of so monstrous a measure.

I will add one word on the Irish Church. In common with its English sister, the Irish Church was some time ago in a condition of great depression and dejection. It is not to be disputed that it was disgraced by neglect of duty and other failings; I admit also that a consideration of the state of the Church on its merits shows that anomalies exist which demand our earnest attention. With reference to this last point, I recommend the noble Earl (Earl Russell) to consider the Report of the Commission for which he moved as soon as it is made; and if abuses exist in that Church, if sloth and idleness characterize some parts of it, we may hope for the creation of a better spirit there. I believe that, taking one man for another, the Irish clergy are as much alive to their duty, and as anxious to perform it, as we are at home. I think they have been placed in most unfortunate circumstances; you have forbidden them to proselytize for the sake of peace, and you expect them to be zealous for the sake of justifying their own existence. Being in that position, I believe they have played their part well. I am here to-night, my Lords, not because I belong to what has been called elsewhere "a trade's union of Bishops." I have not come here because I believe anything will happen in my time to the temporalities of the Established Church at home; I come here because I believe that body which is one with me in faith and in practice, which owns the same Saviour, which teaches out of the same Bible, which looks forward to the same heaven, is bound to me by stronger ties than ties of party, and because it would be infamous and cowardly for one in my position to be found wanting in an hour of trial such as this. I have pointed out the defects in this Bill —I have offered my testimony to the good the Irish Church does—and I conclude by expressing a hope that some measure will be found short of disestablishment and disendowment for pacifying the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

Lord ROMILLY: My Lords, I have noticed, in following some of the arguments which have been addressed to the House, a remarkable fallacy; I have noticed what I may call a desire to set up a personification of the Irish Church — to treat the Church as a thing distinct and separate from all the members which constitute it. Now, if you attempt to treat the Church as a corporate being distinct from its members you personify an abstraction and give it rights which it does not possess, and use a form of words which will only lead to erroneous conclusions. The most rev. Prelate who has just sat down (the Archbishop of York) has taken—if he will allow me to say so—a somewhat narrow view of the case, and has thus impaired to some extent the vigour of his observations. He has considered only one portion of the people of Ireland, when the object of the measure is to consider the whole. The great argument against the Bill is that it interferes with the rights of property, that the Irish Church is a corporation, and that to take away the property of corporations will lead to the taking away of private property. I think, however, it can be shown that by this measure you do not take away property from anyone, nor interfere with the rights of property at all. In dealing with a corporation we have to consider three classes of persons, and three only. The present possessors form the first class; those who are hereafter to become the possessors form the second; and the third class is made up of those who are interested in or affected by the exercise of the powers of the corporation, and who, consequently, will be benefited or injured by your dealing with it. When, therefore, you propose to make any change or alteration in a corporation, you have to consider how far it will affect each of these three classes. Now with regard to the first class every one admits that they ought to receive full compensation, and any proposal would be defective that did not fully meet this requirement. But is it possible to maintain that the second class—their successors—have any rights at all? In reality they have no existence, and no person can be injured by the fact that he will not succeed to an office which is not vacant, and to fill which, when vacant, he has neither a legal nor a moral claim. It is in this respect that the property of a corporation differs so greatly from the property of a private individual, the value of whose property is so much greater, inasmuch as he is entitled to transmit it to his children and descendants. In truth, it is for this purpose mainly that persons seek to acquire and to augment their property. It is the distinguishing incident of private property, that within certain legal limits the possessor can dispose of it as he pleases after his death. The possessors of corporate property possess no such right; their powers are given for certain purposes specified by the State, from whom alone they derive their powers, and these exist only during the time that they are members of the corporation. A distinction has been attempted to be drawn between the property conferred by the State and that which proceeds from the bounty of private individuals. But, in truth, the distinction is merely nominal. When a person gives property to a corporation, he knows that he gives it to an institution created by the State, and therefore subject to the rules which bind and affect that corporation, the first of which is that its property is to be held in trust for the benefit of the community, and that the State may lawfully resume and re-model it when and as the interests of the community require it. It may therefore safely be said that no second class exists or suffers any wrong when a corporation is abolished. The third class of persons are those who are influenced and affected by the exercise of the powers possessed by the Church in Ireland. I take these to be the whole people of Ireland, and not, as some have assumed, only those who are members of the Established Church. It is a manifest and injurious error so to contend. The Established Church exists for the benefit of the people of the country where she is established; and, when she ceases to benefit the people, she should be abolished or re-modelled, so as to produce the benefit for which she was originally created. I may here observe that this fact disposes in my opinion of the argument that you have no right to interfere with the property of the Church, because the Church has a right to perpetual enjoyment by virtue of a prescription of 600 years; for, unless you personify the name, that argument is inapplicable when you take care that every one interested shall be fully compensated for any injury that may arise through the course which you propose to adopt. And, my Lords, if you rest on perpetuity as any argument at all in this case, you must recur to the original endowments, and bestow the property upon the Roman Catholics, from whom it was taken, and, as I think, very properly taken. And why? Because it was taken for the benefit of the country—that is, for the benefit of the people, whose happiness it is the first object of Government to secure and maintain. Now, my Lords, I am not going to contend that the appropriation of the property of the convents as it was effected at the time of the Reformation was justifiable. It was done with great violence, and without any regard to the interests of the existing possessors; but, while on this subject, I should like to advert for a moment or two to a singular argument which has been repeated very often. It has been constantly and pointedly observed to a noble Earl who sits below me (Earl Russell), that the great family of which he is a member acquired a large portion of their property at the time of the Reformation out of grants of the lands of the Church. Since I have been in this House that argument has constantly been used—I have counted it, I think, six times—and it is always accompanied by a delighted chuckle on the part of the noble Lord employing it. If argument it can be called, it is an old one, and first, I believe, used by Mr. Burke, in his celebrated letter to an ancestor of the noble Earl; but from the first time that I read it down to the last time that I heard it, I have never been able to understand the force or object of it. Now, I am not going to defend the violation of rights which occurred at the time of the Reformation, or the taking away of the property of the existing abbots and monks; but I will say this—that if you had respected their rights and in depriving them of their property had given them compensation, you would, without injuring any one, have conferred a great benefit on the people. The wrong committed at that time cannot now be repaired; but the taking the property out of the hands of the Roman Catholics was undoubtedly beneficial to the people of this country, and unless it had been granted to other possessors it would have been wholly ineffectual and would speedily have been resumed. Now, my Lords, I have been greatly struck with one thing which pervades several of the speeches which have been made on this subject, and among them I include the speech of the most rev. Prelate who has just sat down. The arguments employed in those speeches appear to proceed on the supposition that religion is to be promoted for the sake of maintaining an Establishment, instead of supporting an Establishment, which after all is only a means towards an end, with a view to the extension and diffusion of religion. Speaking with great submission and some humility on this subject, I would ask what it is that is to be regarded as true religion? Without impropriety, I think I may say that true religion is to love God with all your heart, and to love your neighbour as yourself. Now, my Lords, does the Church Establishment produce either of these effects in Ireland? Has it accomplished the first? In other words, has it extended the true faith? One of the main objects of the Irish Church was to make converts to the doctrine of the Church. Has it done so? It has neither been successful in making converts to the Church of England or in reconciling the Roman Catholic portion of the population to Protestantism — neither can it do so. While that Church remains an Establishment I believe it impossible for it to make converts in Ireland, and the Roman Catholic people look on her as an enemy; and while she subsists, it is a point of honour and a matter of party feeling not to listen to an argument in favour of her doctrine or tenets. My conviction is that if the distinctions between the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant Church in Ireland were put an end to, you would have a much better chance of obtaining converts. Then has the Church of Ireland accomplished the second object of true religion? Has it succeeded in making the Irish people love their neighbours as themselves? The very contrary is the case. It is notorious that it has been the cause of strife and animosity among all classes of the people. Is it not, my Lords, a matter which you ought seriously to consider whether, because an institution has existed for 600 years or more, you ought, therefore, to perpetuate abuses which alienate above one-half of the people, while they fail to confer any advantage on the remainder? The measure now under your consideration really involves no violation of the rights of property at all. If, as the most rev. Prelate asserts, the Bill is replete with blunders, these do not affect the principle, and if they exist may easily be removed in Committee. If you assent to its second reading you will concur in a measure which will tend to the removal of a great disgrace — one that lowers us in the eyes of Europe, which will tend to the wider diffusion of the Protestant religion, and though possibly at first the effect upon the present generation of the people of Ireland may not be so great as is desirable, yet in the course of a few generations it will result in the union of the Irish with the English and Scotch people in one happy and contented family.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH: My Lords, the object of this Bill, as appears on the face of it, is nothing more than to increase a fund which it is presumed will be at the disposition of Parliament in case of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. It is proposed to do this by prohibiting the promotion of such clergymen as in the course of the ensuing twelve months would, under ordinary circumstances, be presented to Irish benefices. Now, my Lords, before we consent to the infliction of an injury on deserving men, however few they may be, in order to increase this fund, I think we ought to be furnished with full information as to what purposes this fund is to be applied. Upon this point, however, we are left entirely in the dark—we have no information whatsoever:—and therefore I hope your Lordships will not think of passing a Bill the evil of which is apparent, and of the good of which we have not the most remote intimation. But even were the purposes to which this Bill is to be applied fully explained, and were they accepted as most excellent, I think you would hesitate before you passed a Bill of this kind. The persons who will be affected by this Bill are a deserving though a small body of men, whom I am confident your Lordships will be ready to protect, and in whose behalf public sympathy is most warmly interested. This Bill does not affect private patronage; it affects only the patronage of the Bishops and the Crown. Private patrons dispose of their patronage as they think fit, from motives of interest or otherwise, and are seldom called to account for it. But the more extensive patronage of the Bishops is, as a general and almost invariable rule, disposed of in favour of the hard-working and meritorious curates of the diocese; and this Bill is about to interpose and prevent these men, after fifteen, eighteen, or twenty years of hard work, receiving the just meed of their professional advancement. The object, besides, is a mean one. The profit, my Lords, will be small, while the injury will be great. I will confine myself to the benefices which will be at the disposal of the Bishops. Taking my own diocese, and calculating from the last nine years the number of clergy whose benefices will become vacant by death, and giving full consideration to all private patronage, the conclusion I have come to is that the number in the ensuing year will not be above thirty—that is, over the whole of Ireland so far as the patronage of the Bishops is concerned. Those clergymen have, of course, some small cures—perhaps of the value of £100—and the preferment they might enjoy but for this Bill would be from £200 to £250 a year. Now, I think it is almost unworthy of your Lordships' legislation to deal with a matter so small; yet though small in amount it will be most cruel and ungracious to the individuals concerned. Then, my Lords, the injury that will be done to parishes is very considerable. In many cases the clergy are trustees for the distribution of charitable funds—by the step now proposed the whole parochial machinery will be brought to a standstill, the children will be turned out of the schools, which derive their principal support from the rectors. This is an injustice fairly chargeable on the Bill. The whole question of the Irish Establishment is to be brought under the consideration of the next Parliament. It involves many dear and precious interests, precious, not only to the 700,000 members of that Church, but to the whole Protestant community in Ireland; for whatever profession they belong to they look on the Established Church as the bulwark of their civil and religious liberty, and they know right well that if the Established Church is pulled down they will not be able to hold their ground or to exercise their rights as Protestant Christians. This certainly, then, is a question of very great importance. If ever there was a question that should go before any tribunal without prejudice it is this. But what does this Bill propose? That it shall go before the new Parliament and the new constituency with a stigma marked upon it, and as being already condemned without trial. I therefore trust your Lordships will not approve a Bill of this kind.

But the Bill is justified by the assertion that the mission of the Irish Church has failed. My Lords, if that were true no one will say that it is the fault of the present generation, on whom you are going to bring down the heaviest punishment which it is in your power to inflict. Talk of penal laws—they would be nothing compared to the deprivation of the means of grace, and the blessing of an independent Church they have so long enjoyed, which they consider as their birthright, which they possess by right of a prescription of 300 years, and which was assured to them by as solemn a covenant as one nation could enter into with another. It is sometimes said that the Act of Union was but an Act of Parliament. My Lords, it was a treaty between two independent Parliaments, one of which, on the faith of this great nation, gave up its independence. The grand point which the Protestants of Ireland wished to secure was the Church, and on being satisfied on that point they yielded to the Union. It was said to them by Lord Castlereagh, "You are here in a minority; but let the Union be perfected and the two Churches united, and you will then rest on the basis of the population of the whole Empire." On the other hand, it was said to the Roman Catholics, "You are here a majority; we are afraid of you; we cannot give you emancipation; but let the Union be established, and you are an insignificant minority. Emancipation may then be granted to you." Call the Union only an Act of Parliament!—the Act of Parliament was only the seal put on the treaty. What solemnity, what religious vows, what oaths could have made the preservation of the Protestant Church more secure than the Treaty of Union? It rested on the truth, probity, and honour of the Empire, and beyond that there is no political security whatever.

But it is said the Irish Church has failed in its mission. Why, the Church of Ireland never was more prosperous, spiritually speaking, than it is at the present moment. The number of churches recently erected and endowed has greatly increased. The clergy have of late years acted with an energy, zeal, and devotion unknown in former ages. There is a connection of endearment and satisfaction between the clergy and the laity that never existed before. We are doing our duty well to God and to man. The improvement is great and rapid, and at such a time it is said we have failed in our mission! How is that? Is it in population? I question it. Sir William Petty gave an estimate of population taken in the year 1672. At that time there were of Roman Catholics in Ireland 800,000; of Churchmen, 100,000; of Scotch Presbyterians, 100,000; and of English Dissenters of various classes, 100,000. Therefore, Churchmen were to Roman Catholics as one to eight; they were, compared with Presbyterians and other Protestant Dissenters, as one to two. What is the case now? We have 700,000 Churchmen; we are multiplied seven times over. With respect to the Roman Catholics we are as one to six and a half, and with respect to Presbyterians and other Protestant Dissenters, instead of being as one to two, we are a very large majority. That does not look like a Church that has failed in its mission. Besides that, the 700,000 Churchmen of Ireland contain within themselves the most enterprising and intellectual portion of the nation. The great majority of the landed proprietors, the merchants, and skilled artizans belong to the Established Church. The Church Protestants have in every circumstance been ever faithful to the interests of England; they have never been mixed up with any rebellion; and when the Irish people have risen against the Government of this country, it is the Protestants that have always been the chief sufferers and have had to bear the brunt. We have done nothing on earth to forfeit our rights or lose your favour. Our great sin in Ireland is that we are with yourselves one blood, one religion, one language, and it is on this very account that we are singled out and assailed. In conjunction with our other brother Protestants, we have made the most desolate part of Ireland by far the most fertile and prosperous portion of the kingdom. What we received as a heritage in the northern parts of Ireland were the forests and swamps of Ulster. Now you will find there good houses, well-cultivated farms, and a prosperous, industrious, loyal, and peaceable people. If you look through that Province you will see the chimneys of manufactories rising on every side, and you will find that wealth, prosperity, civilization, and national power are on the advance. I do not want to draw comparisons; but I will say you will find the same thing in no other part of Ireland. Well, we have brought up our people—and 700,000 is no small number —it is about one-half of the whole population of Ireland at the time of the Revolution—we have, I say, brought them up in good principles, in the fear of God, the love of the country, and loyalty to the Queen. And now, my Lords, the principal reason given for the alleged failure of our mission is that we have not converted the Roman Catholics. Well, my Lords, I cannot think that that was the fault of the Church in Ireland. Whatever its faults may have been, I do not think that fault lies at its doors. Remember—every effort we made for that purpose was for a long period thwarted by the civil Government. When the Reformation was first introduced into Ireland there was very little objection made to what was then called "the King's proceedings." The chieftains and the great majority of the Bishops took without scruple the Oath of Supremacy, and for a considerable time the people attended the parish churches. I believe they did so for the first eleven years of the reign of Elizabeth. But what did they hear there? They heard an unknown language. It was pressed on the attention of this country over and over again that, if anything was to be done with the Irish, it must be done through the medium of their own language. The Reformation had been established for nigh fifty years before Dr. Daniel, afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, translated the New Testament into the Irish tongue—in 1608 the Prayer Book was also translated — but for fifty years you gave the Irish people neither the Bible nor the Prayer Book in a language which they could understand. Many a great and good man in Ireland saw and lamented this; and Bedell, the Bishop of Kilmore, who was a great scholar, and was sent over to Ireland on the recommendation of Archbishop Usher, as Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, at the age of sixty learnt the Irish language, and, with the assistance of King, translated the whole Bible into Irish. During the course of the translation King embraced the principles of the Reformation, and Bedell presented him with a living. But when word of this was brought to Dublin, it was said that Bedell was encouraging the Natives, and accordingly orders went forth that King should be deprived of his living. The Bishop advised King to withstand the invasion of his rights; but he was seized, bound hand and foot, and carried to Dublin—and that was the way in which the Government encouraged the Reformation in Ireland. The reason is alleged in a letter from Archbishop King to Dean Swift in these words, "Some think that if they were all of one mind the Church would be too powerful," and therefore cold water was thrown on the attempt to present the Reformation to the Natives of Ireland. But is the present generation to be punished with the loss of their Church for the faults of those 200 years, and are you to do that which will have the effect of shutting the doors of the Church against the Roman Catholics? We are told that the whole possessions of the Church are in the hands of one-eighth of the people. Now, my Lords, you will find that to be altogether a fallacy. At the Reformation the great wealth of the Irish Church was in the monasteries. They had one-half the tithe of the country, and very large and extensive lands. When the monasteries were dissolved, the tithes as well as the lands were disposed of by Henry VIII. among his courtiers and friends. The Bishops who conformed remained in possession of their sees; but to use the words of Bramhall, "The alienation of Church property by deeds and leases was infinite." The bishopric of Lismore "was held" (he observes) "by the Earl of Cork at 40*s.* a year." The whole possessions of Kildare were wasted, also the temporalities of Clogher. Cloyne was reduced to 40*s.* a year, and Cashell, Ferns, and Leighlin were all impoverished. On this subject Sir Henry Sidney wrote to Queen Elizabeth—

> "If I should write unto your Majesty what spoil hath been and is of bishoprics, partly by the Bishops themselves, partly by the potentates their noisome neighbours, I should make too long a libel of my letter; but your Majesty may believe that on the face of the earth there is not a Church in so miserable a case. In many places the walls of the churches are down, very few churches covered, and windows and doors ruined and spoiled."

And this was in Meath, the best peopled diocese. Nor did the benefices fare better. Of the southern counties, Edmund Spenser says—

> "The benefices themselves are so mean and of so small profits in these Irish counties, through the ill husbandry of the Irish people which do inhabit them, that they will not yield any competent maintenance for any honest minister to live upon, scarcely to buy him a gown."

Sir John Davis says—

> "As to the vicarages they are so poorly endowed as ten of them being united will scarce suffice to maintain an honest minister. For the churches they are for the most part in ruins; such as were presented to be in reparation are covered only with thatch."

He further observes—"Many of the livings are not worth above 40*s.* a year." Even after the Restoration the Church was in no better case. All the churches had been ruined, first by the rebels and then by the soldiers of Cromwell; and Williams, Bishop of Ossory, writes thus—

> "I went to live on my bishopric at Kilkenny, where I found the cathedral church and the Bishop's house all ruined, and nothing standing but bare walls without windows but the holes, and without doors. If you walk through Ireland, as I rode from Carlingford to Dublin, and from Dublin to Kilkenny, I believe that throughout all your travel you shall find it as I found it in all the ways that I went. Scarce one church standing for seven that are ruined and have only walls, most without roof, without doors, without windows."

The benefices in his diocese averaged £43 14*s.* and a fraction. In 1670, Bishop Mossom gives this account of the northern diocese of Derry—

> "First, the churches, especially those within the twelve London proportions, were generally ruinous, and not one, except that within the city, was in repair, neither were the inhabitants, from their extreme poverty, anyways able to re-build or to repair them; so that the holy offices of God's public worship were, for the most part, administered in a dirty cabin or in a common alehouse; and also that not only were the churches ruinous, but likewise the ministers were generally and necessarily non-resident, not having any houses upon their cures, not being able through meanness of estate to build themselves houses, nor could they find habitations to be hired upon the place."

Perhaps I ought to mention the subject of tithes. They were never easily collected in Ireland, and Bishop Doyle, before a Committee of the House of Commons, said that they were never regularly collected till the time of Henry VIII. For a long time they were of small importance, and added very little to the incomes of the clergy. As the prosperity of the country increased the tithes increased in value. In 1733 the Irish House of Commons passed a Resolution, not a Bill, setting forth that tithes of pasture land ought to be resisted, and they made a common purse, determining that they would oppose every clergyman who went to law to enforce those tithes. The clergy were weak and submitted, and thus the Church lost half of its property. Tithes were taken off the rich graziers and kept on the poor tillers of the soil; and, perhaps, the Irish Church never received a heavier blow than this. After this, another quarter was taken off; and in 1832, Sir Richard Griffith proved before a Select Committee that tithes were only one-sixtieth part of the produce. The Church now has exactly one-eighth of the original tithe granted by Henry II. at the Council of Cashel. When, therefore, it is said that we are a minority, we reply, "True; but we have only one-eighth of the Church possessions." It is certain that if there had been but one religion in Ireland this diminution of the Church property would never have taken place. No Irish Parliament would have dared to free themselves from tithes—for that is practically what they did—and impose it upon their constituents. If, then, our numbers are, by comparison, small, remember that the tithes and other possessions of the Church have, from time to time, been pared down, until we now have only that proportion of Church property which would belong to us if it were apportioned according to numbers. After the Reformation there were very troublous times in Ireland, and it was not until the Revolution that the Church had peace, and could repair its wasted buildings. What it had then principally to depend on were 111,000 acres of land given by James I. for the purpose of supporting the Protestant religion in Ireland; and, whatever may come, I hope that these lands, which were given for this special purpose long after the Reformation, will be left to be devoted to the objects for which they were originally intended. At that time the poverty of the clergy was so great that efforts were made on all sides to relieve them. Bishop Bramhall came over here, and, with the assistance of Archbishop Laud, subscriptions were raised and a great quantity of lay tithes were bought up. In this way the Protestants of the time were enabled to recover possessions of the Church to the amount of £40,000 a year. Primate Boulter left £30,000 a year in the middle of the last century for the purpose of augmenting small benefices. The interest of that money has been absorbed in those benefices, a great number of which have been by it augmented. Primate Robinson and others also left property for Church purposes. Primate Lindsay left an estate in the county of Down which produces £900 a-year. In this way since the Reformation the property of the Church has been gradually created; and now it is proposed to us that, for the sake of securing religious equality in Ireland, we should begin again! Who can tell what have been the benefactions since the Reformation? Since I have been in Armagh one benevolent nobleman gave £6,000 to increase three small benefices in the diocese. The benefices of Ireland have thus grown up from poverty to comparative comfort; that is, they now average £250 a year each.

Another objection is made to us, and that is that we are the Church of the rich and are supported by the poor. Now, neither of these assertions is true. The first is true only in a certain sense. We are not supported by the Roman Catholics. No man pays the tithe rent-charge; it is the land itself which pays that. As to our being the Church of the rich, it is true that nine-tenths of the land is held by Protestant proprietors; but where are they? In England, in France, in Italy—all over the world—anywhere but in Ireland. From my own observation I should say that there is on an average not more than about one resident landed proprietor in each parish in Ireland. In some parishes there may be more, but one will be about the average. If the Church were disestablished, it would then be upon this one proprietor that the support of the Church would fall—for I know very well what answers absentees give to applications for money. I have been to long a beggar not to know how much is to be got by such applications. "My dear Sir," is the answer you receive, "I do not reside in Ireland, and my rents are badly paid. I have schools and other charities to subscribe to here, and you must allow me very respectfully to decline to give anything." I will say that some years ago this was a more common form of reply than is given now, for of late there has been a most splendid and liberal response from the laity on the subject of church-building. Within ten years, I think, £194,000 have been subscribed by the laity for this purpose, and churches have grown up rapidly within the last century. In 1730 in all Ireland there were only 400 churches; in 1806 there were 1,029, and in 1864 there were 1,579. These, then, are our own churches, built with our own money. The laity have liberally subscribed a large proportion of the money they cost, and the grant in aid which we get is from the money of the Church in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Besides this the glebe lands have been greatly improved by the clergy, who have built houses, hedged, ditched, drained, planted, and made the lands double their former value, in the full belief that they would never be ousted from the possession of them. I could mention the name of a clergyman—I know the circumstances well—who, on 100 acres of glebe, valued perhaps at £2,500, spent £500 upon his glebe house, of course with the idea that it would remain permanently in the hands of the Church. If he thought it would have been taken away from the Church, depend upon it he would have been loth to expend that money. The case I have mentioned is one out of many; and in the parish, of the better classes there will be very likely only the clergyman and the squire. A noble Lord has asked how, if the majority of the clergy had only moderate incomes, they could manage to be so charitable as they were said to be? But a great many men go into the Church in Ireland, having some means of their own, and with a wish to do good. If those men had not been in the Church they would never have remained in Ireland, but would have gone to some place more agreeable to them. But they lived and worked in poor, and some of them in desolate parishes, supporting their charities, and, in fact, doing everything that a good, faithful, and devoted Christian minister ought to do. If you destroy the Established Church you will drive away from the country a great number of most valuable residents of that kind. As the Established Church of Ireland sinks or recedes, you may depend upon it there is another Church there which will advance and rise. That other Church is a powerful Church. It is one which does not acknowledge the supremacy of the Queen but acknowledges the supremacy of a foreign Potentate, who at one time was very dangerous to the liberties of this country. If you overthrow the Protestant Church of Ireland you will establish the supremacy of the Pope, and substitute for the supremacy of the Queen that of a foreign ruler.

The Archbishop of Armagh

Let those who foolishly think that by subverting the Protestant Establishment of Ireland they will strike a deadly blow at the union of Church and State remember that, instead of doing that, they will only change a Church with the Queen as its head for one with a foreign Potentate at its head; and that in Ireland you will have an *imperium in imperio.* Then the power and authority of the Queen will, as was said in old times in Ireland, be held only at the Pope's discretion. You may flatter yourselves that you will have got rid of the Irish difficulty when you have abolished the Irish Church; but you will find that that difficulty has then only begun. I recollect well the tithe war in Ireland. Suppose there should be a land war of the same description? At the time of the tithe war, I remember an immense mob surrounding a house in my parish, when the cry of "No tithe!" was raised; but afterwards the cry of "No rent!" was set up, and when that once began the cry of "No tithe!" was immediately given up and forgotten. Do not imagine that if you overthrow the Irish Established Church there will not be, as there was in earlier days, a very extensive emigration of Protestants, comprising many of the best, the soundest, most loyal, and most industrious of Her Majesty's Irish subjects. You will put before the Irish Protestants the choice between apostacy and expatriation, and every man among them who has money or position when he sees his Church go will leave the country, thus weakening the dominion of England over it. Will you then adopt a course which will certainly cause those who have proved themselves for 300 years to be the best friends and defenders of English rule to flee from a country which they will think doomed and accursed? If you do that you will find Ireland so difficult to manage that you will have to depend on the gibbet and the sword; and I think you will then have reason to regret that you have no longer the aid of that Christian Church which kept your people together and made English law, English authority, English freedom, and an English Bible respected and beloved.

THE EARL OF CORK: My Lords, I cannot forbear troubling your Lordships with a few observations, being too strongly impressed with the momentous nature of the subject under consideration, and its deep importance to the English as well as Irish people, to let it pass by in silence. For in the future position of the Anglican

Church in Ireland is involved so much of the future contentment, happiness, and prosperity of that country, that it is, I believe, scarcely possible to over-estimate the decision at which you may arrive respecting it. The social status of the great mass of the Irish people is to a great extent at stake now—besides the larger financial question, which we must all feel will need not only very serious consideration in dealing with it but, where vested interests are concerned, the utmost circumspection in disposing of them. Difficult, however, as the arrangement of these details must necessarily prove, I look upon them as small in comparison with the chief question of the Bill—namely, the maintenance or abolition of an international Church Establishment, opposed to those principles of religious equality for which the Liberals of all classes in this country have ever contended, and which they view as the sole permanent basis of peace and unity. The existing position of that Church is, in point of fact, so unprecedented elsewhere, so unique of its kind in both past and present history, and comprises so many varied anomalies, that no one, I imagine, would ever think of answering in the affirmative the query invariably put by writers of the Press and others on the subject as to whether the foundation of a similar institution would be possible in these days. To appreciate thoroughly the spirit of heart-burnings and grievances which it has always excited among those whose interests have been affected by it, one has need to trace the Irish Church step by step from its origin as a recognized Establishment in the earlier times, when it was in accordance with the faith of the country, through many a scene of political intrigue and mismanagement, to 1560, when the spread of the Reformation placed it in overt and acknowledged opposition to the great bulk of the population. How united and how earnest was the struggle then and for long years to come on the part of all classes no one who has read Irish history can ignore; but repudiated as it has been ever since, and even down to our times continued to be, by the people, can we look at it as other than a prominent cause of alienation from England in their hearts, and a terrible contradiction to that wise truth enunciated by Lord Eldon, "That the union of Church and State is not to make the Church political, but the State religious?" In saying thus much I do not wish to over-state the case, which is already sufficiently strong on its own grounds. I do not imply, much less assert, that the settlement of the Church question is the only Balm of Gilead. I am not so sanguine as to expect that all wounds will thereby be cicatrized, all grievances allayed thenceforth and for ever. Many other points will remain at issue, calling for nice adjustment and delicate handling; but we all know the envenomed nature of so-called religious differences, how they militate against those feelings of justice and harmony which alone make legislation fit to endure and to be endured, and how, more than any others, they exemplify the "rarity of Christian charity under the sun." And, while I entertain the strongest conviction that in this instance justice and expediency work hand in hand in calling for a change, I am unable, I own, to attach much weight to the arguments brought forward on the other side. My Lords, I cannot and I do not believe that the disestablishment in Ireland will effect even remotely the Established Church in England. No parallel, it appears to me, can be drawn between them, except for the sake of contempt. They stand upon completely separate grounds. They differ in sundry minor but by no means unimportant matters of detail as to government and discipline, and in their practical working it is almost impossible to allow adequately for the enormous differences which exist between them. The Church of England is English—the Church of Englishmen recognizing the language and nationality of its members. Ignorance of English is a bar to preferment to an English living, and ignorance of Welsh is a similar bar where Welsh is commonly spoken. The Irish language and nation are ignored by the Establishment in Ireland. Above all, there is this terrible fact, that the Anglican Church in Ireland numbers only 12 per cent of the population; it is rejected by the mass of Irishmen, who regard it as a Church hostile to themselves, and endowed with the spoils of their own ancient Church. Where, my Lords, shall we find a parallel to this in England, or, indeed, in any other country? I must, moreover, call your attention to the fact that in insisting on the differences between the two Churches, I am only dwelling upon what has been repeatedly recognized by Parliament as forming the basis of their separate treatment. Sir John Nicoll, then the chief ecclesiastical Judge in England, on May, 30, 1623, insisted that the Preamble of the Tithes

Bill should be altered by the Irish Secretary so as to express those differences. Sir John Nicoll said—

> "This Bill would be highly objectionable in England, but the case might be different as it affects Ireland. The circumstances of the two parts of the kingdom are widely different. They stood in this respect rather in contrast than parallel to each other."

In 1833 William IV. thus addressed his Parliament—

> "In the further reforms that may be necessary you will probably find that, though the Established Church of Ireland is by law permanently united with that of England, the peculiarities in their respective circumstances will require a separate legislation."

My Lords, it has been declared that in assenting to the disestablishment of the Irish Church the Coronation Oath would be violated. But might not the same charge have been preferred with greater justice against Queen Elizabeth when she put down the Roman Catholic Church, which she found established by the legislation of her predecessor? Prescription, too, is strongly urged as a plea for the maintenance of the Establishment, and that, no doubt, is a strong argument when the property of individuals is concerned; but with regard to the property of corporate bodies Parliament has always recognized a distinction. On this point I may cite the opinion of Lord Althorpe, who was once the Colleague of the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby)—

> "He admitted that it was very dangerous to assert any principle which interfered with any established right of property. He could not, however, admit that there was any analogy between Church property and that of corporations, and still less was there any between it and the property of private individuals which comes to them by inheritance. In the case of the holders of Church property, they obtained their rights neither by inheritance nor purchase, but by the arbitrary choice of the Crown, or of certain individuals who held the right of appointing them."

Tithes have thus been altered and ministers' money abolished, yet none of these measures have had the slightest effect upon the Church of England, which, on the contrary, has of late wonderfully improved in zeal and efficiency. If the Church is disestablished, it seems to me that upon its own behaviour it will mainly depend whether its proper influence, both spiritual and temporal, be impaired or diminished. The Roman Catholic Church has maintained its powers under disestablishment and persecution; whereas the Anglican Church in Ireland will have no political restrictions, no penal laws affecting its life and liberty. The fault must clearly be with its ministers if it fails henceforth to hold its place as a Christian Church in the land. The time, indeed, appears at hand when such a concession to that spirit of progress which characterizes the age in which we live can scarcely be evaded. Religious equality is every day becoming more and more a necessity in Ireland. As education increases so does the knowledge of national wrongs and the determination to redress them. As wealth augments among Roman Catholics so does the self-respect which protests against the ascendancy of the creed of the minority. Roman Catholics have been admitted to offices of trust and rank, and their loyalty to the Government is not doubted. They feel that while the Church Establishment exists a standing insult is offered to their faith. They complain of what Archbishop Whately once described as "the sort of insult implied by the spectacle of an endowed clergyman whose flock was not of his persuasion." The very temperate declaration of Roman Catholic laymen against the Establishment was signed by nearly every Roman Catholic Peer, Member of Parliament, and large landed proprietor. If this appeal, backed as it is by such large majorities in the House of Commons, be not listened to, a fresh opportunity will be afforded to the enemies of British rule to urge the uselessness of appeals to the Legislature for the redress of Irish wrongs. The justice of the claim of nearly 5,000,000 of Roman Catholics to equality is undoubted, and the expediency of acceding to it indisputable. Let us, then, beware how we ignore the one and deny the others. The Act of 1689 for abolishing prelacy in Scotland, commenced with this Preamble—

> "Whereas the Estates of this Kingdom in their claim of right declared that prelacy is and hath been a great and insupportable grievance to the nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the people, &c., the King and Queen's Majesties do declare that they will settle that Church government in this kingdom which is most agreeable to the inclinations of the people, &c."

That Act gave peace and prosperity to Scotland. Let me entreat your Lordships to imitate the wise policy of your ancestors, and no longer to oppose a measure which is ardently desired by the people of Ireland.

THE DUKE OF RUTLAND: My Lords, I must apologize for intruding on your Lordships' attention when there are so many other Members of the House who can address you with far greater ability than I can do; but I feel strongly on this question, and therefore wish briefly to express my opinion upon it. I oppose this Bill on two grounds, I hold it to be unjust, unfair, and inexpedient to disestablish and disendow the Irish Church. Even, however, if I thought such a policy just and expedient, I should equally object to the second reading of this Bill on the ground that this is neither the time nor the manner in which the question should be dealt with. I wish, as far as possible, to avoid any acrimonious feeling, and your Lordships know that I am not a violent partizan; but I must say that if there have been any party or acrimonious feeling on either side of the House the blame does not lie with the Government or its supporters — it must rest with those who have brought forward this question at a time when they knew—and indeed acknowledged — that it could not be settled. Now, it has been urged that it is unjust that Roman Catholics should have to support a clergy to whose religion they are opposed. The answer to that assertion is this—that nine-tenths of the income of the Church in Ireland comes out of the pockets of Protestant landlords. As to the right of the State to interfere with Church property, I admit that Parliament has the same right to interfere with it as with the property of any other corporate body; but though I listened attentively to the speech of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Romilly), I failed to understand what distinction there is between property belonging to the Irish Church and that belonging to any other corporation, so far as the right is concerned. The State interferes, no doubt, with corporate property when it has been wrongly applied; and even with private property in the case of railways and public improvements, but it does so only when the public good requires it. Now, I cannot see that such a case for interference exists with regard to the Irish Church. It has been urged, indeed, that that Church has failed in its mission; but I think it has been shown by the most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of Armagh) that the contrary is the fact. If I wanted independent evidence, it is not from the Irish Church—it is not from this side of the House—I would seek it. I would apply to the candour of the noble Earl who addressed us from the opposite side last night (the Earl of Clarendon), and who read to us a paragraph in which it was stated that the Irish clergymen as a body have nobly done their duty. If that is not sufficient, I would appeal to another noble Earl opposite, who some time ago thought it not beneath his dignity to preside at a meeting in St. James's Hall (Earl Russell). I have not the speech of the noble Earl by me, and therefore if I misquote him I hope he will correct me. As I understand, he said he had always been of opinion, and was still of opinion—whatever the alteration which his other sentiments might have undergone—that the Irish Church had promoted religion and morality in Ireland. Well, my Lords, if that is the case, do you mean to tell me that the Irish Church, which has always promoted religion and morality in Ireland, has not fulfilled its mission? The noble Earl went on at that meeting to say—

> "But there is another principle which I have discovered, and which to my mind is superior to religion and morality, and that principle is equality."

I hope I have not misquoted the noble Earl. I read his speech with great regret to think that at the close of his official and useful career he should have made such a statement. At the same time his statement was gratifying to me, in so far as it went to show that the Irish Church had fulfilled its mission. There is another argument in favour of this measure to which I shall address myself for a few moments. It is, that the Irish Church is a badge of conquest. Now, on an excitable, generous, and noble people like the Irish that statement is calculated to have a great effect; but I deny it. I deny that the Established Church of Ireland was introduced by the conquest of that country. In 1172 Henry II., instigated by Pope Adrian, conquered Ireland, which up to that time possessed an independent Church. The Roman Catholic Church was then brought into Ireland, and the Reformation only replaced the Church which had existed before the conquest. The noble Earl who spoke last, to use a vulgar expression, "let the cat out of the bag." He said the vote your Lordships are called upon to come to to-night is not as to this Bill, but is a vote of "Aye" or "No" on the question whether you will preserve or destroy the Irish Church. Therefore, my Lords, let us clearly understand what it is we are about to vote upon. We have been threatened, we have been warned, we have been told that we must not put ourselves in opposition to the majority in "another place;" but, my Lords, with all due respect to that majority—and no one has a higher respect for the House of Commons than I have—I do say this, that I do not think we ought to regulate our votes solely and entirely by the opinion of any House of Commons that may be in existence. And, with regard to this majority in "another place," it is a majority that has condemned itself. It has committed what I may describe as the greatest weakness a public body can be guilty of. It may be right or it may be wrong, but it has committed political suicide. It has destroyed itself, and it has placed on the Journals and Votes of the House of Commons its deliberate opinion that it does not represent, as at present constituted, the feelings and wishes of the people of England. It has written that on the page of history, and it has therefore declared that it is incompetent to deal with any measure of importance, and much less with a measure of such transcendent importance as that for the destruction of the Irish Church. My Lords, there may be grievances and anomalies, and if there be by all means let them be considered and removed at the proper time; but it will be a gracious act of your Lordships' House towards the country and the new House of Commons to give them an opportunity of saying whether or not they are in favour of the destruction of an Establishment which has existed for at least three centuries. My Lords, I never gave a vote with a clearer conscience than the one I shall give to-night, nor did I ever give one with more hope than I now entertain that Parliament will hand down to the remotest posterity of Irishmen the blessing which our ancestors conferred upon Ireland.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET: My Lords, I listened to the speech of the noble Duke who has just sat down (the Duke of Rutland) as I listened to the other speeches addressed to your Lordships from that side of the House, with the greatest attention. I can assure noble Lords on that side of the House that no one can be more anxious than I am that this House should not place itself in a false position with regard to a question which is of great importance now, and which promises to become still more so in the future. The subject of the Irish Church is undoubtedly opening upon us; and I therefore at once ask your Lordships whether you are determined to stand by that Church as it is now? Now, my Lords, I venture to say that this is a serious question. You noble Lords on the Government side of the House have been for many years under the Leadership of the noble Earl lately at the head of the Administration. I admire the ability and I respect the character of that noble Earl. In my opinion he has every qualification for the Leader of a great party—except judgment. He led you through the campaign in support of the Corn Laws, and since then through campaigns on other great questions; but what has become of your glorious majorities and your "No surrender?" I ask you now, not in a party spirit, but as a Member of your Lordships' House, to calmly consider what position you are going to take up on this Irish Church question. Do you mean to say that you will stand by the Irish Church exactly as it is? I believe not. As far as I can understand what has fallen from Members of the Government they say this—"We will not stand by the present distribution of the revenues of the Irish Church; but we hold that those revenues should be applied for the purposes of that Church." That, I think, is your position. The noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) would take all those revenues, put them in a common fund, and divide them among different religious denominations. But the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees warned us against the sacrilege we were about to commit. It was quite frightful to hear the sins with which he charged us. But, for myself, I must say that I am not in any way responsible for this Bill; and as regards the Resolutions neither am I responsible for them. But this Bill has come to us, and you, at least, on the opposite side of the House ought to be very glad to have it, and for this reason—that you made a great complaint because the Resolutions of the House of Commons were not laid before you. You said, "Why should we not have them? they ought to be laid before us. Let us have them, and deal with them, and discuss them," said the right rev. Prelates—who, no doubt, were very eager to discuss the question. Now you can discuss it; and you ought to be very much obliged to the Gentleman in the House of Commons who, with what prudence I will not say, have sent you up this Bill to discuss. You have got the whole question before you. The Bill prevents the creation of any new vested interests. Well, my Lords, for thirty years I have voted for a large reduction in the Irish Church, and I believe it would be well if we had carried that measure years ago. I was reminded of the debate on the Appropriation Clause when listening to the speech of the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby), for he recalled many phrases which struck me as familiar. The noble Earl had evidently been ransacking some of his old pigeon-holes, for he brought out the very arguments which did duty in 1836 or thereabouts, and he told us what opinions were entertained by Lord Palmerston in 1828. In the year 1828 those arguments did very well, but are they gravely to be put forward in the present day? I regretted that the noble Earl should have taken this line, and regretted it the more because nobody admires the ability of the noble Earl more than I do. It has been said that whoever votes for this Bill must be in favour of entire disestablishment and disendowment. Now, the Bill, as far as it goes, contains neither disestablishment nor disendowment. Disendowment was not even in the Resolutions, and in Mr. Gladstone's introductory statement the disendowment was very limited. The great fault found with his speech by many persons was this—"You are going to make a great change in the Irish Church, and at the same time you propose to allow three-fifths or two-thirds of its property to remain in the hands of the Church." But that proposal is not in the present Bill; there is nothing like it in the present Bill. What the scheme of distribution may be I confess I do not know, for I have not seen it. ["Hear, hear!"] I admit it; I admit that I do not know what the scheme is, and that I am not prepared to discuss it. ["Hear, hear!"] I have not heard, up to the present, of any one who is prepared to discuss it. ["Hear, hear!"] All I have heard is the proposal that three-fifths or two-thirds of the property of the Church shall still remain to it, and that all vested interests are to be respected. I admit to the full the great difficulties of this question. I heard the speech of the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London) last night; it was a very able speech, and I agree with a good deal of it. It showed the great difficulties of the question, and that before dealing with this subject we must consider it much more completely. At the same time I say this Bill has a value; and for this reason—it is a declaration to the people of Ireland that we are prepared to consider it. If you come to details, I admit there are great difficulties in any Bill. I cannot conceive myself how such a scheme is to work. ["Hear, hear!"] Yes, I am willing to admit the difficulties which must attend the carrying out such a scheme. That was the reason which induced me to rise; I am not going to make a party speech. But you say that this Bill is brought forward with a party motive; that we want to turn you out and to get upon those Benches ourselves. I at least do not want to get into that place of humiliation! I assure you that I enjoy myself very much more upon this side of the House, in freedom, than I ever did upon those Benches. But to return to this Bill and the scheme of disestablishment. Under it we are invited to deal with the Church in this way—If a Bishop dies he is not to be replaced, or if the incumbent of a parish dies he is not to be replaced; but vested interests, as long as they continue, are to be preserved. Therefore, in one diocese a Bishop may live for thirty years—and I hope that many of them will live for the next thirty years—and retain full jurisdiction, while the very next see may be vacant the whole time. In the same way one parish may have its incumbent performing his duties for the next thirty or forty years, while in the adjoining parish the voluntary principle perforce will be at work. As far as I can see, the whole state of transition is one that is intolerable. If it is to be carried out it must be by some different arrangement; but what that is to be I confess I do not know. I will take another case—that of the noble Lord the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. I will suppose him attending with all his state, and with that great courtesy and ability which never fail to distinguish him, at some important gathering. By his side, and on his right hand, there will be a Roman Catholic Archbishop in the place of honour, and some simple Protestant will naturally ask, "Where is our Archbishop?" "Oh, the Protestant Archbishop!"—the reply will be—"he was abolished some time ago." Now, to my mind, that is anything but religious equality. I do not understand how religious equality is to be insured; I see so many difficulties in the way, and questions of such magnitude, and so calculated to excite the feelings and passions of men. But it is, I think, most important that we should show to our Irish fellow-subjects that we are ready to entertain conciliatory measures. I confess that if I were in the midst of a Protestant community, and saw all the revenues going to the

Catholic hierarchy, I should view such a process with the greatest jealousy and dislike. And why should I do to my Catholic fellow-subjects that which I should never willingly endure myself? I do not want to take up your Lordships' time with details of a scheme which is not practically before us; but I do wish to urge that in dealing with a question like this the House of Lords ought to take a large view, and show that they are willing to give it fair consideration, without favouring or offending either Protestant or Roman Catholic. The most rev. Primate (the Archbishop of Armagh) told us how matters had been managed in Ireland some years ago. He showed most clearly that the State had robbed the Church of an immense amount of revenue. I never heard a stronger case made out against the State, or the conduct of the State from the time of Elizabeth to the present day more bitterly denounced than by the right rev. Primate. My Lords, I will not trouble you with further observations, but whenever the real question comes before us, I hope we shall be able to view it in a spirit of justice towards the Irish people.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I must say that I hope the position of the noble Duke upon the other side of the House, which contributes so much to his enjoyment as well as ours, will continue; and I hope the noble Duke will long retain the means of enjoyment which he is so happy to possess. I listened with great interest to his speech, but the only impression left upon my mind was somewhat perplexing; for, as I understood him, it was his opinion that this Bill was absurd, could not possibly work, and would produce effects of the most ludicrous character, yet that it was absolutely necessary for the credit of your Lordships' House that you should pass the Bill without delay. Of course, I am not as old a Member of this House as the noble Duke, and I do not know in what way the credit of your Lordships' House may be best maintained; but my impression is that, unless the nature of the people of England has altered very much within the last few days, their opinion of your Lordships' House will be increased rather than diminished by your refusing to pass a Bill which is declared, even by those who are friendly to it, to be absurd and unworkable. The noble Duke's speech was distinguished by one peculiarity for which I heartily thank him, and that is that he did discuss the Bill before the House; whereas the noble Earl who opened this debate (Earl Granville) appeared to show a steady and ostentatious contempt for the Bill which he was introducing to your Lordships' notice. He discussed everything in Europe and out of Europe—he went to England, to Scotland, to Canada, among all his foreign friends, but I could not hear one single observation about the Bill submitted to your Lordships except that he thought there might be a great many plausible things said against it. Now a Bill introduced to your Lordships under such auspices I think requires some careful weighing before you proceed to vote upon it on grounds wholly unconnected with it, and not contained within the four corners of its clauses. The truth is this:—The Bill professes to be one to leave the question open for the decision of the new Parliament. But there is a well-recognized and well-understood means of leaving a question of this kind open for consideration. Whenever a Royal Commission pronounces itself unfavourably to any institution or in favour of alterations, there is a form of Act we constantly pass if we wish to leave ourselves free to confirm those conclusions, and that form of Act is perfectly well known to those who are now promoting this measure. It would gain for them all they desire—its simplicity is extraordinary, and it is this—"After the passing of this Act any person who accepts any office in such and such an institution shall be understood to hold the office and receive its emoluments subject to the pleasure of Parliament." You have done that in connection with the public schools; you have done that this very Session with respect to the endowed schools; and I do not hesitate to say that if, after the vote of the House of Commons, such a Bill had come up to your Lordships' House, I should have felt there was no course open to us but to pass it. It is quite clear that the vote of the House of Commons is at least as important as a decision of a Royal Commission; and I am sure your Lordships would have been very ready to pay that deference to the opinion of the House of Commons which consists in leaving a question unprejudiced for the decision of a future Parliament. But, knowing that this was the ordinary course, having these precedents before them, the promoters of the Bill have deliberately set them aside; they have adopted measures which several right rev. Prelates have shown will, if carried, produce the greatest confusion in the actual administration of the Church of Ireland; and I can conclude only that they desire something totally different from leaving this question entirely unprejudiced for a future Parliament. I can conclude only that they desire by a side wind and in an indirect way to procure the sanction of your Lordships to the large measure of change which they contemplate. That being the only interpretation to be put upon the very unsatisfactory and remarkable provisions of this Bill, I must ask myself before I vote for it, what does it intend to do? What are these changes which I am asked vaguely and indefinitely to sanction without having them in any shape before me? Well, my Lords, I have heard allusions to various plans for disestablishment without disendowment; I watched the noble Earl the late Foreign Secretary (the Earl of Clarendon) last night, and I remarked he was very chary of the word "disendowment." But on the solitary occasion when he mentioned it he favoured us with some remarkable information; he said that two-thirds—the greater part of the property was to be left to the Irish Church. My noble Friend who ordinarily sits near me (the Earl of Carnarvon) made to-night a very remarkable and able speech. He stated his intention distinctly that he would vote for disestablishment, but that he was not prepared, except to an apparently very limited extent, to vote for disendowment. I do not know what such schemes may be worth; we have not them before us, and I have not seen them stated in the papers; when they are laid before us I shall be ready to examine them: but they have nothing to do with the Bill before us. This Bill is founded on certain Resolutions which state in the most distinct and absolute way that disestablishment is the object of Mr. Gladstone, who has stated as much in his speeches. In language which can leave nothing to desire from its completeness, he has asserted that every vestige of property, except, I think, Sir Benjamin Guinness's endowment, is to be taken from the Church of Ireland. Now, my noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon) made many observations this evening in which I entirely concur, if I understood him rightly, as to the unwisdom under present circumstances of what is called a pure no-surrender policy. Personally, if I consulted my own disposition, I should have no objection to fight *à outrance*; but I confess, from the experience I have had, my inclination is to say, "How can you expect to hold the fortress; it's no use holding out, for the troops won't stand to their guns?" Therefore, my Lords, if there were any intermediate proposal before the House, I should doubt whether I should assent to it or not—of course, everything depends upon its provisions. I should esteem any Minister who voted against his convictions in support of such a proposal wanting in self-respect, but I should not say that any Member of your Lordships' House, who cannot escape from responsibility by resigning, was debarred from modifying his convictions in deference to a great public exigency. But these questions do not arise upon the present occasion. None of that very eloquent diatribe which my noble Friend delivered against those who stand out for a no-surrender policy applies in this instance. Nothing in the nature of a compromise — nothing which the most flattering critic would describe as a compromise—has been offered to the acceptance of either House of Parliament. My Lords, we are told that to agree in time is to prevent a demand for something more. But I have no doubt that those who brought forward this proposal would have already demanded something more if they had been able to find it. I do not doubt their possible power so far as political action is concerned; but there is this limit in the nature of things, that when you have abolished a thing you can do nothing more with it; and it is an absolute and complete spoliation that Mr. Gladstone has offered to the Irish Church. The noble Duke who has just sat down (the Duke of Somerset), told us that two-thirds of its property were to be left to the Irish Church. Two-thirds of the property! Why, I heard Mr. Gladstone make his calculations, and I think it was three-fifths of the property that were to be left to the clergymen of the Church. These are very estimable gentlemen: I am glad that some provision is to be made for them; it would be a great breach of the rights of private property if some were not made. But as a promise of consolation to the Church of Ireland it is absolutely worthless. It is a matter of perfect indifference to the Church of Ireland whether the present holders of livings are compensated or not. Therefore, my Lords, I want to make this point very clear. We are dealing with a Bill which, in the first place its own advocates will not defend; in the second place, with a proposition as large, as extreme, and as sweeping as it is possible for human or radical ingenuity to devise. Now, my Lords, on what grounds is this great change recommended? We are told that they are two—that one of them is justice, the other rests upon considerations of expediency. Now, whenever we argue that this thing is dangerous to some other interests—dangerous to the Union and to the Church—we are met with the assertion, "It is just;" and because it is just, we are told we must do it, come what may. Well, let us examine this plea of justice. Let me, in the first instance, take exception to a species of testimony with which I may say we have been inundated. I think it may be called the "foreign-friend argument." Several noble Lords on the opposite Bench, having a large foreign acquaintance, have given us the views of their friends in abundance—as if that were the proper argument to offer to an English Parliament; they have told us the opinions held in society they have been accustomed to frequent; and they say so and so is held to be what the House of Lords should do. Well, my Lords, I listened to the opinion of these foreign friends, and I found that the late Foreign Secretary (the Earl of Clarendon) was much smitten by the article of an illustrious writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes.* None would be wanting in respect for that illustrious writer; but among his claims for our respect we must remember that he can boast of this characteristic, that he is a most earnest believer in the Church in which he was brought up, and that Church is the Roman Catholic. I must say that if England were judged on the "foreign-friend" ground—on the principles put forward by this critic in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* there are many actions in our history that would be very severely condemned. I even doubt whether my noble Friend's critic in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* could entirely approve the English Reformation. Now, my Lords, when you come to talk of justice in holding property, it is a question of title. If my right to my land is good, it is absurd to say there would be justice in taking it from me and giving it to somebody else. Therefore the question of justice resolves itself into an examination of the title by which the property is held. No one says, as I understand, that this title is bad. If it be bad, the property vests in some one else. But we have no second claimant for this property with which it is proposed to deal. One of the greatest difficulties lying before you in this case is the way in which this property shall be applied if it be taken. I do not understand that anyone has disputed that in a Court of Law the Church's title to this property is good; but there appears to be some idea in the minds of noble Lords, either that the Church is different from other corporations, or that there is something weak in the title of corporations which exposes them to peculiar operations of this kind. I am fully aware of the power of phrases judiciously used. The noble Earl who introduced this Bill (Earl Granville) told us that the existing state of things was the paying of the clergy of a minority out of a public fund. I have heard again that fund called public property. These are very significant phrases. Whenever anybody wants to rob his neighbour of anything he always says the thing he covets is national property. I speak for a moment as a Railway Chairman when I say I have heard somebody lately assert that railways are national property: and I have heard the assertion with alarm. Where is the title of this national property? Will you find it in any deed, in any charter, in any statute book, or in any treatises of law? No. You will not find it in any of these things. It has simply been evolved from the innermost depths of the Liberal consciousness. There is not the slightest vestige of external proof in favour of this claim on the part of the nation to dispose of this property. There is, indeed, only one claim advanced, and that is that in past times violent Sovereigns and unscrupulous Parliaments have dealt with Church property in the manner that best pleased their violent passions or inclinations, and you conclude that because it has once been subjected to violence you have the right to resort to violence again. But, beyond the fact that this property may have been violently dealt with at different portions of our history, you have no argument which you can urge in favour of what you call its peculiarly national character. Well, there were some noble Lords who apparently felt the weakness of these arguments, and were alive to the absolute impossibility of proving that the title by which the Church of Ireland holds its property is different from that by which the property of any other corporation is held, and, boldly supplying the link which is missing, they told us that the property of corporations was at the pleasure of Parliament.

The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Kimberley) told us that the State was the heir of corporations such as the Irish Church. Unfortunately the State appears to have a power which many heirs may envy—that of killing off the possessors of the property which it desires to inherit. Now, my Lords, I can only say with regard to such statements as these that they are based upon a code of law which is totally new in this country. Do not imagine that you can perpetrate this illogical violence, and then go no further than you originally intended. I can quite believe that you intend to go no further; but others will take up the principles which you have started, and drive in the wedge which you were the first to insert, and the result will be that you will be led into consequences from which you, I believe, would be the first to shrink with alarm. But there is one peculiarity in this position to which I think the corporations of this country should have their attention called. It is bad enough that the supposed perpetuity of corporations should be entirely abolished; it is bad enough that it should be laid down that the State is the heir to the property of a corporation which it may destroy at any moment, or as any party exigency may arise. But observe the peculiarity of this case. It is not because the property has been abused—it is not because its trusts have not been fulfilled—it is not because in some cases its trusts have become impossible of fulfilment; that might be remedied by a much more moderate measure—it is not because its means are required by other classes; but it is because a certain body of men grudge and envy those now in possession of this property that you are prepared to take it away by force. But how far do you intend to carry this right of dispossession and to yield to demands dictated by feelings of grudge and envy? Now, my Lords, I do not wish to push too far the analogy between corporate and private property. I am willing to acknowledge the very great difference, the existence of which every one must see; but I feel convinced that if you familiarize the minds of the people of this country with the idea of yielding to the mere display of discontent, and the mere ostentation of envy, you will cause injury to property otherwise secure, and it is not with corporate property that this principle will end. So much, then, for the question of justice. The other question is one of expediency. We are told that this Church is unpopular, and that the Irish will not be pacified until it is destroyed. But there are other matters which it is equally important to consider. You have been informed to-night by a most rev. Primate who is fully qualified to judge (the Archbishop of Armagh) that the abolition of this Church will be followed by great discontent in the North of Ireland; that it will be followed by a large emigration; that Ireland will lose a large proportion of that already too scanty class—the resident landlords within her border. But you cannot stop here. You talk of the immovable loyalty of the Orange population. Now, my Lords, I do not believe in such a thing as immovable loyalty. I believe that if you commit a deep and glaring injustice upon any portion of the population, however loyal, they will nourish in their breasts feelings of resentment which will not, perhaps, break out into open disturbances, but which will still be in the highest degree disastrous to the country, which will find their support wanting in the hour of its need. I would ask your Lordships to put yourselves in the place of some Protestant congregation in Dublin or the North. Hitherto the Protestants have paid willingly to the Protestant clergyman the tithes to which he has had a right from time immemorial. Without asking for any change, they suddenly find the clergyman taken away, the money hitherto devoted to his support bestowed upon the erection of a lighthouse or some other similar work, while they themselves are called upon to contribute towards the support of a minister who ought to have been supported out of the money already contributed by them. It would not be in human nature to bear this contentedly. I have spoken of Ireland and the Church of Ireland to-night, but these are mere expressions, having no ethnological and scarcely any historical value. The Ireland which you assume for the purposes of the present argument is not the Ireland of the Union; because, if you take all the country together, and take it as one nation, your alarming statistics will at once disappear, because the Church of England will still be the majority. On the other hand, if you regard the country in its true ethnological aspect, you will make out no case whatever in that part of the country where the Protestants prevail. In fact, it is simply by lumping the Protestant and Roman Catholic portions of Ireland together, and by cutting off England altogether, that you contrive to make up these formidable statistics. But if you so disregard the connection between the two countries, and embody that feeling in an Act of Parliament, you will find persons perfectly willing to follow your principle to the logical result of severing all connection between the two countries; and in the hour of your trial you will find the Orangemen, who have hitherto been so strong a support, very little inclined to exert themselves in defence or in promotion of an arrangement which has been attended by such bitter fruits to them. Then come the arguments about the Church of England. I agree with my noble Friend that the cry of "the Church in danger" is a cry of too serious a character to be lightly raised. I do not want to press that point, but I wish to know what you will do in the case of Wales and Cornwall, for instance, where the Church of England is in a great minority? It may not be a case of 12 per cent—but I suppose legislation does not depend upon fractions—but it is a case of great minorities. If you once acknowledge the principle that the Church is to be disestablished whenever it is in a minority, how can you resist the application of the argument to Wales and Cornwall? You may say that this Bill will have no effect upon the Church of England: but has it not had an effect already? In every part of the country the people are beginning to feel that the Church Establishment is not so safe as it was. This is alike the feeling of the clergy and of the people, and both are beginning to prepare against the issue. And in what way do they prepare themselves? How does a Church suddenly turned into the wilderness prepare to protect itself? Why, its first instinct is to protect itself by a strong development of sacerdotal organization—by a strong and powerful clerical organization. This, perhaps, may not be a great evil in a spiritual point of view; but I know there are many among your Lordships who will regret it. That will infallibly become more and more characteristic of the members of the Church of England when they begin to feel that their connection with the State is a mere question of time, and that, therefore, they must prepare themselves for the evil day. This danger has not been much alluded to, and I feel the way in which this attack is organizing the clergy, is one of the most formidable difficulties of the present time. Well, but then comes the policy of conciliating the Irish. Your proposals seems to be to still the waters of this agitating time, as the ancient Greeks were wont to do, by offering up a victim to the avenging Deities; but are you quite sure that the avenging Deities are prepared to accept your offering? I have heard many elaborate attempts to prove that Fenianism is the true necessity that has caused this movement. But is it not an extraordinary phenomenon that for the first time in the history of rebellions you have rebels who do not know the real motive which is the cause of their rebellion? This is the age of rebellions—we have seen them in all countries—but I have never before heard of one where they were at a loss to state the grievances they desired to see removed. You tell us that though the Fenians never raised a cry against the Established Church, it is the Established Church which is really at the bottom of their agitation. It is impossible to conceal from ourselves that something very different is at the bottom of the Fenian movement; and I suspect when the Irish people hear that many Liberal landlords have joined in this attack on the Irish Church, they will say the reason is that they think they will save themselves by making the parson their Jonah, and thowing him overboard. My Lords, it is against the land, and not against the Church, that this Fenian agitation is really directed. You offer them that they do not ask for; you offer them that which will not pacify them. Talk of the monuments of conquest—the landlord is a much more complete monument of conquest than the clergyman. The clergyman does not hurt the peasant; if the clergyman be taken away, the peasant would be no richer, but rather poorer; but the landlord holds the property which the peasant, in his traditions, well remembers once to have belonged to his sept. If you seek to appease the danger by mere concession—if you yield to the mere demands of anger—or, to use the euphemistic language we have heard—if Fenian outrages are to make you reason calmly and dispassionately—it is to the landlord, and not to the clergyman, that you should really turn your attention. My Lords, I have only one word more to say, and it is with respect to the position of this House. We have heard from the opposite Bench several very animated appeals to this House, and several constitutional lectures as to our duties. The noble Earl the late Foreign Secretary (the Earl of Clarendon) went so far, as I understood him, as to tell us that we must watch public opinion more closely, and pay greater attention to the majorities in the other House of Parliament. My Lords, it occurs to me to ask the noble Earl whether he has considered for what purpose this House exists, and whether he would be willing to go through the humiliation of being a mere echo and supple tool of the other House in order to secure for himself the luxury of mock legislation? I agree with my noble Friend the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) below me that it were better not to be than submit to such a slavery. I have heard many prophecies as to the conduct of this House. I am not blind to the difficulties of its position in this peculiar age—I am not blind to the peculiar obligations which lie on the Members of this House in consequence of the fixed and unalterable constitution of this House. I quite admit—every one must admit—that when the opinion of your countrymen has declared itself, and you see that their convictions—their firm, deliberate, sustained convictions—are in favour of any course, I do not for a moment deny that it is your duty to yield. It may not be a pleasant process—it may even make some of you wish that some other arrangement were existing; but it is quite clear that whereas a Member of a Government, when asked to do that which is contrary to his convictions, may resign, and a Member of the Commons, when asked to support any measure contrary to his convictions, may abandon his seat, no such course as this is open to your Lordships; and therefore, on these rare and great occasions, on which the national mind has fully declared itself, I do not doubt your Lordships would yield to the opinion of the country—otherwise the machinery of Government could not be carried on. But there is an enormous step between that and being the mere echo of the House of Commons. My Lords, I quite admit that the difficulty of ascertaining the opinion of the country may be great. Perhaps no more striking instance of that ever occurred than in reference to this very question thirty years ago. The tide then ran very strongly against the Irish Church. Popular opinion appeared to be pronounced. The House of Commons acted upon it, and sent up Bills to this House which your Lordships systematically objected. And in course of time it turned out that you were right—that you knew the opinion of the nation better than the House of Commons. The nation became apathetic, the question slept, and for a whole generation we have heard no more of the Irish Church. That is a proof at once of the difficulty of deciding what is the opinion of the nation, and of the duty incumbent on your Lordships of taking your course not less with firmness than with prudence. I have no fear of the conduct of the House of Lords in this respect. I am quite sure—whatever judgment may be passed on us, whatever predictions may be made, be your term of existence long or short—you will never consent to act except as a free, independent House of the Legislature, and that you will consider any other more timid or subservient course as at once unworthy of your traditions, unworthy of your honour, and, most of all, unworthy of the nation you serve. I admit that the future is full of difficulty, and that on many questions of doubt and perplexity which may be submitted to the House your prudence and judgment may be sorely taxed; but I am quite clear that with respect to this Bill, so vague, unmeaning, ill-constructed, and having behind it projects of change so vast, so crude, so sweeping, your Lordships can have but one duty, and that is to reject it.

LORD LYTTELTON: I am anxious, my Lords, to say a few words before I vote, as it is my intention to do, in favour of this Bill; but I must be allowed, in the first instance, to read a letter I have received from one of the gentlemen who signed the Petition I presented the other evening. He says—

> "It may be worth while just to mention that there are, in fact, very few 'unattached' clergymen among the petitioners. Nearly half are beneficed incumbents—a very good proportion. Then there is a more than usual proportion of schoolmasters and College tutors, if the Bishop of Oxford prefers to see them there, and a somewhat smaller than usual proportion of curates. Those actually 'unattached' are a small handful. In theology I imagine that the large majority are 'moderate' men."

I must also read a few words from a letter which I have received from a gentleman whose trustworthiness I can answer for. He says—

> "With reference to the observations made on the subject of the Petition against the Irish Church Establishment presented by your Lordship last Tuesday, I have reason to know the views of the Petitioners are shared by several clergymen of the Irish Church. It always requires great and exceptional moral courage for the members of a corporation—more especially of a religious corporation—to express opinions unfavourable to its character or existence. The silence, therefore, of Liberal Irish clergymen on this subject is by no means to be taken as a proof that they do not share the views of their English brethren who signed the Petition in question. A brother-in-

law of mine—an Irish clergyman of great ability and popularity as a preacher—wrote to me some time ago, expressing his strongest sympathy with Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions, but adding that if he expressed those views publicly in Ireland such an outcry would be raised against him by his brethren that he rather shrank from saying anything about the matter. He has recently written to me again, saying, 'I find several neighbouring clergymen agreeing with me that it is the only hope for the future welfare of our Church that the millstone of the Establishment, and all its corruptions and scandals, should be cast off.' I think it is a fair conclusion that, if he could find several clergymen in his own neighbourhood holding such views, there must be a considerable number of Irish clergymen altogether who are in favour of disestablishment. That they are timid in the expression of their views is but natural under the circumstances."

My Lords, I shall vote in favour of this measure because, from the circumstances attending it, from the importance attached to the present occasion, and from the course of this debate, I think the real question before us is that of the establishment or disestablishment of the Irish Church. Upon that question I have no doubt whatever. I am bound, however, to express my agreement with my noble Friend the late Colonial Secretary (the Earl of Carnarvon), who probably will have made the only speech in favour of the Bill proceeding from that side of the House, that on the whole I regret that this question should have been raised during the present Session. I impute no blame to those who have brought the measure forward, for I do not know that it may not have been incumbent on them to do so in consequence of steps taken by those opposed to them. But I should have been glad if this very rare occasion—an occasion which will probably never occur again in the life of any of us—had been taken advantage of for the purpose of passing some measures unconnected with political feeling — educational measures, such as the Bill of the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Marlborough), or that of Mr. Bruce. Our position at present is peculiar, and we were never placed in a similar one since 1831 or 1832. We are on the eve of a new election, on which all questions will be referred to an entirely new constituency; and we have no means of knowing in what way these questions will be dealt with by them. This very battle of the Irish Church will have to be fought over again; and, assuming that there was no necessity for an attempt to oust the Ministry, which was very unlikely to succeed, as it has not succeeded, I could have wished that the question had not been raised during the present Session. But such was not to be our destiny. This question has been raised, and having been called upon to say "Aye" or "No" to it, I can have no hesitation as to what answer I shall give. Nor, my Lords, in my view is this question of the Irish Church one of detail, such as it is so elaborately put before us day after day in the pamphlets with which we are favoured, and in so many speeches that we hear. I cannot conceive that in any possible circumstances a religious system which, after a full and fair trial of three centuries, has, from whatever cause, failed to attract to itself more than one-sixth, to put it most favourably, of the people, ought to remain the national and Established Church of the country. By a national and Established Church I understand one which covers and embraces the whole country, which is supported by the whole population, and which is enforced over the whole country and the whole population by law. I do not go one step beyond that; and the only point which I conceive to be involved in the Resolutions upon which this measure is founded is that the Church shall cease to be the national and Established Church of the country. I hold with the late Colonial Secretary (the Earl of Carnarvon) on the question of secularization, and I should be disposed to agree with the noble Earl who moved the Amendment (Earl Grey) in the views expressed in his letter to Mr. Bright. I only regret that it is not likely those views will be entertained. If I am asked if I can reconcile my view with the theory of Church and State which I am supposed to hold, I say that I still believe in the soundness of that theory in itself, and as one of general application. I hold the doctrine as set forth in Mr. Gladstone's book, and I believe he himself holds it still to be sound in the above sense. But no theory will stand against an extreme case, and I believe the Church of Ireland is that extreme case. Parliament is just as much bound to establish our Church in Lower Canada and Australia as to maintain the Irish Church Establishment. It is said that this question is argued on the abstract or general ground of religious equality; but that I deny. The Church of England I support on the principle of the connection of Church and State; and I must say that I can conceive nothing more unreasonable or suicidal than the identification of the causes of the Churches of England and Ireland. They are identical in doctrine, but it is scarcely possible to find any other material point in which the Churches are not distinct. We are often told that more than half the people of England do not belong to the Established Church. That is a statement I entirely disbelieve. But even if it were true that the number of Dissenters in England were equal to the members of the Established Church, the members of the Church of England enormously outnumber those of any one Dissenting body. That is not the case in Ireland. Further, the difference between the English Church and Dissent is nothing like that between Protestantism and Romanism in Ireland. Again, many of the English Dissenters themselves wish well to the English Church. And, lastly, the Romish religion is in Ireland diffused throughout the whole country, while in England Dissent is mainly confined to towns and populous districts. That the present measure should be looked upon as a warning and a stimulus to the Church of England I by no means doubt, for I conceive that no Church should continue as an Establishment unless it is rooted in the affections of the people. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) said that this proposal was brought forward merely on account of the grudging and envy of certain people for other people's property.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: What I said was that it arose from the envy of one religious denomination against another.

Lord LYTTELTON: Well, the argument which we use is distinctly that it is for the public good that this property is taken, just as we argue that it is for the public good that private property should be taken for the construction of railways and other purposes. Before concluding, however, I am bound to say a few words as to this Bill in itself. I cannot but think there was considerable weight in the objections which were urged by the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey), by the Primate of the Northern Province, and by the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London). I cannot but doubt whether it was necessary or expedient that this Bill should be offered to us at all. For the reasons I have given, and because I do not think that any very serious inconvenience will result from its adoption, I shall vote for it; but I question whether this House has been treated with proper courtesy and respect. The Bill before us was the result of previous deliberation and discussion in the other House of Parliament. It followed upon formal Resolutions agreed to by that House. But we have had no such Resolutions, and what ground for the Bill has been laid before us? This may be a matter of form, but it seems to me that the point is of some importance — that the Leaders of Opposition in this House ought to have brought the subject generally before us prior to the introduction of such a Bill, so that we might have come to some agreement with the other House upon the subject. Let me add that, if anything could have induced me to abstain from voting in favour of the Bill, it would be the tone of bullying and of menace which has been adopted towards this House on this subject—I do not say in this or in the other House of Parliament, but in certain publications and out-of-doors. We all know that when any question of importance is before the public certain newspapers tell us that the nation has made up its mind—which means that the writers in these newspapers have made up their minds, and that there is nothing left for us but either to assent to the changes which are proposed or to be ourselves abolished. Sometimes a modified statement is made, and we are told, not that we are to be abolished, but reformed. Now, I have very little feeling on this subject, and if I were abolished as a Peer and Member of the Legislature, I should not care about it; but I confess I do not see how we are to be "reformed." My noble Friend indeed, the late Foreign Secretary (the Earl of Clarendon), told us our reform should be to advance with the times. That, I understand, is a reform in the conduct, both of individuals and of public bodies; but in what other way we are now threatened with reform instead of abolition I do not know. Whatever we may do with regard to this Bill, I have no doubt that the House will deal fairly and considerately with the question if it is brought before your Lordships in a future Session. If a deliberate opinion is pronounced by the whole nation, and it is in favour of this or any other measure, I do not suppose that this House will for any long time stand in the way. The question, being decided by the country, will then come before us; and I feel no doubt that whenever this question of the Irish Church is finally settled, it will be by the removal of this badge of servitude—this mark of the domination of the minority over the mass of the Irish people.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY: My Lords, there is one point connected with this question which I think we ought to remember—namely, that the agitation for this Bill does not come from Ireland. It is the result of an English raid in, Ireland just as the Fenian outbreak there was got up by strangers to the country. The Liberation Society have gone over to provoke and teaze the Irish into agitation, and ask them whether they would not come forward to help the agitation got up by the Society for the general abolition of State Establishments? The Irish Church was merely selected as a weak point for attack. We know this from their own confession, and we see the same causes operating in Wales. Mr. Bright went down to Liverpool, and addressed the Welsh people collected there, urging them to join in the movement; and the same attempt will be made to get up a cry against the Establishment in Scotland. Do not deceive yourselves. This is not an Irish movement or an Irish grievance; it is only the first part of a general system of tactics emanating from those who oppose all Establishments whatever. It is a mere cloak for a future attack upon the English Church, and hardly a meeting against the Irish Church is held in the towns of the North of England where the parties who move in it do not pledge themselves to carry out the attack upon the English Church. It is not, therefore, mere idle apprehension which leads us to think that the case of the English Church is closely connected with that of the Church in Ireland. My Lords, we are urged to take the formidable step which is now proposed either upon the grounds of expediency or of justice. Now, what is this justice? You mean to say, do you not, that the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland was robbed by the Protestant Church established there? Well, do you mean to make restitution? No! You call it "justice" to rob the robbers. You simply deprive them of their spoils. What is this, then, but merely to satisfy a feeling of vengeance for wrongs supposed to have been inflicted three centuries back? Do you think that by satisfying this feeling of vengeance you will ever introduce peace and tranquillity into Ireland? We often hear people speak of Ireland as if there were only one denomination of Protestants there; but,

Lord Lyttelton

in truth, besides the 700,000 Episcopalians, there are about as large a body of Presbyterians and Protestant Dissenters in that country, most of whom feel as keenly the injury which will be inflicted on Protestantism by this measure as Churchmen do themselves. Therefore, do not imagine that you are satisfying the whole people of Ireland when you are only satisfying one class. You are, in reality, only satisfying the Irish Roman Catholic priesthood. Whenever that priesthood have tried to get up a feeling against the Irish Established Church they have found it necessary to buoy up the question by pledges on the subject of the land in the first instance, in order to enable them to make an attack upon that Church. In fact, the Irish Catholic peasantry have not that aversion for the Protestant clergymen which some persons seem to suppose. My Lords, I cannot but think that those Gentlemen who have brought forward this question on the present occasion are deeply responsible to the country. They themselves look with considerable apprehension to the effect of the great organic change which has lately been carried in our representative system. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright have themselves confessed this. But how are they preparing for this great experiment? Why, by throwing down into the arena as the first subject of discussion among the new constituencies the destruction of the ancient institutions and religious establishments of the kingdom. Is it, I ask, a wise thing to flesh the young blood of the new electoral body upon those old institutions and venerable establishments? Is it a wise thing in them so to enter upon this change, instead of meeting it in the manner referred to by my noble Friend (Lord Lyttelton), who, however, supports this Bill for reasons little understood by others, and which, it would appear, he can hardly explain to himself? Surely the interval before the appeal to the new constituencies is made should rather be employed in quieting and composing the public mind than in exciting and inflaming it by raising such issues as these. You may say this is only an act of justice; but I hold that it is not doing justice to say a thing is robbery and not to follow it up with restitution. Nobody desires this measure but the Irish Catholic priesthood and those who follow their lead. The priests themselves have not said they will be satisfied with it; but have told you that there are other and deeper questions behind, which you seek to get rid of by bringing forward the question of the Church. You have no reason to believe that any danger will be averted by it, or that one wound of Ireland will be thus healed. Instead of healing old wounds you are only creating new. You could not do an act of more perfect and unmitigated mischief, without securing to yourselves the slightest degree of advantage in return. The real "badge of conquest" of which we have heard so much will still remain behind—namely, the question of the land. Do not let Irish landlords think they can divert attention from the present settlement of the land of Ireland, which rankles in the minds of the Roman Catholic population far more than the matter of the Established Church. By this proposal you will remedy no existing evil; but only give a triumph to one party, cause the bitterest animosity and disappointment among the rest, and enormously increase your own difficulties.

THE BISHOP OF KILLALOE: My Lords, I desire to express my high respect for the noble Lord who spoke last but one (Lord Lyttelton), but the more I respect him the more deeply I regret that he should join in supporting this Bill. I think his speech made one thing plain—namely, that the noble Earl who sits on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) is not altogether so singular in his views as some may have supposed. It seems that his convictions are shared by many of those who sit opposite. What he is singular in is that he appears to have acted upon those convictions. I maintain, notwithstanding all that we have heard, that the attempt now made to disestablish the Church of these realms, not in a remote dependency of the Crown but in an integral part of the United Kingdom, is wholly unparalleled. You have modified the terms on which Church property is held; you have altered the arrangements of the dioceses; you have taken away jurisdiction from the Bishops, and have relieved some of them from the performance of Parliamentary duties; but a measure like this is wholly unprecedented in our history. Is there any justification for it in the opinions and authority of great statesmen? I think not. All the great authorities who have been cited had, I believe, a different plan for dealing with this question. They had before their minds the exclusive establishment of Protestantism in Ireland, with no provision for the hierarchy of the majority. Some of them thought of supplementing the maintenance of the Establishment by some endowments of the Roman Catholic priesthood. You say that scheme is impracticable. I quite agree with you. But what right have you to cite those statesmen who were in favour of no such scheme as total disestablishment, and who denounced the exclusive Protestant Establishment solely on the ground that they thought something was wise and practicable which you say is impracticable? As to the sentiments of illustrious foreigners on this question, I greatly doubt whether any of your Lordships would attach great weight to their opinions on any other point of the British Constitution or of British policy, except this one question of the Church Establishment in Ireland. With great respect for those who have had far larger opportunities than I have had of consulting the opinions of distinguished foreigners, I think the same idea to which I have referred as being in the minds of distinguished statesmen at home was in the minds of these illustrious foreigners. They cannot understand the difficulty in a country like this of making a *Concordat* with Rome, and of placing all religions on an equal footing. The State finds in Ireland three great religious denominations—the Roman Catholic, the Protestant Episcopalian, and the Presbyterian. It cannot ally itself to the first, though it is the Church of the majority. There are a hundred reasons why it cannot, but one is sufficient. The hierarchy of that Church will not take your endowments on any conditions which you could accept. They know that they enjoy a greater amount of liberty in this kingdom than they would enjoy under a *Concordat* in any other country. Under those circumstances the State takes the next and most numerous body which it finds, whose clergy teach what the majority of the people of this realm believe to be the truth—a Church which is identical with the Establishment in England; the Church to which the Sovereign belongs; the Church recognized by the Estates of the Realm; the Church to which belongs the great majority of the landlords of the country, out of whose estates it is chiefly supported. The fact is that all property, and especially private property, is a grievance to those who do not possess it. The law of entail, primogeniture, the hereditary privileges and rank attaching to Members of this House, are all sentimental grievances to the persons who are debarred from them. Indeed, I have conversed with many intelligent men in this country who have put forward as an intolerable grievance the existence of privileged orders; and I would advise the aristocracy of this country not to reckon too confidently on their privileges escaping attack. I do not believe, moreover, that the disestablishment of the Irish Church would remove the sentimental grievance, for that really rests on the social inequality of the Roman Catholic population; and as long as the Protestant Church continues to be the Church of the aristocracy—as long as it is established in this country and the Sovereign and nobility of England belong to it, so long will the sentimental grievance remain. The source of the present difficulty is that agitators trade on the passions of the Irish people, keeping old wounds rankling and sore, and persuade the people that those evils which are the result of the faults of their national character are due to the English Government. The only way to meet such agitators is to announce our unalterable determination to maintain our Protestant institutions in Church and State. I may be told that this is the old cry of Protestant ascendancy—and in a certain sense it is so; but there is a Protestant ascendancy which is essential to the integrity of the realm. The people of England being the majority of the people of the realm—being, as I hope they will continue to be, Protestants; having a vast preponderance in wealth, in intelligence, and in habits of command; having the seat of Government among them, and having traditions of Imperial authority—it is impossible but that they should, if they are united, possess an ascendancy in this Empire. Why, what is it that prevents you from establishing the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland? Do not you know very well that it is the Protestant feeling of the people of England and Scotland? Well, what is that but Protestant ascendancy? It is quite possible, indeed, that if these conflicts of faction continue in England, a compact, solid body of Roman Catholics may, though a minority, obtain that preponderance which for several centuries Protestants have exercised in the affairs of this realm; but it is to be hoped that such a thing may not happen. The Established Church in Ireland may be in some sense a symbol of ascendancy, but it must be remembered that it is also a symbol of the settlement of property; and if the Church is given up you will also have to surrender the Protestant succession, and the good old cause—the cause of liberty all over the world—the cause for which Hampden died on the field and Sidney perished on the scaffold. All this you must sacrifice, or you will not satisfy the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The Protestant Church, I repeat, is a symbol of the settlement of property. You may draw a nice distinction between them, but you will never persuade the mass of the people that property set aside under trusts for the highest uses is less sacred than property which appears to be set aside merely for the advantage and comfort of individuals who may, without check or responsibility, scatter and squander it upon the most trivial objects—upon dogs and horses, and on degraded human creatures far less respectable than those animals. You will never get people to understand these metaphysical distinctions, or to understand that ecclesiastical property is less sacred than the property of individuals. Hence, if you confiscate the possessions of the Church you will endanger all other property. My Lords, I have not been a little surprised to hear the argument that because the Presbyterian Church was established in Scotland the Irish Church should be disestablished. The case of Scotland is not one in point. To make it so the question of establishing the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland should be before you. In Scotland the question at the time to which reference has been made was not only of disestablishment but one of establishment; and there is this difference between the Presbyterian and Roman Catholic religions—that the former is at least homogeneous with the Protestant feelings of the people of England, which certainly the latter cannot be said to be. Anything that is particularly objectionable to the people of this country in certain papers drawn up in connection with the Presbyterian religion has been set aside, at least practically; but, my Lords, the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland have not abandoned the principles of intolerance which that Church professes. On the 1st of September, 1851, there appeared in the *Rambler*, a Roman Catholic magazine, an article, to some passages of which I beg your Lordships' attention—

> "It is difficult to say in which of the two popular expressions, 'the rights of civil liberty' or 'the rights of religious liberty,' is embodied the greatest amount of nonsense and falsehood. As these phrases are perpetually uttered, both by

Protestants and by some Catholics, they contain about as much truth and good sense as would be found in a cry for the inalienable right to suicide. . . . Let this pass, then, in the case of Protestants and politicians. But how can it be justified in the case of Catholics, who are the children of a Church which has ever avowed the deepest hostility to the principle of 'religious liberty,' and which never has given the shadow of a sanction to the theory that 'civil liberty,' as such, is necessarily a blessing at all? How intolerable it is to see this miserable device for deceiving the Protestant world still so widely popular among us! We say 'for deceiving the Protestant world;' though we are far from implying that there is not many a Catholic who really imagines himself to be a votary of 'religious liberty,' and is confident that if the tables were turned and the Catholics were uppermost in the land, he would in all circumstances grant others the same unlimited toleration he now demands for himself. Still, let our Catholic tolerationist be ever so sincere, he is only sincere because he does not take the trouble to look very closely into his own convictions. His great object is to silence Protestants, or to persuade them to let him alone; and as he certainly feels no personal malice against them, and laughs at their creed quite as cordially as he hates it, he persuades himself that he is telling the exact truth when he professes to be an advocate of 'religious liberty,' and declares that no man ought to be coerced on account of his conscientious convictions. The practical result is that now and then, but very seldom, Protestants are blinded, and are ready to clasp their expected ally in a fraternal embrace. They are deceived, we repeat, nevertheless. Believe us not, Protestants of England and Ireland, for an instant, when you see us pouring forth our Liberalisms. When you hear a Catholic orator at some public assemblage declaring solemnly that 'this is the most humiliating day in his life, when he is called upon to defend once more the glorious principle of religious freedom' (especially if he says anything about the Emancipation Act and the 'toleration' it conceded to Catholics), be not too simple in your credulity. These are brave words, but they mean nothing; no, nothing more than the promises of a Parliamentary candidate to his constituents on the hustings. He is not talking Catholicism, but nonsense and Protestantism; and he will no more act on these notions in different circumstances than you now act on them yourselves in your treatment of him."

My Lords, when we find such sentiments entertained by Roman Catholics, I say, without meaning them any offence, that self-preservation requires us to defend the Established Church in Ireland.

On Motion of the DUKE of ARGYLL the further debate on the said Motion adjourned to *Monday* next.

LIQUIDATION BILL. [H.L.]

A Bill to facilitate Liquidation in certain Cases of Bankruptcy Arrangement and Winding-up—Was *presented* by The Lord WESTBURY; read 1ª. (No. 181).

House adjourned at One o'clock, A.M., to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, June 26, 1868.

The House met at Two of the clock.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — County Financial Arrangements, Mr. Clive *added.*

SUPPLY—*Considered in Committee — Resolutions* [June 25] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — Colonial Governors' Pensions Act Amendment*; Medway Regulation Act Continuance*.

First Reading — Medway Regulation Act Continuance* [196].

Second Reading—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2)* [195].

Committee—Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-comm.*) [139] Debate *adjourned;* Consular Marriages* [188]; Bank Holidays and Bills of Exchange (*re-comm.*)* [180].

Report—Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts Amendment* [155-197]; Consular Marriages* [188]; Bank Holidays and Bills of Exchange (*re-comm.*)* [180].

Third Reading — Renewable Leasehold Conversion (Ireland) Acts Extension* [182].

Withdrawn—Sale of Liquors on Sundays (Ireland) (*re-comm.*)* [138].

SCHOOLS INQUIRY COMMISSION.

QUESTION.

MR. BEACH said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, What course the Government intend to take with reference to the Report of the Schools Inquiry Commissioners?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, in reply, that the Report of the Schools Inquiry Commissioners would fill about twenty-four thick octavo volumes, eleven of which had already been published. Owing to the voluminous character of the documents, Her Majesty's Government had not been able so to study and consider them as to arrive at any decision with respect to the legislation which they would recommend upon the subject.

IRELAND—ROYAL SCHOOL OF BANAGHER.—QUESTION.

MR. G. MORRIS said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the Royal School of Banagher has not been closed for the last two years; why no Head Master has been during that period appointed; and, what has become of the endowment and emoluments reported by the Royal Commission in 1858 as belonging to that School?

THE EARL OF MAYO, in reply, said, he

was sorry to say that the School had been closed for a considerable time in consequence of two causes. First, an endeavour had been made to see whether an arrangement more advantageous to the public might not be made with regard to the School by joining it with some other similar establishment; and secondly, great difficulty had been experienced in getting a competent person to accept the office of Head master, owing to the lowness of the salary. The endowments and emoluments belonging to the School had been received by the Commissioners of Education.

MEROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Hunt*)

[BILL 139.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Sir ANDREW AGNEW asked whether it was competent for his right hon. Friend (Mr. Milner Gibson) to move at this stage the Amendment of which he had given Notice, and which, if carried, would have the effect of defeating the measure?

Mr. SPEAKER said, it was quite competent for the right hon. Member to move the Amendment.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: * Sir, The first witness who was produced in opposition to the Bill asserted a proposition in which all will readily agree. He said—"I think the Cattle Plague has taught us a lesson by which we ought to profit." The fruit of that lesson is the Bill now before the House. Yet I cannot entirely claim for Her Majesty's Government the origination of the present Bill. It has sprung rather from the House itself; I may even say, from a Member of the Opposition. The House last year determined that parts of ports should be defined for the reception and slaughter of foreign animals; and a Member of the Opposition desired to insert a clause to make it compulsory on the Government to effect this purpose, and on the market authority in each town to provide land for a separate foreign market. But as it had not been ascertained what towns would desire to import foreign cattle on those terms, and as the circumstances and localities of those towns were not known, the House determined merely to give the Privy Council the necessary powers, on the understanding that they should be exercised without delay. That policy has, after considerable labour, and the examination of the several localities, been carried out in all the ports which desired it. In the metropolis, however, greater and quite unexpected difficulties presented themselves. After making various attempts and labouring for more than two months, we had to relinquish the task and come to Parliament for additional powers. Thus arose the necessity for the present Bill. The object, therefore, of the Government was merely to carry out the policy which had been originated by the Opposition and accepted by the House. The real question at issue is, whether the annual loss, which is due to a sense of the risk of a re-introduction of the cattle plague, together with the present value of the loss which would ensue if the cattle plague was re-introduced, exceeds the annual injury to trade from those restrictions which may be necessary for security? If that question is answered in the affirmative, then there arises a further issne—namely, by what means can we attain the maximum of security with the minimum of injury? In each case, the House will observe, the question which has to be decided is merely a balance of advantages. The decrease of importation has to be measured against the risk of loss, and the actual losses to our home stock. The trade in foreign cattle has to be put into one scale of the balance, the production of home cattle in the other. Let the House first turn their attention to the one scale and then to the other. What is this trade? What foreign cattle are imported? There is no trade in foreign store stock. Lean cattle never have, to any extent, been brought from abroad. Thus Mr. Rudkin, the Chairman of the Markets Committee, asserted that "there were never many store cattle" in the metropolitan market; "a few sterks and half-lean things did come from time to time, but very few comparatively." Why is this? Because foreign animals are not fit for store stock. Mr. Kilby, in his evidence, said that farmers all agree that foreign animals are "constitutionally unfit." Mr. Dickson asserted that "they never make much of animals," and that "the country is far better without them." Mr. Symonds testified that they are "practically useless for grazing purposes." While Archer, a witness against the Bill, said that we do not require "any foreign cattle as store stock," and that "none should be used for grazing purposes." Professor Strangeways expressed himself strongly as "against the importation of foreign store cattle entirely." The foreign trade, therefore, is wholly confined to fat cattle which are destined for immediate slaughter. And the question is narrowed to this—what is to be done with foreign cattle during the short period intervening between their importation and their death? As the foreign fat cattle have to be weighed against English stock, let the House consider the relative characters and values of the two. It seems to have been admitted by the witnesses on both sides, that foreign cattle are cheaper and worse than English cattle. Thus Archer, a witness against the Bill, testified that "foreign meat is, without exception, cheaper than English; and that the price depends entirely upon the quality." As all concurred in that testimony, it is useless to enlarge upon it. The destination, moreover, of the foreign fat cattle is different from the ultimate destination of English cattle. The foreign meat falls into the hands of the large wholesale traders (that is, carcase butchers, shipping agents, and army and navy contractors); while some of it is eaten by the poorest classes of large towns. This fact also was generally admitted. Thus Mr. Symonds told the Committee that "it is a different class of butcher who kills the foreign cattle" namely, the "carcase butcher." Mr. Lintott, a Brighton butcher, corroborated this evidence. Mr. Rudkin, the Chairman of the Markets Committee, was asked—

> "What percentage of home cattle is killed by carcase butchers?—Very small. How much of the foreign supply?—A large proportion."

Mr. Woodley, a large carcase butcher, and a member of the Common Council of the City, said that—

> "Foreign meat goes chiefly into the hands of wholesale traders, while the coarse parts go to the low thickly populated districts."

Hence, in conformity with the evidence of Thomas Harrison, it may be taken that at least three-fourths of the supply of foreign cattle go back to the neighbourhood of the place where they were landed. Why, it may be asked, are foreign cattle so much cheaper and so much worse than English cattle? Something depends upon the breed. This is inferior; for the foreign witnesses, who appeared against the Bill, averred that just before the breaking out of the cattle plague they had begun to import English bulls into foreign countries, with the intention of raising somewhat the quality of foreign cattle. Since the cattle plague, however, they have ceased to import, and they are not likely to import any more bulls for many years to come. But even if the breeds were equal to the English, yet the cattle must always be inferior, for they are all grass-fed. If they fed their cattle abroad as highly as we do in England, then it would be impossible for them to pay the freight to this country, and yet compete in our markets. It is true that now and then some few good beasts have come over to England, and have fetched exceptionally high prices. One of the witnesses, a German, of the name of Prenzlow, said that a few that he brought over sold for £27 a head; he was asked how he obtained such an unusually high price for foreign beasts, and he stated that the reason was that they were so good that "the retail butchers could make use of them." Such cattle are smuggled by night into the West End by the retail butchers, who are willing to give this high price, because it is, nevertheless, lower than the price of home cattle. But they smuggle them in clandestinely by night, because they would lose their custom if it were known that they kill foreign beasts. This rests on the evidence of many witnesses, as Blackman, Brewster, and Rudkin. While Gebhart, a German witness, who had been brought over in opposition to the Bill, said that—

> "Only the very best foreign beasts go to the West End butchers, and they are smuggled in by night, so as not to be seen; but all the others go to the poorer classes."

It may be concluded, therefore, that the foreign trade is a trade in a very inferior article; and also that it is a trade in an article which is used for a totally different purpose; so that there can be no clashing between the English and foreign cattle trade. The case with us lately has been this—Pharaoh's seven lean kine have come up from across the water and have eaten up our seven fat kine in England.

The next point to be considered is the injury to this foreign trade by any restrictions which may be necessary for security. It may be stated generally, that importation depends on the relative prices in this and in the foreign country. Many of the witnesses against the Bill wanted to make out that the price of cattle here depends on the importation from abroad. That is putting the cart before the horse. How is it that importation takes place? A man sits down and calculates what the price of cattle abroad, together with the freight to this country, would come to; and if, on comparing this sum with the price of cattle here, he finds that it leaves a large margin to cover risks and profits, then he buys the cattle abroad and imports them. The price of meat must therefore be high in this country, and low in that; or else importation will not take place. But meat is now very dear abroad. The prices in Paris and Brussels are as high as here, while the freight to them is less. This was testified by Mr. Scott, by Brewster, and others. The cause is obvious. Manufactures have sprung up, large populations have gathered round them, wages have risen, and the meat-consuming power having increased, causes a greater demand for cattle in those countries. The foreign cattle trade has thus, as Hönck, a witness against the Bill, testified, a natural tendency of itself to flow into other channels. The Trade and Navigation Returns for the four months ending April 30, show how considerable has been the falling off in the importation of foreign cattle. During the first four months of 1866 there were imported into this country 42,301 head of foreign cattle, the value being £487,083. In 1867 there was a slight increase, the number being 43,125, the value being £678,160; while in 1868, during the same period, the number fell to 18,496, the value being £225,048; showing that the foreign trade in animals was passing of itself into other channels. Belgium consumes all her own produce; for she imports as many cattle as she exports. Thus, for instance, the importations into Belgium in the first three months of 1868 were 16,219 head of cattle, while the exports were 16,265. We cannot look, therefore, to a supply from Belgium. France also, according to the evidence of the witnesses against the Bill, consumes all that she produces. Her exports and her imports during the year are very small and nearly balance each other. While meat has become dearer abroad it has become cheaper at home. This is no doubt partly due to the slackness of trade in this country; for badness of trade and the consequent distress among the working classes cause a fall in the consumption of foreign meat. The foreign trade is lessened in proportion as the consuming power of the working classes is diminished; while a rise in wages causes the working classes to eat more meat and attracts the foreign supply. This was remarked by two of the witnesses, Archer and Brewster. I will now quit this subject for the present, as I will afterwards show more fully that the restrictions which are necessary for security will not affect the foreign trade; or, according to the opinion of M. Bouley, it will have no great effect on importation if we were to enact that all foreign cattle should be slaughtered at the port of landing. We have now put the foreign cattle into one scale. Let the House now turn its attention to the other scale; namely, to the loss which will ensue if the cattle plague, or the other foreign epidemics, are re-introduced. Three epidemics have, at various times since 1842, been imported from abroad — foot-and-mouth disease, pleuro-pneumonia, and cattle plague. The losses from these diseases have been very great. Take first the lowest estimate of all. The estimates of Professors Simonds and Brown, of the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council, give the probable number of cattle lost from July, 1842, to December, 1867, from contagious diseases, other than cattle plague, as 1,275,000, and from cattle plague 300,000, making a total of 1,575,000 head of cattle which have died from imported diseases. The total importation into the United Kingdom during that period was 2,590,296. When it is remembered that the losses are losses of prime English cattle, while the importations are importations of foreign cattle, it will be conceded that even this low estimate is very serious indeed. Take now the Report to the Veterinary Department in 1862. The average annual importation of cattle into the United Kingdom during the six years ending in 1860 was 92,172. The average annual loss from imported diseases during that time was 375,850. So that while our loss from imported diseases, up to 1842, was only $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the stock of the United Kingdom, the annual loss was nearly 5 per cent. The actual number imported during those six years was 553,043 head; the total loss from diseases other than cattle plague during those six years was 2,255,100 head; or four times the number imported. The value of the cattle imported during those six years was £4,424,264. The value of those lost was £25,933,650, or nearly six times the value of the importations. This was before the cattle plague had been imported. The losses from the cattle plague, amounted in the two years to 290,527 head of cattle. Yet the total number of cattle imported from the year 1842 to 1867 into the United Kingdom was 2,590,296; so that during two years we lost more than one-eighth of the total importations from 1842 to 1867. "New lamps for old" was the cry in 1842; "New lamps for old;" and we exchanged the good old lamp which had been the source of our wealth and power for a new lacquered lantern, merely because it was brought to us by a stranger. This, however, is not the entire loss, because to it must be added the expense which was incurred during the cattle plague years, in providing security against greater losses. The sum taken in the present year for the Veterinary Department was £7,743; the sum voted from the Civil Contingencies Fund amounted to £111,518 18*s.* 4*d.*, while the sum voted in Class 7 last year was £16,155, giving a total of £135,417 17*s.* 10*d.* These are the losses which the country has sustained by the importation of an epidemic among the cattle. This, however, is not all; for I have spoken only of the losses which have been actually incurred. But the risk is every year increasing. As Professor Spooner stated, we are every year going for our supplies further and further into countries where the cattle plague is indigenous. The learned Professor warned the Committee upstairs—and Harrison and Archer joined in the warning—that as we extend our trade we increase the chances of infection. Besides the actual losses which occur only when disease has been introduced, there are the annual losses which are consequent on the sense of risk, and the fear lest it may be introduced. I will blink the amount of insurance, although that also may, perhaps, fairly be taken into account. I allude more to the fact that the breeding and rearing of cattle has been greatly deterred by the sense of risk. Mr. Clayden said that it was a fact decidedly within his knowledge that the rearing and breeding of cattle has been stopped by the imported epidemics; and that he entertained a decided apprehension that, if precautions were not taken, this injury would continue. This evidence was corroborated by Mr. Duckham. With regard to Scotland, Mr. Dickson testified that a great many there had left off breeding bullocks and taken to the rearing of sheep. When he was asked why this was so, he answered "Because they were afraid." Mr. Syme also told the Committee that sheep had thus replaced cattle to a very considerable extent. Mr. Brewster, one of the witnesses against the Bill, admitted that this was the case in England also. So did Mr. George Eve; while Mr. Symonds gave it as his opinion that the breeding of cattle will be decidedly diminished if things are allowed to remain as they are. It is clear, therefore, that not only a periodical loss in cattle ensues, but an annual loss in the staple of the cattle trade of the country is produced. The first issue placed before the House must therefore be answered in the affirmative; that the annual loss occasioned by the sense of risk, added to the present value of the losses which may be caused by the re-importation of the cattle plague, far outweigh any injury which may be incurred by the trade of the country in taking measures for security. Indeed the point is one which has already been determined by the House; for what else do the present metropolitan regulations mean, if it be not that restrictions on trade are less injurious to the country than cattle plague? Why did Parliament pass the Acts on which those regulations depend, if the country had not come to the same conclusion? Why did the House last year direct the Privy Council to define a part in every port for the reception and slaughter of foreign cattle, if the House had not then already made up its mind on the question? Parliament and the country have already decided that the question of injury to the foreign trade is eclipsed by the losses to English cattle. As we examine the question, the former fades into dim distance, while the desire for security steps into the foreground and assumes gigantic proportions. Mr. Gebhart, the strongest of the witnesses against the Bill, willingly admitted this principle, for he said—

> "If I myself were convinced that a foreign maket would be the only means of protecting this country from the cattle plague, I should say by all means have the foreign market, because any sacrifice would be better than to introduce the cattle plague again into England; but I believe that is not the proper way."

He thought that the cattle plague should be excluded, and that the herds of England should be preserved in security. He concurred in this common object, He answered the first issue in the affirmative But at this point he diverged from us: he said that a separate foreign market is not the best way of effecting this object. This leads me therefore to the second issue; by what means we can obtain the maximum of security with the minimum of injury. How do we now seek to attain it? What are the present metropolitan regulations with that aim? What is the system now in force? The cattle come from two or three ports, and arrive on Saturday. They are crowded together in a small space on the wharves, and have to wait twelve hours, or generally speaking twenty-four hours, for inspection. Some of them are unhealthy, being affected with foot-and-mouth or some other disease, and are mercilessly slaughtered at the waterside. There are no slaughterhouses, no slaughtermen, no market, no buyers for them, and they are disposed of for a paltry sum of money on the spot. The importers, one and all, complained that this occasions a great loss. What happens to the healthy cattle? A certificate has to be obtained from the Inspector, which is subsequently exchanged for a licence from the Commissioner of Police, to enable the owners to take them to the metropolitan market. Thither they can be transported by railway alone. There the licence is exchanged for market passes. The cattle are then driven through the streets to the slaughterhouses, and must be killed in six days. The market passes must be taken by the butcher to the police station weekly and delivered up to the police. Three-quarters of the cattle are thus driven back to the vicinity of the place of landing. No cattle which have entered the metropolitan area can leave it again alive. They must be killed within the stated time. Nor may cows be moved within the metropolitan area without a licence, for a greater distance than 500 yards. Such is the system now in vogue to secure English cattle from disease. To estimate the inconvenience, it must be borne in mind that the metropolitan market was once, before the introduction of the cattle plague, the great central cattle market of the whole country. Cattle from the whole kingdom came to London to be bought. Cattle and customers, beasts and buyers, came from all parts. Buyers came from Southampton and other towns to the south and west of London to the metropolitan markets to buy the Irish and Scotch and English cattle which were to be found there, and to take them into the country for slaughter. That such was the case was shown by the evidence of Mr. Rudkin, Mr. Birt, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Symonds, Mr. Walsh, and several other witnesses. Thus it was that, as the Cattle Plague Commissioners reported, and as the witnesses before the Committee attested, two-thirds of the cattle which came into the metropolitan market overflowed into the country, having been purchased by the country butchers. On this ground it was that Mr. Walsh complained of the metropolitan regulations; because he used, before the imposition of those restrictions, to send great numbers of Irish cattle, which were then bought up for the country markets. It was on all sides admitted in general terms that these restrictions are exceedingly cumbrous, onerous, injurious, and quite insupportable. I will mention specifically the injuries which are caused, and the classes of persons who are injured. In the first place, the cattle are driven through the streets to the great inconvenience of the inhabitants. On that point I will read the evidence of Mr. Rudkin, the chairman of the Markets Committee of the Corporation of the City. He said—

> "I think it is very necessary that something should be done to prevent the driving of cattle through the streets; I think it is necessary to get rid of many slaughterhouses which I know to be great nuisances, &c."

Again, another witness against the Bill, Mr. Guerrier, said—

> "I say that driving cattle in the heart of the City of London must necessarily, to any unbiassed mind, be a nuisance; no person who means to give a straight-forward answer can deny that."

The same witness mentioned that the Thames Haven Company had been got up in order to abolish the nuisance of driving cattle through the streets. He said that there had been numerous complaints of the inhabitants, and reiterated petitions to the Customs, which were so injurious to the trade, that importers formed themselves into a company with the intention of landing and slaughtering cattle at Thames Haven. Such is the state of things under the existing system; but under the operation of the Bill it would be remedied. There is at Islington a market for English cattle, which is close to the Great Northern, London and North Western, and other stations, the points of arrival of English cattle; while the foreign market will be at the point of arrival of foreign cattle at the waterside. I have mentioned that no cattle which enter the metropolitan area are ever allowed to leave it again, but must be killed within six days after the market day. This amounts to a forced sale. The farmer, the grazier, or the salesman who brings them to town is compelled to sell them to the butcher. This forced sale is a great injury to various interests. The farmers complain at not being permitted to remove their beasts from the market and take them home again, if they do not receive for them that which they consider to be the full value. On no other trade is this compulsion placed. "It is nought, it is nought," says the buyer, in every case. But in no other case does the State step in and say to the seller, "You must sell your beasts for nought." Again it is an injury to prevent milch cows from going into the country to be bulled, and to prevent the 2,000 calves which are born annually in London from going out to be reared on the grass lands of Essex. Again, the railways suffer, because all railways abut within the metropolitan area, and hence the transit of cattle through London is stopped by these regulations, and those cattle which would come if the transit were free, are not now sent by the Scotch and Irish owners. The same may be said with regard to many English cattle. Thus Mr. Archibald Scott, the traffic manager of the South Western Railway, stated that from this cause the cattle which should go to London, now go to the local markets. For instance, the cattle which are intended for Brighton no longer come north to the metropolitan market, but are driven to the market at Chichester. The railways are injured in this also: the country butchers can no longer come to London to buy their beasts and remove them to the country. Mr. Barford, the veterinary of Southampton, said that if these restrictions were removed the butchers of Southampton would come to London to purchase. The present system is also an injury to the metropolitan market. The Chairman of the Markets Committee, Mr. Rudkin, stated that the restrictions led to the following diminutions in the number of cattle at the market. During the years 1857-8-9 and 1860, the annual average of cattle in the market was 309,000 head. During the years 1861-2-3 and 1864 it was 343,000 head. But in 1867 it was only 287,000 head. This he said was due to the restriction which prevented country butchers from removing beasts out of the metropolitan area. This restriction, he testified, is now causing a diminution of 1,000 beasts a week in the metropolitan market. This evidence was corrobated by Mr. Symonds, who said that the amount in the market "will go on decreasing." Country butchers and country populations are also injured by the system now in force. They have to scour adjacent districts in order to obtain the supply they require. It was said by some of the witnesses that country butchers might buy in country markets. But as the farmer is never sure of finding a demand in any country market, so the butcher is never sure of finding a supply. The Leicestershire farmer will not venture to send his beasts to Reading market, for instance; and the butcher from Hastings, Dover, or Maidstone will not go to Reading for the chance of buying. Mr. Lintott, a butcher from Brighton, said that he has to travel from farm to farm in Leicestershire to buy his beasts; and what with the expenses, and what with the muddling of his beasts in travelling, his beasts cost £2 a head more when they get to Brighton. Thus meat is there raised 1½*d.* to 2*d.* per pound, and frequently they have an insufficient supply. Mr. Dickson stated that the country butchers cannot obtain what they require for their customers, except at greatly increased expense. This evidence was also corroborated by Hönck, by Eve, and by Harrison; while Mr. Rudkin alleged that the country butchers cannot supply their customers as cheaply; and that they would be able to suit themselves far better from the large supply of the London market. It has been said that a large central market might be made outside the metropolitan area. But that could not take the place of the London market; for beasts come at different seasons from different parts of the country—at one time from Scotland or Norfolk, at another time from the midland counties. The difficulty of transit, moreover, could not be overcome. Romford, in Essex, has been suggested as the place for the central market; but how could beasts get from Romford to Brighton, Hastings, or Dover, without going into the metropolitan area? Every railway goes to London; not every railway goes to Romford. Even if transit were possible, yet the increased freight would make it unavailable. For there is no competition between railways at any other point than the metropolis. The same objection prevents cattle from being taken by railway round the metropolitan area. It costs 10*s.* to 15*s.* a head more to stop at Harrow than to take your beasts from the North on to London. Why is this? Because there is a monopoly of railway communication with Harrow. From Aberdeen to Brighton, shunting at Harrow is, I believe, nearly double the freight from Aberdeen to Brighton through London. So also the Great Eastern Railway charges from Norwich to Cambridge twice as much as they charge for twice the distance—from Norwich to London. That is, wherever they have a monopoly their charges are 400 per cent higher. These restrictions are an injury to the consumers of the metropolis, in establishing a monopoly for the butchers; and the result has been that, while the price of meat has been exceedingly high in London, the price of cattle given by the London butchers to the farmers and salesmen has been exceedingly low. The effect of the forced sale is, that butchers, knowing that an animal exposed in the Monday's market must be killed before the next Monday's market, and that it cannot be exhibited for sale in any other market, hold back from buying until the price has been considerably reduced. Having obtained him cheap, they kill and sell him dear. As this is an important matter, I will, with the leave of the House, read some of the evidence on this point—

"CLAYDEN.—540. Then the butcher can give as low a price as he likes by waiting, as the cattle cannot leave London again?—We are left entirely at his mercy in every way.

"LINTOTT.—2907. Without speaking unfairly of your friends in the metropolitan market, do you think the present state of things gives any advantage to the London butchers as regards price?—It is a decided advantage to the London butchers, because if we were allowed to go to buy beasts there and bring them away, the price at times would not be so low as now. In bad weather in the autumn, when the supply is greater than the demand, we have to buy at a higher price, and have to compete with butchers who buy at a lower price.

"2962. You say that the existing state of things lessens competition within the metropolitan area to the butchers?—Yes.

"SYMONDS.—2840. Do you think at present the London butchers have a complete monopoly of the market as against you?—Yes.

"2841. You think that this Bill would have the effect of breaking down that monopoly as against country butchers?—Yes.

"2800. Will you give the Committee any reason for that?—Because the London butcher is in a position to dictate terms to the people who send cattle to that market.

"STEADWELL.—3038. Do you consider, as regards buying cattle, the London butcher has an advantage which you do not possess yourself?—Quite so.

"3069. Therefore, the London butcher enjoys a monopoly over you?—Yes.

"3071. The effect of this Bill would be to do away with that monopoly?—Yes.

"CLAYDEN.—276. For two or three years the butchers in London have enjoyed the monopoly of all the cattle that have come there?—Yes; most decidedly.

"277. What has been the result to the consumers of beef in London?—That the price of meat has been exceedingly high. . . Though the prices are quoted high, there are many beasts sold at an exceedingly low price.

"SYMONDS.—2858. Has the effect of the restrictions been to seriously reduce the price of meat to the consumer in the metropolis, do you consider?—I think not at all; at the present moment the London butcher is charging more, in the whole, than the country butcher, notwithstanding his advantages. The restrictions have in a measure diminished the profits of the grazier, and not benefited the consumer, consequently the butchers are the persons who get the profit, and, consequently, they are very desirous of keeping things as they are."

Sir James Elphinstone, formerly a Member of this House, and a very large breeder in Scotland, stated that he obtains £2 a head less for his cattle, although his butchers' bills in London are much higher than formerly. It is well known that, in consequence of the high price of meat in London, many persons obtain their supply from Tiverton and other country places. I was two days ago informed by a Member of this House, that he received all his meat from as far as Aberdeenshire, preferring to do so rather than pay the prices of the London butchers. Such facts as these, Mr. Woodley, a wholesale butcher, explained by saying that "the country butchers run their profits finer," than the London butchers. This is how it takes place. There are, as some of the witnesses explained, over-stocked weeks and scarce weeks. In a scarce week prices rise, and the butcher of course sells his meat dearer. Then comes a week of over-supply. The cattle which have to be killed within six days are more than the inhabitants of London can consume. But the butcher does not sell cheaper. The wholesale man, and the shipping agents, and army contractors, lay in, for a small sum, that surplus which used to overflow into the country. That being the variable and inconstant nature of the London market, Mr. Dickson, a large salesman and most competent witness on that point, said: "You never know how many beasts to send to market." Cullen gave similar testimony. Mr. Syme, a Scotchman, asserted that it is a great pecuniary risk to send cattle to the London market. While Mr. Lintott testified that this forced sale causes Scotchmen to receive for their cattle £2 less than their value; corroborating, by this evidence, the reiterated statement of Sir James Elphinstone. Mr. Dickson gave it as his opinion, on the other hand, that if these restrictions were removed, if an extended market were thus provided, from which cattle could be taken to the country, prices would be equalized and rendered steady throughout the kingdom. There would then be found in the metropolitan market a larger supply of cattle, and more buyers from an extended area. For buyers from a distance would be sure of a supply to meet the wants of their customers; and producers would be certain of a demand which would adequately remunerate them for their produce. The surplus would, as Mr. Symonds said, always overflow into the country, and "trade would be relieved." That will be the effect of this Bill. It will produce a freedom of market; a competition of buyers; and therefore a great reduction in the profits of butchers. Although the farmer will receive more, yet the consumer will pay less. That is the reason of the violent opposition to the Bill. That accounts for the resistance of the retail butchers. "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" they cry; "Great is Diana of the Ephesians and that windfall from heaven—the cattle plague!" There is also an injury to the English trade from the present system; Mr. Rudkin fully allowed this; for he said that, to prevent the country butcher from removing the beasts which he buys, and to prohibit the English farmer from having a more extended market, "is certainly a protective view." English farmers will not send their beasts, "lest the market should be overdone," and "therefore the London market is not, in any sense of the word, a free market." The Aberdeenshire farmers complain that trade is so far from being free, that the regulations, as they find to their cost, amount to a tax of £2 per head of cattle. Mr. Dickson gave the Committee his experience; whereas he used annually to bring 7,000 head of cattle from Scotland, he now brings only 4,000 head a year; for, he said, the butchers from the South and West used to buy half his cattle for their customers. The same remarks apply to Ireland. Here is evidence on that point—

"WALSH.—3218. Less have come since those restrictions?—Yes.

"3203. Before those restrictions more cattle used to come to London than have come since.

"3204. Before the restrictions which were put upon the metropolitan market?—Yes.

"3288. Have you any reason to believe that if these restrictions are continued the supply of stock sent to London will continue to diminish?—I think it will from Ireland.

"ROBINSON.—1534. That system of restriction prevents us bringing Irish cattle to the London market, because they are obliged to be slaughtered in London now within the district.

"1535. Then anything that puts an impediment which, according to your account, there exists at present on importation from Ireland, is a hardship upon Ireland, and a hardship to the consumer here?—Yes.

"WALSH.—3352. How has the price of the Irish cattle been affected by these restrictions; is it higher than it was before the cattle plague broke out?—It was affected by the restrictions at first.

"3353. Was it higher?—Lower.

"3354. You know there has been a great increase in the price of butchers' meat?—Yes.

"3355. The difference must have gone into the hands of one of these middle men?—The butchers; they have made a very good trade of it these last few years.

"3215. Do you think in giving this opinion of yours, that you represent theirs also?—I do, of the most respectable part of the trade, and of the grazing trade, I think, entirely in Ireland.

"3216. Do you believe it perfectly certain that the grazing trade are entirely in favour of this Bill?—I do.

"Mr. VERNON HARCOURT.—That may be taken for granted."

These restrictions are injurious, not only to the English trade, but to the foreign trade also. Mr. Robinson, a gentleman who imports very large numbers of foreign cattle, stated that the foreign trade is now suffering from restrictions more onerous than any which would be necessary under a separate foreign market system. In answer to a question, he asserted more particularly that the possibility of a prohibition of importation was the worst restriction that could be placed upon the trade; because it stopped production on the other side of the Channel. The rule of detention for inspection, although most necessary for security, is also injurious to the foreign trade. For foreign cattle thus often lose the market, and have to stand over, waiting for another market. The killing in six days is also in this case an injury, for butchers hold back from buying, until the price is forced down; and the foreign importer receives less for his goods, and importation is discouraged. There has been a considerable decrease in the number of foreign cattle in the London market of late years. Thus, in the week ending March 24, 1868, the number of foreign cattle in the London market was 3,851; in the corresponding week in 1867 the number was 7,431; in the corresponding week in 1866 the number was 10,681; and in the corresponding week in 1865 the number was 8,000. Another injury by the present system is its great expense to the ratepayers of the metropolis. What are the means employed to prevent cattle leaving the metropolitan district? There are 142 policemen employed to watch the principal roads, at an expense of £11,691 6*s.* 8*d.* per annum; twenty-eight more are stationed at the different railway stations, besides sergeants, superintendents, and other officers, who are all paid out of the police rates of the metropolis, at a total expense to the ratepayers of the metropolis of perhaps as much as £16,000 per annum. The Bill before the House would thus at once reduce the rates in the metropolis. I have now shown that the present system for giving security to English herds is needlessly injurious, not only to the foreign trade, but also to many other interests and classes of persons. Besides being injurious the system does also not attain security. It fails to give the maximum of security with the minimum of injury. As we extend the range of our imports the chance of re-importing the Cattle Plague increases. Yet these cattle, from the furthest limits of our imports—these cattle from the countries where cattle plague is indigenous, and carelessness traditional, arrive in the market and may infect everything there, and are then driven along the metropolitan streets and roads, past the dairies of the metropolis, the cows of which thrust their noses out and smell these catlle as they pass; so that Mr. Priestman, an eminent veterinary, and an inspector in London, who was called as a witness against the Bill, exclaimed, "So that I am really in dread every day of a fresh outbreak of cattle plague." Moreover, the inspection of these foreign cattle is most insufficient. They are herded together in great crowds near the waterside, and then they are hurriedly and therefore imperfectly inspected. This inspection is necessarily hurried; otherwise very many cattle would be detained too late for the market. Besides, as the plague is incubating for twenty-one days, during which time not even a veterinary can detect it, and as the journey from infected districts is performed in six days, all men of science are agreed that inspection is so uncertain as to be no security at all. And if the disease happens at any time to be introduced, it will be sure to spread rapidly; and all our efforts will be powerless to arrest it. For, as Mr. Rudkin testified, the cowkeepers of London are sure to send to the market any cow which they perceive to be in the least ailing. The manure also of infected beasts, if there be any in London, is taken out to the country and spread upon the land miles away, carrying the infection with it. Moreover, sheep mix in the metropolitan market with foreign, perhaps infected cattle, and are then allowed to travel out of the metropolitan area and all over the country. Mr. Rudkin recognizes this as a serious defect in the metropolitan re-

gulations. Professor Spooner, Dr. Nicholls, and Professor James, all of them scientific witnesses, testify a similar opinion. Again, Dr. Priestman asserts that infection can be carried by wool, whether woven or raw. Men's clothes can be a vehicle for infection. Yet 200 or 300 drovers and salesmen bring English cattle to the metropolitan market on Monday morning, and pass among the foreign cattle, pinching them and feeling them, and on Monday evening they are again in their masters' yards in the country, watering and feeding their masters' cattle; these men pass from the infected market to the country without disinfecting themselves or changing their clothes. Mr. Gebhart justly gave it as his opinion, on this ground, that our regulations are of no avail. Again, calves are smuggled out of the metropolitan area, and from the London dairies to a great extent. Nay, even oxen themselves are carried out of London by railway every week. As the regulations are so strict on this point this statement may be hardly believed unless it is given in the words of the witnesses—

"DICKSON.—686. There are so many dairy cows in London, and there are so many calves born in London, and those calves are sent, and will be sent, out into the country, do the best you can and you cannot keep them within the boundary, and those foreign animals will mix alive with your dairy cows in many places, and the calves will go away and will take the disease.

"KITTLE.—2772. To dispose of their calves they frequently attempt to smuggle them out.

"PRIESTMAN.—6027. They do have some calves in London, I suppose?—Yes, they do.

"6028. Do you know how many they had previous to the cattle plague?—I think they have rather more now, for many people have had their cows bulled since, to preserve them, to save buying fresh animals; to save infection, they have bulled all they could to calve them in.

"6029. Then when a witness said that no calves or next to none were born in London he was mistaken? Yes; I have a large practice, and I know the particulars, though I have not them with me.

"6,030. Can you tell us what becomes of these calves?—Many of them are smuggled out of London, I believe.

"6,031. Previous to the cattle plague, it was a regular trade to sell the calves in the country?—Yes, it was a trade, and there is a trade carried on just the same now; they go out of London now with all the restrictions; many of them do.

"6,061. So that that risk is going on at the present moment?—Just so.

"JAMES.—6177. There will always be infringements, no matter how stringent the regulations may be.

"A. SCOTT.—7,990. Now, with regard to the passage of cattle through London by railway, what do you think of the Orders which prohibit that arrangement at the present time?—I would respectfully suggest that these Orders are of no real value. I have practical experience of this difficulty in acting upon them; that under the present Orders cattle once entering the metropolitan district cannot be sent out of that district again. Notwithstanding these Orders, I have to deal with cattle that do arrive in London, the dealers wanting to get them to the North or South; and in order to get rid of them, I am obliged to send them from London to Reading for the North, or from London to Guildford for the South, to get them out of the metropolitan district again.

"CHAIRMAN.—7991. Do you mean to say that you now send cattle out of London to Reading and Guildford?—I am obliged to do so. I get these cattle, and they are going to the North or South; they must go somehow, and so I send them to Reading and Guildford.

"7,992. Then you set the Orders in Council at defiance, and send them to Reading and Guildford?—I cannot help myself.

"7,993. When did you do that last?—It is a case that is occurring every week."

It is therefore certain, from the evidence of Mr. Scott, the traffic manager of the London and South Western Railway Company, that the regulations of the Council are openly set at defiance by the railway companies. Such a system of regulations does therefore not attain security. The fact is that in the nature of things it must, under any system, be extremely hard—nay, even impossible—to watch the metropolitan area. It is so large that it must always be easy to evade the regulations. The extent of the area is 117 square miles. It is partly rural and partly urban, and the line of separation between the rural and urban boundaries is extremely indented and irregular. The roads are very numerous. The boundary of the metropolitan area there is nothing to mark; it is generally the parish boundary. Where it runs across the middle of fields and meadows it is quite ideal. Yet cattle which have mixed with foreign cattle in the metropolitan market, or even the foreign cattle themselves, may be sent and have a legal right to go to any part of the metropolitan area. Say they enter at nightfall the corner of a field across which the metropolitan boundary runs; in the morning they are at the other corner of the field, and outside the metropolitan boundary. They then have a legal right to go to any part of the country without obstruction. Kittle, the police constable, said that the police do not profess to be able to watch these imaginary lines, and that it is not difficult, therefore, to evade the regulations. Mr. Rudkin himself allowed that the regulations are very easily evaded. To Aberdeenshire, as Sir James Elphinstone testified, there are very few roads of entry. A few gamekeepers and shepherds on mountain tops, with telescopes, can see every road for miles; and yet, with all these facilities, Aberdeenshire was thrice invaded by the cattle plague. What, then, is to preserve England—if cattle plague once gets into the metropolitan area—with its hundreds of roads of entry, and without its high mountains and watching shepherds? Let the House therefore conclude that the present system is not only onerous, oppressive, and injurious, but also that it is very far from attaining our object of the maximum of security. Yet all that Brewster, Baker, Gebhart, and Guerrier proposed as alternatives to the Bill was to maintain this present system. This system clearly will not do. But what other plans were proposed to attain the object of the maximum of security and minimum of injury? First, suspend the present system until the cattle plague is re-imported, and then impose the present system again. This plan was propounded by two foreign witnesses. Thus Mr. Gebhart says—

"I believe that all those restrictions might be very well done away with until the cattle plague comes again."

He was so pleased with the notion that he afterwards repeated his advice. Another witness, Hönck, wanted us to leave it to the Privy Council to close up the metropolitan area when the cattle plague should have got in. This Hönck, together with another witness (Baker), furnished the money which purchased the unlucky cargo at Revel, in the summer of 1865, and this cargo—the *fons et origo mali*, I believe—came over, he said, in one of his ships. He also acknowledged—as any reasonable man must do—that the destruction of English cattle by cattle plague must be a benefit to foreign importers. These two foreign importers were of opinion that we should suspend the restrictions until the cattle plague had got in. On this subject I will waste no other argument than this—

"I hear a lion in the Lobby roar!
Say, Mr. Speaker, shall we shut the door,
And keep him out; or let him in
To try if we can get him out again?"

Another plan for attaining the maximum of security with the minimum of injury was to forbid importation from infected countries as soon as we know them to be infected; but to leave importation from other countries perfectly free, and to do away with all restrictions within this country. This plan, also, was propounded by foreigners. Of course! it suits the interests of foreigners. Thus M. Bouley advised that—If cattle plague breaks out in a country whence we get our supplies, then the Privy Council should stop them; while all cattle from suspected countries should be slaughtered at the waterside. This plan he afterwards called "the system I have developed." Now, in the first place, I must ask—What is an infected country? and what is a suspected country? Dr. Nicholls, a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, who has studied the subject as much as any man, was asked this question—How would you distinguish infected countries? He answered that he could not give any opinion upon it. This is a list of foreign countries from which we received reports of cases of cattle plague during the last year—Austria, Bavaria, Belgium, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Germany, Prussia, Russia, Turkey. Are all those infected countries? Should all importation from them be prohibited? From what countries, then, would it be permitted? But suppose that cattle plague occurs in a country, and that we do not hear of it until too late, or not at all, what should we do then? It is a case likely enough to happen. Besides, it would be a great disturbance of trade suddenly to throw back the tide of importation; if indeed the wave do not prove itself to be altogether too large, so that it may overbear your regulations. Such sudden stoppages of trade are too violent in their operation, and prejudicial in their results; much more so than any permanent measure such as that in the Bill. Mr. Robinson, the large importer, told the Committee that the restriction most baneful to trade is the possibility or fear of prohibition, for it stops production on the other side. Yet M. Bouley would change this possibility into a probability, and erect it into a system and make it a law. But suppose it done: let us imagine the great sources of our supplies to be suddenly stopped, where are we to find other supplies at a moment's notice? It is hard to foster a trade. So those Southampton witnesses and the Normandy farmer told us. You have to nurse it, and coax it, and dandle it, and still it is apt to dwindle. And this is the work of years, not of a day. Then where are you to find your supplies at a moment's notice? These are some of the objections against M. Bouley's way of dealing with infected countries. What does he propose with regard to cattle from suspected countries? He would kill them at the waterside. What? and have no market for them, no concourse of buyers, no slaughterhouses, no conveniences?—that is just what the importers now complain of as such a great source of loss. But if he would have the market, and buyers, and slaughterhouses, then I tell him, "So would we too." Gebhart's version of this plan is somewhat different—"The importation of cattle from any infected part of a country should be prohibited." And so the Committee asked him what he meant by an infected part? "A district," he said, "which has been declared so by its Government, that is what I call an infected part." Good! But how does he proceed? "And nothing is allowed to come out of it." It is "a place round which a *cordon* is drawn, so that nothing can come out of it." So then all we may do is to exclude the cattle which can never come. But suppose for a moment that they can come; what security would there be in such a system? This depends on our knowing as soon as any cattle plague breaks out in a country, and on the certainty that cattle from that country do not come in contact with cattle which we obtain from any other country. For suppose that cattle from Podolia or Galicia arrive at Munich, and that other cattle leave Munich for this country before the incubation has ceased in the former cattle, that is before it becomes known that they are infected. Then the infection will be brought over to us. Again it depends on the certainty that railway trucks on foreign railways are not infected. And also we must alter the present practice, and not allow boats to go in turn to healthy and to unhealthy parts, as Gebhart says they now do. Well, but grant all this, how are we to carry out the proposal? Prenzlow, a Berliner, who was brought over to give evidence against the Bill, informed the Committee that beasts from Bohemia and Galicia arrive at Gestermunde, together with those from Berlin. At Gestermunde they are all shipped together to this country, where they all arrive together on Saturday. Now, how are you to separate the cattle which have come from infected parts? And if this could be done, what would be the good of doing it? Therefore, although anyone may fairly agree with Professor Spooner that the best means to protect a country from infection is to stop importation; yet no one can reasonably suppose that such a rule can be applied with any benefit to one part of a cargo and not to another.

The third plan which was proposed for attaining the maximum of security with the minimum of injury was this:—Abolish all restrictions in this country, and trust entirely to the regulations of foreign Governments. This plan also was propounded by one of the foreign witnesses. Mr. Gebhart advised us to trust entirely to foreign Governments. He was asked by the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtonshire (Sir Andrew Agnew), whether he thought we made our restrictions at the wrong end, and that what we required was more stringent restrictions abroad? He answered—"That is my idea." When a man is not clear in his judgment how suicidal are his arguments! What does Mr. Gebhart say next? The foreign cordon regulations inland cannot be more severe; all we want is that foreign Governments should make regulations at the ports of export. Here again we are told to exclude those who cannot come. He is then asked, whether he thinks that foreign Governments would be very anxious to prevent the departure from their shores of unsound foreign animals in exchange for good sound British gold; and what does he answer? "They cannot come from any cattle plague country except through Prussia, where they would not allow the transit." It becomes important therefore to ask what Prussia does do; what is her practice? Let Mr. Robinson be the first to answer—

> "G. A. Robinson.—1705. Are the cattle of Germany ever diseased?—Germany is a large place now; we do not know what Germany consists of at present; but cattle that come from the centre of Europe and that way are very subject to foot-and-mouth complaint; there is scarcely a cargo of German cattle that comes in now where the cattle are not stopped on account of foot-and-mouth complaint. It is, I believe, pretty well admitted that cattle were imported here last year from Germany suffering from cattle plague, and it caused the Bavarian Government to prohibit the transit of Austrian cattle through Bavaria, and for some weeks our trade was stopped; but the Austrian shippers made interest with the Prussian Government, and they got permission to send them through Silesia, and then they came here."

And what does Gebhart himself say? He told the Committee that in May, 1867, he had a consignment of forty cattle; he could not tell whether they were Polish, or Podolian, or Galician; he knew not whence they came. They travelled through Saxony and Prussia. They arrived in London on Saturday, with a certificate of health from a Prussian inspector. They were crowded for inspection; they proceeded to the metropolitan market on Monday, and were sold in four lots. On Thursday he was informed that they had cattle plague—not the Steppe cattle plague, to which the country had become accustomed, but a new type, the Galician type. The veterinary surgeons knew it, and distinguished it. The police informed us, at the Privy Council Office, that animals were disappearing by night from the London cowsheds, they knew not whither. Detectives were employed, and the whole thing was discovered. Mr. Gebhart came openly to the Lord President and informed him; for which Mr. Gebhart told the Committee that he got into great odium with his compeers. I suppose therefore that other foreign importers would have concealed the mischief. The result was that with much trouble and anxiety, and the killing of upwards of 200 infected beasts, the plague was stamped out. Now, three things in this narrative have to be noted—1. They came with a certificate of health from a Prussian inspector. 2. They came from unknown sources. 3. The disease was not perceived until they had been five days in this country. Prussian regulations, therefore, do not secure us against cattle plague. Mr. Gebhart also mentioned with an ejaculation of alarm and concern which was not taken down by the reporter, that some sheep had been put into a field adjoining his "valuable herd." He was asked what occasioned his concern; he said it was because these sheep had come from abroad. It was plain, therefore, that in the case of his own herd, he does not trust to foreign regulations. Mr. Robinson also mentioned an outbreak of cattle plague in Friesland; and he added that the effect was that the cattle in the district were moved down to the waterside, and hurried across to England. Again he stated that two or three times cattle plague occurred in parts of Holland; and that, before the Dutch Government could hear of it, or do anything, the Dutch farmers hurried off their infected cattle so quickly, that special steamers were telegraphed for to come from London and fetch them. These cattle were in London in thirty-six or forty-eight hours; and a week afterwards the Dutch Government heard and informed our Government that there was cattle plague in the place. Of what use to us, then, are the regulations abroad? I must mention a few points with respect to incubation. It must not be supposed that the disease can be detected during the period of incubation. Dr. Nicholls asserts that incubation lasts from nine to fourteen days. Mr. Priestman puts the period at five to twenty-one days; while M. Bouley asserts that the average time is ten to eleven days, but that he has seen examples of twenty days. During the period of incubation the most experienced veterinary cannot detect the disease; to use the words of Professor Spooner, "one word denies the other." The word incubation denotes that the disease is spreading and growing unseen. Yet, according to Dr. Nicholls, Mr. Priestman, and other scientific witnesses, the disease, during the period of incubation, can be communicated by contact, by the breath, the saliva, or the excreta. Infected cattle from Bohemia or Poland may therefore reach London, and remain to all appearance healthy for five days, as in Gebhart's case; or the disease may not be developed for fourteen days afterwards; and yet they may all the time be communicating the disease. During that period, you cannot stamp it out, for it cannot be known. This would be like striking at a ghost with a falchion. Even after it has become developed, it would be kept secret. Dr. Nicholls informed the Committee that a butcher, the moment symptoms of cattle plague declared themselves, would put the beast quietly out of the way. While Mr. Priestman said that a beast in which the disease was incubating might be taken to a private lair, where the cattle plague would break out, and no one would know of it; it would not be discovered, and yet the infected manure would go into the country and be spread on the land. I, therefore, fully agree with Professor Spooner, that we cannot depend upon foreign regulations. Lastly, there is Mr. Rudkin's plan, which seems to attain the maximum of injury and the minimum of security. For he wanted to "strengthen" the present metropolitan regulations, and carry them out more stringently. He would also remedy these regulations in the following points where he deems them to be defective: he would prohibit sheep from going out of the metropolitan area into the country; he would abolish cowsheds as being the nuclei of disease; he would keep a registry of cows, and have them periodically inspected; he would brand every beast which arrives, and cause inspectors to follow him and inspect him day by day; he would permit no cattle to be driven through the streets, and would allow them to travel by railway only; he would establish a public *abattoir* system, and a system of check and countercheck which could never be evaded. Such a system would be most oppressive and least secure. The only other plan proposed for attaining a maximum of security with a minimum of injury is the plan which is contained in the Bill before the House, namely, a separate market for foreign cattle, with slaughter at the waterside. Consider first the question of security. It was alleged by the witnesses against the Bill, that if infected beasts come over to this market the infection will spread to the Islington market. If infected beasts do come over to this country, the infection will be more likely to spread to the Islington market if the foreign beasts themselves go there than if men merely pass between the markets. If the foreign beasts are kept at the new market, they will be always under the eye of an inspector, and any infected beasts will be killed the moment the disease is perceived, and everything disinfected before the disease can be carried by men. For Dr. Wells, one of the scientific witnesses, asserted that it was not likely that a man could carry the infection from beast to beast during the period of incubation. But if an infected beast itself were at Islington market, it would communicate the disease during the period of incubation. Hence, as Professor James said, there will be far more danger if the foreign cattle themselves go to the metropolitan market than if it is confined to men. Suppose even that the cattle plague does become declared in the new market, yet men are not likely to carry the infection to English cattle; for, as Dr. Nicholls testified, the man who buys foreign cattle is not the man who goes to the country. And Mr. Gebhart said that persons would not go from one market to another; for "they have no purpose for it." Even if it were only a question of the comparison of more or less, yet the advantage would be on the side of the new market. For now every Monday 200 or 300 drovers go straight from the foreign cattle in the market to English cattle in the country. So that, according to Dr. Nicholls and Professor James, the contagion would be far more likely to be carried by them. Besides, moving through the air in passing from one market to the other would disinfect the men. Dr. Nicholls asserts that the air is the best disinfectant, and that a twelve miles' journey would be enough;

but that no amount of moving through the air would remove infection from a beast. Moreover, if the two markets do not take place on the same day, an additional security is presented; men are then sure not to pass direct from the one market to the other. Dr. Nicholls recognized this as conclusive; and yet, after all, the attendants at the foreign market may be made to change their clothes when they enter and leave the market. This is the rule in Paris at the market of Vilette, and Dr. Nicholls recommended the practice to us. Guerrier admitted that it would be quite proper to require that butchers and drovers should change their clothes in accordance with such a rule; and Priestman said that when he went about inspecting he made his attendants disinfect themselves with chloride of lime. At the Islington market perhaps the novelty of such a rule would prevent it from being enforced; but it may easily be made a regulation of the new market. Besides, those who offer such an objection to the Bill forget that they themselves told us to trust to foreign Governments, saying that foreign regulations are sufficient to secure us against the possibility of any infected beasts coming over. If so, there will be no infected beasts in the new market. I will adduce from adverse witnesses a few authorities in my favour. Mr. Woodley gave it as his opinion that if the market were placed in the Essex Marshes the cattle plague might be expected to spread from it; but that it certainly would not spread through the streets, nor to the cattle in London, nor to the market at Islington, if the new market be placed nearer to the metropolis. Mr. Barford, a veterinary from Southampton, said that—

> "The new foreign market, as proposed by the Bill, would undoubtedly do away with the risk of importing the cattle plague."

And Professor Spooner averred that—

> "A resident inspector in the new market will reduce the risk to a minimum."

This disposes, then, of the question of security; and now for the estimate of injury. The fairest way to estimate the injury which may be done is to consider the objections alleged against it by the opponents to the Bill. Before entering upon this, it would be well to consider the character of the witnesses who appeared in opposition. First, there were butchers—the men whose monopoly will be destroyed by the Bill. Take Charles Harman as an example. He is a "butcher in a small way;" he kills two beasts a week; but he is the representative of a class, for "the majority of the butchers are such" as he. What, then, is the character given of this class of witnesses? Professor James, after calling them "a very careless set of men," is asked this question—

> "You are probably aware that the number of butchers in London is 5,000?"

And he answered—

> "Yes; and I am aware that they are a very dangerous set of men."

This seems to be explained by Mr. Rudkin, who describes persons whose livelihood consists in going round the country and the London cowsheds, buying diseased animals cheap. This is confirmed by Hönck, who told the Committee that the butchers who buy foreign meat go to the London cowsheds to buy diseased animals; and he added, "A great many London butchers do this." Dr. Nicholls says further that the moment any animal in the London cowsheds is supposed to be infected, "they are down like so many vultures on their prey;" for, knowing that something is amiss, they "think he is to be had cheap." Inspector Priestman informed the Committee that these are the very men who buy foreign meat—that is, for the working classes—"it is their living; they job in these things; there is a great number of these men." Harman himself admits that—

> "The men who buy foreign meat, because it suits the class they supply, also frequent the London cowsheds."

Who cares, then, if the horrid monopoly of these men be destroyed? Besides, it is hard for us entirely to believe that they will be injured in the way they assert. For Mr. Rudkin, the Chairman of the Markets Committee, testified that he never knew a butcher in favour of any new market, or of any alteration of an old market; and he thought them mistaken in their opinions. When the Copenhagen market, he said, was about to be established, they asserted that it would be "dead ruin" to them. M. Guerrier testified the same; when the Islington market was proposed, although no one contemplated any provision for compulsory slaughter, they said the same, and alleged the same injuries as they do now against the market with compulsory slaughter—

> "They say a great many funny things," he added; "I have heard them say funny things in this Committee-room since I have been here."

Therefore I think we should be careful before we attach much weight to the allegations of injury from this class of witnesses. The next class of witnesses were the foreigners. They objected on the ground that the Bill would benefit the British at the expense of foreigners. The Bill will benefit the British! — is not that the strongest of all arguments with a British House of Commons? Thus Mr. Gebhart, a Prussian, said—

> "It is a Bill to protect the English farmer at the expense of the foreigner. He would have all the benefit, and we would have all the loss."

Franz Prenzlow, another Prussian, who was examined through an interpreter — so little did he know of England or the English — of course took the same view as Mr. Gebhart, whose Berlin correspondent he is. M. Bouley, a French gentleman, was also examined through an interpreter, and candidly and honourably warned the Committee that he judged from a French point of view, and did not speak as an Englishman. Hönck, a Schleswig-Holsteiner, objected to the Bill on the score that in Schleswig they would again plough up the land which was laid down in grass for the British trade; so that his compatriots were "very uneasy" about the Bill. This was the witness who, in company with Baker, was unfortunate enough to be the means of introducing the cattle plague into England from Russia in 1865. M. Pouppeville, a Frenchman, was also examined through an interpreter. He objected to the Bill because "it is adverse to the interests of the French people." Alphonse Leguillon, a French farmer, also examined through an interpreter, opposed the Bill because "it sacrifices French interests for the benefit of the English." He said he had never seen the Bill, but had it explained to him. This reminds me of another class of witnesses: those whose minds had been prejudiced, and evidence vitiated by having the Bill explained to them. Thus, William Lancaster gave his evidence under the impression that the market tolls were to be raised; the fact that the tolls were to be reduced by the Bill from 5*s.* 11*d.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* had never been explained to him. He had also been told that the new market was to be very far down the river; he naturally concluded that it would be very inconvenient at that great distance. They had forgotten to explain the clause which enacted that the market should be in London, or in a parish immediately adjoining. Mr. Woodley a straightforward honourable man, I think had his evidence prejudiced by ardent opponents; he also had been given the impression that the "market is to be far off in a place where the roads are bad;" and also he had been told that "there is to be no dead meat market there," a thing which the Bill actually provides. The remaining class of witnesses to which I shall allude are interested witnesses. As the Bill provides that the market is not to be far down the river in a place where the roads are bad, Thames Haven will be excluded; the Thames Haven Company will no longer reap profits by the importation of foreign cattle. The Thames Haven Company were naturally interested in throwing the Bill out. The first witness against the Bill, Mr. Brewster, turned out to be a director and shareholder of that company; so is Mr. Archer; M. Guerrier is a director; and Mr. Baker, whose regimental banner bears date 1865, is also a shareholder. That is the character of the witnesses against the Bill. Let the House now consider what injuries they allege. The first objection was against having a separate market. Mr. Brewster objects to this, because he would like the whole supply to be in the market at once. Mr. Woodley supports this view. Mr. Baker would have only one market place, and one market day. That is to say: the power of purchase being virtually limited to monopolists, they would naturally like to secure a large supply. That would increase the monopoly, and depress the prices they would have to give. Mr. Gebhart is an importer; a seller of foreign cattle; his interests are therefore contrary. To have many buyers, and to divide the supply, would suit him better. He told the Committee that if the market is only once a week "the animal wastes between." He therefore would have no objection to a separate market if there were two market days for the sale of English cattle, and two market days for the sale of foreign cattle; or have only one market day for English cattle if you like (that is nothing to him), say Wednesday; and have the markets for foreign cattle on Monday and Friday. Mr. Rudkin backs up the objection about cattle standing over for a week, and wished for two market days for home and two for foreign cattle. In Paris the cattle are sold every day; why should we single out market days? Sell the cattle as they are wanted. The next objection was that which was raised against compulsory slaughter, or rather the objection was directed against a public slaughterhouse: for the small butcher prefers to drive his cattle home for slaughter. Yet there are strong reasons, on sanitary grounds, against permitting the nuisance of private slaughterhouses any longer to continue. All these private slaughterhouses are immediately behind dwelling-houses and in thickly-peopled districts; so that the air, already loaded, becomes fully contaminated. Besides, as Mr. Rudkin informed the Committee, they can never be kept in order, for slaughterhouses "must be concentrated to keep them under control." Moreover, if private slaughterhouses are studded over the town, cattle must be driven through the streets to all parts of the town, which is another nuisance. The House has long ago declared its judgment on this point. Twice it has given notice that these nuisances shall cease; but with a charity, which I think rather mistaken, they determined that the inhabitants of London should endure the nuisance for thirty years more in order that the butchers might have no room for the complaint that their interests were being damaged. Mr. Woodley read to the Committee the part of the Report of the Committee of the Common Council which referred to the Act of 1844 and to the other Act—

> "WOODLEY (*reading Report of the Committee of Common Council*). 4989. 'Our attention has been directed to certain provisions contained in the Building Act (1844), under the operation of which many slaughterhouses now in the metropolis will, in the year 1874, cease to exist; and we have also considered the provisions contained in the Newgate Market Abolition Act, under which the various slaughterhouses in the vicinity of that market will, in all probability, be removed.'"

The large carcase butchers and the Government contractors do not seem to object to a public slaughterhouse. Mr. Rudkin testified that it is no detriment to a large butcher, that it is immaterial to a carcase butcher, where he slaughters. Mr. Garton, a carcase butcher and Government contractor, said that individually he had no objection to a separate market with compulsory slaughter; a public slaughterhouse close to London was the same thing as his own; there would be no loss if it is sufficiently near to London. Mr Woodley, it is true affirmed that it would throw the killing trade into the hands of a few large men. Mr. Archer also said that it would destroy the small retail men, and put the trade in the hands of the large men. Gebhart said the same. Why will it do so? Because the expenses of large firms are smaller in proportion; and because the profits of large firms can be smaller in proportion. It is the tendency of all businesses to fall into the hands of large firms. Well, then, the large firms will grow, and squeeze out many of the smaller men—the 5,000 of cowshed notoriety. But this is no injury to the consumer. The demand does not depend on the number of agents for distribution, or middle men; it depends on the amount required for consumption. The fewer distributors and shopkeepers and middle men the better, consistent with convenience; for there will be fewer profits to extract. Large monied men require a smaller total of profits, and as there are fewer of them fewer profits will be required. But we hear a whine—"It will injure the small butchers." Put against this the cry from England, Ireland, and Scotland, that the present system injures farmers, small and large. Archer very fairly allowed that against the injury to small butchers we must balance the loss to farmers and graziers. Besides, the small butchers will not lose so much after all; for they can buy dead meat, even if they cannot kill their own beasts. Mr. Blackman, a large man, says that the retail butchers, who are scattered over the metropolis, buy carcases of him. Woodley says that they buy dead meat at the Newgate market. Archer was asked, "Who are the principal buyers in Newgate market? — Butchers." And he added that a great many beasts are killed in all parts of London, and carried to Newgate market to be sold. Mr. Rudkin affirmed that two-thirds of the supply of cattle to the metropolis are killed by the carcase (not the retail) butchers, and sold in Newgate, Leadenhall, and Whitechapel markets; whence the retail butchers fetch it to stock their shops. Take an individual case as an example. Mr. Woodley told us, that at the place of business belonging to himself and other large men, there are twenty-five slaughterhouses all together, all belonging to wholesale men. "This is a very great convenience to the whole district." For he said, customers come from the surrounding districts; "from a very large population;" they come distances of four miles, and take away the meat in their own conveyances. That is to say, they have discovered the benefit of dispensing with the middle man. He adds—"These are better than if they were in twenty-five different districts, because they make a large market." The very thing we want to make! Here are some authorities in favour of the public slaughterhouse. Mr. Rudkin avers that butchers are not reasonable in objecting to the abattoir system. He said it was because they misunderstood the question. He, it seems, persuaded the City to vote £36,000 to erect a public slaughterhouse at Islington. "It is not to be compulsory!" I shall be told. True; all the better for my argument. City people do not vote money unless they are sure of a return. And how will the City get its 7 per cent; unless butchers find a public slaughterhouse such a benefit that they will invariably use it, how will it yield a profit? At Portsmouth, Sir James Elphinstone said they object to having any slaughterhouse inside the town. At Edinburgh, ever since 1850 they have had a public slaughterhouse outside the town. On which Professor Strangeways remarked that this has been a gain to the butchers, and that only the bad butchers complain; which they do, because they cannot surreptitiously kill and sell bad meat. That is to say, a public slaughterhouse will put a stop to those gentry who frequent the London cowsheds to buy diseased animals cheap. In Paris, as Mr. Woodley testified, they have one large market and slaughterhouse, which supplies the whole of Paris, and the market is held every day, and the killing is performed every day. And although, he says, that in Paris they slaughter as much as 92 or 93 per cent of the whole amount killed in the metropolitan area of London, yet this does not affect prices, nor injure the butchers. But it was urged "it will cause the price of meat to fall so that the foreign trade will not be attracted." What then will be the amount of the depression? George Eve tells us that it may be ½*d.* per lb.; that the foreigner will get 5*s.* to 6*s.* less for each beast. Brewster puts it at the same amount when testifying against the Bill; but Mr. Gebhart said it would not make a farthing of difference. M. Bouley testified his opinion that no great effect on importation would be produced if we were to enact that all foreign cattle should be killed at the port of landing. Mr. Rudkin evidently contemplates an increase of the foreign trade; for he says that a larger market (6397-6403) will be required for the foreign cattle alone than there is now at Islington for both English and foreign together. This view of Mr. Rudkin's is not extraordinary. It is very reasonable. For, by breaking down the butchers' monopoly, by providing a more extended demand, we confer a benefit on the trade. This is the very benefit which accrues from good roads and railways—namely, a more extended market for the produce. What will be the result? The English cattle will go out to supply the country, and more foreign cattle will be required to supply the thickly populated districts of the town. That the Bill will break down this monopoly was clearly seen by Mr. Symonds and by Mr. Syme. The latter gentleman was asked—

> "Why do you suppose that after this Bill is passed the butcher will take a less profit?—His neighbour—that is, the country butcher—will come in then and buy along with him, and he will have to pay the regular country price for his cattle."

The last objection which was urged against the Bill has been termed the offal question. It is a peg on which were hung numerous appeals *ad populum*, and passionate addresses *ad misericordiam*, and a fervid Chatham-peroration. Offal is injured by carriage, they said, even for the shortest distances, and the poor live on offal. Yet the Committee heard from numerous witnesses that a great deal of offal is imported from Antwerp and from Hamburgh, "guts and all, in casks." And Archer testified that it is always brought from Holland with dead meat: that 2,600 dead sheep and many tons of offal have been brought over in one vessel; and again, that 3,000 or 4,000 dead carcases of sheep have come from Hamburgh with thirty or forty tons of beef, and all the offal thereto pertaining. "Aye! but this is water carriage." Well, but it comes by land as well. Lambs' offal is sent by waggon a distance of forty-four miles to London. And Captain Engledue said, in his remarkable evidence, that the offal of sheep and lambs is sent to London in hampers from all parts of the country, "and those do not speak the truth who say the contrary." What is the nature of this offal trade? Baker attested that the offal of the smaller butchers, and even of the carcase butchers also, is disposed of by contract to the offal dealers and tripe dressers. Mr. Blackman "does not know of one who retails it." "Not one in ten retail it; because they have not the means of dressing the tripe." Blackman, Archer, and Lancaster stated that the offal shops collect the offal, and then, when dressed, it goes to the low neighbourhoods to be sold. The way is this—the contractor calls with his cart at a butcher's, and obtains what offal there is; he proceeds to the next butcher and then to another, and another, until the cart is full; so that offal does now travel about the streets before it is dressed, and after too. These offal salesmen, says Blackman, are few in number; and they are the men who retail it. I appeal to authorities. Mr. Rudkin allows that there will be no differeence between the offal in the new market and the offal of a large carcase butcher. Lancaster speaks of depôts of offal as an advantage; and says that the poor will get the offal cheaper in the new market, which will be a considerable benefit. Mr. Symonds and Captain Engledue affirm that the offal objection is very slight. Captain Engledue used weekly to send the offal from his farm at Southampton up to London to be sold. That the objection is slight is practically proved by Harman's evidence; for he states that he buys offal at Whitechapel, Newgate, and Leadenhall markets, and of wholesale men and offal salesmen, transports it to his shop, and then retails it to the poor.

In conclusion, let the House call to mind that the present restrictions are most cumbrous, onerous, ineffective, oppressive, and easily evaded. The inconveniences are numerous; the driving of cattle through the streets; the number of pestilential slaughterhouses in the metropolitan area. All these inconveniences, this insecurity, these evasions, are consequent on the enormous extent of the area to which the regulations are applied. It is like trying to defend a fortress of 117 square miles with a small army against a large and insidious foe. The natural remedy, then, is to contract the area. The regulations were applicable to an area of 117 miles, and were passed at a time when cattle plague was raging in the whole metropolitan area, and while the rest of the country was comparatively free. Now that the cattle plague has retreated, why should not the House close in and contract its line of defence? Evasion would then be impossible, inspection would be easy, and the detection of diseases certain. The number of police would be less; two would then effect more than 200 now. The expenses would be smaller. Cattle would all be under command and constant supervision. Dr. Nicholls was asked—

> "5859. But do you not think, if you reduce the area, where the liability of infection exists, you diminish the chance of conveying it, and you increase your power of taking precaution against it?—I think you do.
>
> "5860. Therefore, if you get all the cattle liable to disease on one spot, you would be better able to take precautions against conveying that disease than you would upon the large district of the metropolitan area?—It would be more unmanageable."

Professor Spooner was asked—

> "7402. Would you suppose that when foreign cattle can only be landed in a small defined part, it would be much easier to inspect them than when they are spread over the whole town?—Yes."

That is what we propose to do by this Bill. The object is to contract the area of the restrictions to a spot on the waterside. For the Islington market, as Mr. Gebhart urged, is very inconvenient for the foreign trade; but it is conveniently situated for home cattle. The House last year affirmed the principle of defining parts of ports for the reception and slaughter of foreign cattle. It has been tried; and no injury or inconvenience has resulted. Professor Spooner was asked—

> "7400. You are aware that that policy has been carried out in all the larger ports except London, are you not?—Yes.
>
> "7401. Have you heard of any injury that has accrued from it?—No, I have not."

For the small ports, the supply of English cattle was found amply sufficient; they never desired to import any foreign cattle. They have therefore but one market. In the larger ports, foreign meat is required for the poorer population, as well as English cattle for the richer. Because of the size of these towns, two markets are necessary. A part of the port is therefore set apart; they have a separate market for foreign cattle, and a market for English cattle; while the principle of non-contact between English and foreign cattle is strictly maintained. But for London, the largest port of all, some pretend to say that one market should suffice, and that the principle of non-contact should be disregarded!

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Lord Robert Montagu.*)

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, he regretted that the noble Lord had reflected on the evidence of one of the French witnesses as having been given in the interest of his own country, as if he had come here to promote some object of his own. Now, this French witness was the most distinguished veterinary authority in France. He was the adviser of the French Government, and had, in fact, inspired those regulations which had kept the cattle plague out of France. The French Government had been kind enough to send this great officer to this country to inform the Committee what those regulations had been. The noble Lord, therefore, who represented the English Government, was not entitled to reflect upon such a witness by saying that he had given evidence to promote the interests of his own country.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, he had stated that this witness had spoken from the French and not from the English point of view.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, the noble Lord probably did not remember the words he had used. The Committee were very much indebted to the French Government for the information this gentleman had given. He had asked the Committee to adopt the French system, and that was what we ought to do. That system was to let the cattle in from healthy and uninfected countries, and when they were in to treat them as French cattle, but not to admit them from infected countries. The system had been successful in France, whose Government distinguished between countries that were infected and those that were not, and closed the frontiers of France against importation from particular countries as occasion required. The French Government contrived to get information and to act upon it so successfully that in France the cattle plague had extended only to some forty-five beasts. The noble Lord was the representative of the Privy Council, upon which, however, the greater part of his speech contained the gravest reflections. Notwithstanding the alleged impossibility of distinguishing between one country and another, and the consequent necessity of treating all foreign countries as infected, there was at present an Order in Council founded on the principle that you could distinguish between countries that were infected and those that were not. The Privy Council had great experience in the matter, and no doubt they were acting wisely in admitting cattle from Spain, Portugal, and Normandy into all English ports on the South and West Coasts up to the Mull of Cantire. He had been under the impression that the Government had no real intention of proceeding with this Bill, the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government having said it had not been formally withdrawn because there were special reasons why it should be brought under the consideration of the House. He should be glad to know what those special reasons were. It was generally desired that necessary business only should be disposed of, and that the dissolution should be expedited as much as possible ; and he believed that even those who favoured this measure would have been glad if the consideration of it had been postponed at present. There was no urgent necessity that it should be passed, for the cattle plague did not exist in England, and the Privy Council had ample powers to stop the spread of it should it, unfortunately, reappear. They had also full power to regulate the importation of cattle in such a manner as they might think best calculated to prevent the introduction of cattle plague from abroad. Seeing that there were these securities, what necessity was there for pressing forward this questionable measure ? If passsed it would not come into operation for years, and during that time we must trust our present machinery. He was reluctant to oppose the Bill at this stage, but there had been no previous chance for discussing it. It was introduced just before the House adjourned in December, and at the first opportunity, after the House re-assembled in February, the Bill was read a second time. He had no idea that the Bill was to be carried through with so little explanation. He had taken what was called a technical objection, and the more he considered it, the more valid it appeared to be. It was that persons whose property was to be taken from them had not received the required notice through the *Gazette*, and although the Standing Orders Committee had held that the Government might be relieved from the giving of such notice, because the persons concerned were aware of what was going to be done, he believed a different decision might have been come to had not erroneous statements been made. It did not follow that because people had presented petitions they were not to have Parliamentary notice. If they had said nothing it would have been held that they had no objections. The reasons given were insufficient for so formidable an invasion of private rights as was involved in the provision of this exclusive landing-place and market, which would, for instance, deprive Mr. Brassey of £7,000. For that property it was not proposed to compensate him, and he did not believe that any company or individual who proposed to take away the private property along the banks of the Thames would be permitted to do so without complying with the greatest accuracy with all the forms which Parliament imposed in such cases. The noble Lord who represented the Privy Council had, he might add, in his opinion, given a very imperfect account of a very imperfect scheme. His object was, he said, to prevent home and foreign cattle from coming into contact, and how was that object to be effected? All the cattle brought up the Thames in ships were, it appeared, to be taken to a particular place; but no provision was made with regard to cattle which happened to have been landed at other ports and were conveyed by railroad to the metropolis. It was impossible, however, to avoid the conclusion that if the proposal of the Government were adopted a similar policy must be pursued throughout the kingdom. For could anything, he would ask, be more monstrous than to take away the cattle trade from London in order that it might be carried on elsewhere, and that then the cattle should be sent flying through the country by railway? Looking over the memorials which had been laid before the Committee by the Government he found that they all, without exception, pointed to the necessity of a general application of the proposed system. The hon. Member for Norfolk (Mr. Reed), for instance, in his petition expressed a hope that the House would pass a law for the slaughter of foreign animals at all the ports and landing-places; but there was no provision of that kind in the Bill. Again, the Council of the Smithfield Club, in a memorial signed by the Earl of Hardwicke, as President, expressed it to be their wish that animals imported into this country should be slaughtered at the port at which they were disembarked. It was but right, under these circumstances, that the House should have the whole scheme of the Government before it, and a Cabinet Minister, the Duke of Richmond, who was examined before the Committee, when asked whether he did not think that a general measure should be introduced, applicable to all the ports of the United Kingdom, replied, "It may be so; I am not answerable for this Bill." Who, then, he should like to know, was answerable for it? He was astonished, he must confess, to find the noble Lord opposite coming forward and casting reflections on those who were his official superiors, and he should wish to be informed whether the Bill was the Bill of the Privy Council? But if he wanted to condemn the plan of a separate market and the compelling everyone to go there, he need only state the views of the Government themselves two or three months ago with reference to that very scheme. We lived, however, in days when Ministers seemed to be able to say anything and not be bound by it a few weeks afterwards. These were the days of "heedless rhetoric," and the noble Lord had, he thought, recourse to "heedless rhetoric" when he described the Bill. The noble Lord described it as a gigantic scheme of protection. For his own part, he could not go so far as that; for he thought that it was a little petty scheme of protection, and would not afford security against the cattle plague. It would raise the price of meat to the inhabitants of the metropolis, and impose a very considerable restraint on the foreign cattle trade. If the Council were in favour of this measure it was extraordinary that they did not call before the Select Committee their scientific advisers. They called farmers and agriculturists, the drift of whose evidence was, for the most part, that though they would like to go a good deal further, yet half a loaf was better than no bread. They would have liked to keep foreign cattle out altogether. The evidence brought before the Select Committee by the Government was of an improper kind. The Committee were not considering class interests, and yet the tendency of the evidence produced by the Government was to show how beneficial the Bill would be to the agriculturists. They put themselves forward through their witnesses as the farmers' friends, and it was not the first time that that title had been assumed by the party opposite, especially at the approach of a General Election. Sir James Elphinstone intimated to the Committee that the Bill was a capital measure for the agriculturists, as it would raise the price of beasts £2 a head. Now, as there were 300,000 head consumed every year in London, an increase in the price of £2 a head would be a tax of £600,000 on the people of the metropolis, and if to that were added the increased price of sheep, the tax on the population of London would amount to £1,000,000 a year. The noble Lord talked of the expense of the police under the present system, but what was that to the £1,000,000 a year which this Bill, according to Sir James Elphinstone and the Government themselves, would impose upon the metropolis? The farmers advocated quarantine, because they thought that the expenses attendant thereon would keep foreign cattle from coming in, and one witness expressed an opinion that it would be a great advantage if the country were entirely free from the foreign trade. The feeling among the farming class was that the foreigner should be kept out, and that the metropolitan market was too good a thing for him. He did not believe that the present Bill was the Bill of the Council. At present, under the orders of Council, foreign sheep were exposed for sale in the metropolitan market, and might be carried inland by railway. But the Bill proposed that in three years from the present time no foreign sheep should leave the port of debarkation—at any rate as far as London was concerned—but should be there slaughtered. If it were safe now to allow foreign sheep to be imported and sent inland to Birmingham or elsewhere, why should it not be equally safe three years hence? The provision was manifestly absurd. Either the Privy Council were wrong in allowing the sheep to go into the country to feed the people in our large towns, or else the Bill must be wrong in stopping that source of supply three years hence. The Bill laid down that from three years hence for ever no foreign sheep or cattle shall be allowed to enter the interior of this country alive; but, he contended, that the Acts of the Privy Council were opposed to any such principle. He did not believe that the Privy Council and its advisers could be said to be the real promoters of the Bill, which was forced upon the Government by the agricultural interest. As was said by Mr. Vernon Harcourt before the Committee—"The manner was the manner of the Jacob of the Privy Council, but the hand was the hand of the Esau of Norfolk." It was said that this Bill had been before a Select Committee of that House, which had gone through it clause by clause with great care, and it was asked whether the House could take upon itself the responsibility of over-ruling the finding of its Committee, which decided the question after due consideration of all the evidence that could be adduced in support of or against the principles embodied in the Bill? No doubt there was great force in that argument, but he must state one fact connected with the decision of the Committee which perhaps was not generally known. He was not about to find fault with the composition of that Committee—although, perhaps, the agricultural interest was rather better represented in it than the town interest was—but it was clear that if there had been one more Gentleman on it like the hon. Member for South Essex (Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson), who had voted with him upon a vital principle of the Bill, the Bill would have been smashed. The question raised before the Committee was a very important one, and was whether the Bill was to apply to all foreign cattle, or only to such cattle as came from infected districts. An Amendment was moved to the effect—"That all countries shall be exempted from the operation of this Bill which are declared by the Privy Council to be free from rinderpest." He and those who thought with him were not desirous of running the slightest risk of infecting our herds and flocks; but what they complained of was that the power of the Privy Council should be superseded by this Bill, and that that Department should have no power to let cattle in when necessary to supply the wants of the country. Upon this question the Committee were equally divided, and the Amendment was only rejected by the casting vote of the Chairman. It was important that he should bring that fact before the House when he was taking so strong a course as asking them to review the decision of one of their Committees. The hon. Member for South Essex said that the Bill went too far in seeking to impose one iron rule for all times, upon all countries on this subject. The Bill was almost too strong for the hon. Member for East Suffolk (Mr. Corrance). The importation of foreign cattle into this country was a very important trade in this country, and no foreign cattle should be excluded which could be admitted with safety, and no restrictions should be carried one atom beyond what safety required. But the Bill proposed to go beyond those limits in saying that all foreign cattle should be subjected to this iron rule, which was in direct contradiction to the acts of the Privy Council. The population within the metropolitan district amounted to upwards of 3,000,000, and half of the food of that immense population consisted of foreign cattle; and it was a serious matter to attempt by the imposition of any restrictions to exclude that half of their food from the London market. He contended that the Bill proposed to reverse the policy of Sir Robert Peel, and that it was a retrograde step in our intercourse with foreign nations, as it imposed what was neither more nor less than a differential duty upon the foreign article. It was estimated that in the event of the Bill becoming law the importation of foreign sheep and cattle would be reduced by 60 per cent, and that none but the inferior sorts would be sent here by the foreign producer. Was it likely that, with the free markets of Paris and other great continental cities open to them, the foreign producers would send their best cattle here to be subjected to these vexatious restrictions? Of course not; and the inferior class of beasts they would send would be the most likely to introduce the cattle plague. The best provision to make against the cattle plague was to empower the Privy Council to take proper precautions suitable to the every-varying circumstances of the case to exclude that disease. If necessary, the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act should be improved, and the Privy Council should be empowered to take the necessary steps for excluding the importation of the disease and for stamping it out in the event of its being re-introduced into this country. He thought the provisions which sufficed to guard the human race from disease would be amply sufficient to protect the bovine race. If a person came from a country where the plague was raging he was subjected to quarantine, but that was a very different thing from subjecting all persons to quarantine indiscriminately from whatever country they might come. Cattle were now let in from Spain, Portugal, and France, but of course the Council could not be unaware that the French frontier was at present open to cattle from all parts of Europe. [Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: Only Normandy.] Normandy, which was open to the whole world, was also open to the rest of France. It was obvious that if cattle were let in from France, Spain, and Portugal the same privilege must be extended to Denmark and Sweden. It was probably owing to political exigencies that it was determined to let in Spanish and Portuguese cattle. His hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves) had to be got rid of, for there was a report that he was going to carry his Motion, whereupon the great principle was immediately departed from, and the great farming interest of England exposed to the danger of cattle plague. The inhabitants of Manchester, Ashton-under-Lyne, and the other hives of industry appreciated what had been done, as they were no longer deprived of the opportunity of purchasing excellent Spanish and Portuguese beasts. He did not mind small things being done to please political friends just before a General Election, but he was of opinion that the free trade policy of the country was a matter of far too great importance to be disturbed for such a purpose. And he should not wonder if after all the farmers' friends betrayed the farmer as they had done before. No doubt the farmers had been led to believe that the Government intended to carry this measure; but surely no hon. Member could think it was destined to pass during the present Session. The First Minister of the Crown would not, in his opinion, undertake that it should pass, and he thought it was time the farmers should know they were being misled in this matter. The question had been made a party cry; but the matter would not bear investigation. He felt confident that no Government would be found to give effect to the plan as it stood. What would the farmers of South Essex say when they heard of the astounding fact that one of the hon. Members who represented them had actually voted against the vital principle of the Bill? The farmers were a good, honest sort of people; but they were being made use of for political purposes, as they had been during the time of the Corn Law agitation. He would now advert to what had fallen from the noble Lord as to the prevention of infection. In carrying out that object it was necessary to take care that no injury was done to the foreign trade. The noble Lord had asserted that the present system was very vexatious and restrictive, as the beasts were detained on landing in order that they might be carefully inspected before they were sent to the metropolitan market. For his own part, he was in favour of a rigorous system of inspection, and of excluding all infected beasts. The noble Lord, however, would let in all cattle indiscriminately into the proposed safety market at Plaistow Marshes; but it should not be forgotten that the Cattle Plague Commissioners had stated that the disease might be communicated by proximity without contact. Upon this question of infection he preferred to be guided by authority. Professor Spooner denied that he had ever been in favour of a separate market. The Commissioners were not in favour of a separate market. [An hon. MEMBER: Yes, they were.] No; they were in favour of slaughtering the animals at the place of debarkation; but that was not what was meant by a separate market. The Committee of 1866 unanimously rejected the idea of a separate market. There could be no doubt that the infection of the cattle plague might be communicated by the clothing of individuals, and that the disease would be spread by those who would attend both markets. It would be far better to maintain the present *cordon* around the metropolitan area, leaving it to the Privy Council to relax the existing regulations when they thought it prudent to do so. Communications would be constantly going on between the two markets which would remove the *cordon* in the most dangerous manner. There would be a collection of dangerous beasts in the foreign market; the butchers would be constantly going backwards and forwards from one market to the other in their carts, and what was there to prevent a butcher from calling at the foreign market for dead meat, then going to the live market and taking up a live calf, and afterwards sending both into the country? The time might come when it would be prudent for the Privy Council to remove the existing metropolitan *cordon*; but this was a matter for them to decide, and it would be most unwise in the House, by passing this Bill, to take the matter out of the hands of the Privy Council, and perhaps compel them to act against their own judgment. If the Bill did not prevent the introduction and spread of the cattle plague, it would be so much superfluous mischief, since it would subject the people of London to a great and unnecessary expense. The Resolution appeared to him to be a most reasonable Resolution. He thought he ought to have the support of every Chamber of Agriculture and every Farmers' Club that had petitioned the House on this subject. The House by affirming his Resolution would not deny the principle of the Bill, which was the compulsory slaughter of all foreign cattle brought into London. Who would contend that the metropolis was not to be allowed to do something that all the other ports of the kingdom were permitted to do? The Bill would not secure the country against cattle plague infection; it would most certainly impose a serious restriction on the supply of the food of the inhabitants of this great metropolis; and it involved a great interference with private rights and property on the banks of the Thames without necessity. His Amendment asked the House to consider whether they would now entertain the question with regard to London apart from the other ports of the kingdom? The question had arisen, who were to be the authorities who were to manage the proposed market? The Government said the Corporation of the City of London; but they came before the Committee and framed certain clauses which would be necessary in case they exercised the option which they were to have under the Act of being the market authority. They could not carry these clauses, however, and Mr. Hope Scott, the counsel for the Corporation of London, thereupon announced that the Corporation withdrew from all connection with the Bill. In the Court of Common Council it had been stated that the Corporation of the City of London had declined to have anything more to do with the Bill, because the Government had broken faith with them. This was a serious charge, requiring an answer from the Prime Minister, who would naturally like to stand well with the Corporation; and he should like to know what engagement the Government had broken—what it was that made the Corporation start off in this abrupt manner. The co-operation of the Common Council could not now be relied upon, and the Committee itself rejected the Metropolitan Board of Works, thinking that the Corporation would be the best authority. As the authority, whatever it was, must have funds, an hon. Member from Scotland proposed, after raising the price of meat to consumers in London, to put a rate upon them to defray the expenses of the market. It would have been more reasonable in the hon. Member, when he was raising the price of the Aberdeenshire beasts, to levy a contribution upon Scotland. The people of London did not want this Bill, and the witnesses connected with the London consuming interest protested against it; they were satisfied with the system which had proved effectual in keeping the cattle plague out of the country since September last, and it was monstrous that the price of meat should be raised by these restrictions, and that then the ratepayers should be called upon to pay an additional tax to carry out the scheme. There was another proposal to create as an authority five Royal Commissioners, but they were to have no funds, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer said he would not propose a shilling for them in the Estimates, nor would he put a money clause in the Bill. How were the Commissioners to pay large compensations if they were not provided with funds? All this only showed that the Government could not be in earnest, and that this crude and ill-considered scheme ought not to be proceeded with. Might not the measure be safely remitted to the new Parliament? Let that decide upon this new protective policy—upon the reversal of the policy which Parliament had of late years followed. He was not opposed to reasonable precautions for keeping the rinderpest out of the country; but this measure had not received the sanction of any Committee of Inquiry which ever sat upon the subject, and it was not in accordance with the Resolutions of the Committee of 1866, which simply recommended that the Privy Council should have power to declare any country infected, and to prohibit the importation of animals therefrom. Under those circumstances he should conclude by moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Mr. NORWOOD, in seconding the Amendment, said, that the very able speech just delivered by the hon. Member had so exhausted the subject that he would confine himself to stating to the House the very serious results experienced by his constituents from restrictions of a very similar character to those proposed by the Bill. The importation of cattle into Hull in 1865 was 35,000 head; in 1866, when the Order in Council confined the circulation within the borough boundary, the import fell to 23,000; and in 1867, during which slaughter was made compulsory within an area of but ninety acres adjacent to the waterside, it was further reduced to 12,000, while for the five and half months of the present year the import has not exceeded 1,000 head. Thus the import of foreign cattle into Hull has nearly ceased, and his constituents expect that a similar result would attend the operation of the proposed measure in the metropolis. The trading interests of the port had also suffered severely, for the reduction of import had operated in the same proportion on the payments for freight, wharfage, railway carriage, and other charges. In 1865 the freight paid to the steamship owners on cattle alone was estimated at nearly £27,000. He was assured by a leading butcher at Hull that the price of beef was 1*d.* per lb. dearer than it would have been had the restrictions alluded to not been imposed, and he called the attention of the Members for the large towns of the West Riding to the fact that in 1865 as many as 28,000 head of cattle were forwarded from Hull to Leeds, Wakefield, Sheffield, and other towns. This was a question therefore in which their constituents were as largely interested as the outports, and he called upon them to resist a measure of so retrograde a character, and designed—in his opinion—with a view of protecting the agricultural interest to the detriment of the meat-consuming people of this country.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the proposal to pass a permanent law, requiring that in order to prevent the introduction of the Cattle Plague into this Country from abroad, all foreign cattle and other animals imported into the Port of London shall be landed at one prescribed spot, and shall not be removed thence alive, ought not to be considered apart from the general policy of imposing legal restrictions on the foreign cattle trade in other ports of the United Kingdom,"—(*Mr. Milner Gibson,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that in the Select Committee he had voted with the hon. Member for Ashton-under-Lyne (Mr. Milner Gibson) for continuing the permissive power to the Privy Council to admit cattle from Spain and Portugal, where no cattle plague had existed; and in so doing he did not think that he had struck at the vital principle of the Bill. Barking Creek had been chosen because it presented the most reasonable prospect of a site within easy limits of the metropolis. After having passed twenty-five days in the Committee with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton-under-Lyne, and witnessed his efforts to defeat the Bill, he was not surprised at his Proteus-like appearance in opposition to it again. He found in the right hon. Gentleman a strong supporter of the butchers, of the foreign importer as against the Englishman, and, last of all, an instructor as to the course which he ought to have taken in the interest of the farmer. With respect to the evidence laid before the Committee, the

House ought, he thought, to be put in possession of one fact, which was, that in order to lessen the expense the Committee determined to make its proceedings as short as possible, and stopped the witnesses for the promoters of the Bill in order to further that object. The Bill was objected to on three grounds—that it was calculated to diminish the importation of foreign cattle, and consequently the supply of food; that it was a return to protection—that now very ugly word; and that it would afford no adequate security against the introduction of the cattle plague. As to the first point there was a considerable amount of evidence to show that though the importations at the outset might be diminished, it would soon find its level. Other witnesses thought that the foreign trade would not diminish. They had the evidence of one witness, a large importer, to the effect that the present restrictions acted much more injuriously than those proposed would do. But even if foreign importation were diminished, would it lessen the supply to the consumers of London? Would not the home trade increase and fill up the gap when the farmers of this country, relieved from the dread of infection, ceased to have objections to the breeding of cattle? With regard to protection, he could say that all the Agricultural Societies with which he had communicated denied that the idea of protection—except the protection of their flocks and herds from disease—had entered into their mind at all. The proper description to apply to the object now sought to be obtained was to call it, not protection, but rather the establishment of police regulations, which it was necessary to adopt in consequence of the character of all the localities from which foreign cattle came not being sufficiently known. As the present metropolitan area was acknowledged to be insecure, inasmuch as, in spite of all the restrictions, there was a constant transmission of cattle through it, they were entitled to ask the House to pass a measure which would reduce that area, bringing it down to such a circumference that it could be fairly watched. The butchers had always shown themselves most consistent, for whenever any measure interfered with their trade they were always found banded in opposition to it. They had opposed the Copenhagen market, and the Islington market. In many instances their opposition had proved to be erroneous, and in the present case they would discover that the Bill would not so seriously affect them as they feared. In his country the people felt strongly on this question, and, as Member for that county, he hoped the House would pass the Bill as speedily as possible.

Mr. DENT said, he believed that the general feeling of the members of the Royal Agricultural Society was in favour of the Bill, but he thought that they did not thoroughly understand what the Bill proposed to do. It was supposed by the farmers generally that the object of the Bill was to confine the sale and slaughter of all foreign cattle to a particular spot at the waterside. He did not think that that was a right description of the nature of the Bill. Already leave had been given for the importation of cattle from Spain, Portugal, and parts of France, and it was quite clear that that principle must be carried out by allowing the introduction of cattle from other places not infected with disease. Perhaps hon. Members were not aware what a large proportion of the metropolitan supply came from countries not infected. He found by the Customs' Report for 1866 that out of a total metropolitan supply of bulls, oxen, and cows, amounting to 145,000 head, 73,000 came from Portugal, Spain, Denmark, France, Sweden, and Norway; so that half the supply came from countries perfectly uninfected by the rinderpest. If a waterside depôt were established in which the cattle from the uninfected countries were placed in contact with cattle from infected parts a manifest injustice would be done; and if, on the other hand, a market for Russian cattle were exclusively established, the rinderpest would be brought there in a more dangerous form than it had hitherto presented itself. He believed that Mr. Algernon Clarke, of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, had much to do with the concoction of the present Bill, for he wrote to *The Times* that—

> "The very purpose of such a market is to provide for the constant reception of animals without let or hindrance from all countries whatever, whereas, in the absence of a safety market, animals can be admitted under a rigorous examination only from those ports which from time to time may offer no danger of disease."

The Bill afforded the minimum of safety with the maximum of inconvenience. It was an attempt to shift the responsibility from the shoulders of the Privy Council to irresponsible Commissioners. The course adopted by the French Government at the time of the cattle plague was most judicious. They closed their frontiers to all cattle during the continuance of the plague, but the moment they found that it was extinct they at once removed the restrictions. A great deal of the evidence taken before the Committee went to prove that the metropolitan market was always more or less full of disease. This disease, however, came from the country districts of England as well as from abroad. Diseased cattle were sent up from the country to the metropolitan market; and therefore he thought it would be advisable that store cattle should not be brought to that market. It should be confined to the reception of fat stock. The noble Lord the Vice President of the Council attacked the foreign cattle importers in a manner that was scarcely justifiable. Although foreign stock might have originally introduced the disease in this country, the proportion of infected cattle imported from abroad was very small. The noble Lord seemed to think that there was a decrease in our home production of cattle; but Ireland was now our great home emporium for our cattle. Before 1845 the foot and mouth disease was scarcely known in this country, because the cattle were driven leisurely along the roads to London, being furnished with plenty of food and water on their journey, whereas at present they were conveyed in railway trucks, where they were kept without food and water. The decrease in the supply of English cattle was owing to the farmers in many districts finding that the feeding of animals for the fat markets suited the rotation of their crops better than rearing young stock, and in consequence they depended more upon Ireland to supply store animals.

MR. HEADLAM moved the adjournment of the debate.

COLONEL BARTTELOT said, he hoped an early day would be named for resuming the discussion.

MR. HENLEY said, the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Milner Gibson) had stated that the Standing Order Committee had had some erroneous information placed before it. He should be glad to know to what the right hon. Gentleman alluded.

SIR ANDREW AGNEW said, he wished to explain, that whereas the right hon. Gentleman had said that the Scotch cattle dealers hoped to gain an additional £2 per head for their cattle if the Bill passed, they hoped that the public would at the same time get their meat a great deal cheaper. He thought there was an attempt by a side wind to defeat a most useful measure.

MR. GOSCHEN said, that it could scarcely be said that there was an attempt to defeat the Bill by a side wind when the noble Lord who had charge of it had occupied two hours in addressing the House upon going into Committee. That was the best proof that the subject required ample discussion. He trusted that when the debate came on again opportunity would be afforded for the metropolitan Members to express their opinions with regard to it.

MR. MILNER GIBSON explained that one of the erroneous statements to which he referred as having been made before the Committee on the Standing Orders was to the effect that there could be no doubt that the opponents before the Committee were the identical persons who in March last petitioned against the clause, and who for twenty-three days, directly or indirectly discussed it without raising this particular objection.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he wished the First Minister of the Crown would state whether he considered these Morning Sittings satisfactory? His own opinion was that they interfered with the rights of private Members when the House resumed in the evening.

MR. AYRTON said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give them full time to discuss the question. He believed they would be able to satisfy him that the Bill could not possibly go on, but still it was desirable that they should have full opportunity of entering into the matter; more especially so as, in consequence of the breach of the Standing Orders, not one out of 100 of his constituents would be at liberty to appear before the House of Lords and demand as of right that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee of the House of Lords, and gone into *de novo*. In his opinion the Bill would actually defeat the object which its agricultural supporters desired to accomplish.

MR. DISRAELI said, he would put the Bill down for Monday next, not because he had any hope that it would then come on, but to give an opportunity of seeing what arrangement could be made for the discussion of it. He would do what he could to bring about the resumption of the discussion next week. Although hon.

Members might object to Morning Sittings, they must at this period of the Session be content with what time they could get.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he believed that there was a disposition to take either a Morning or an Evening Sitting for the discussion of this Bill. It was a measure of great importance, and ought to be discussed fully.

Debate adjourned till *Monday* next.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH THE EAST.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Lord WILLIAM HAY, in rising to draw the attention of the House to certain Memorials recently presented by the Bankers and Merchants of the City of London, and of Calcutta and Bombay, relative to the Telegraphic Communication with the East, said, that the memorials represented that this telegraphic communication was in an extremely unsatisfactory condition, which the Government were called upon to remedy. It might seem surprising that the enterprize of the present age had not supplied anything like tolerable telegraphic communication between this country and India. But such was the fact, and the reason seemed to him very plain. It seemed that the Government had interfered up to this point—that they had succeeded in paralyzing private and commercial enterprize without giving on their own part complete communication. In 1859 a company was formed to lay a cable from Suez by way of Aden to Bombay. The Government supported the scheme, and gave a guarantee of £36,000 a year for a period of forty years. The cable was laid, but no single message was ever transmitted along the whole length of the line, and the English Exchequer would be burdened for forty years with an expenditure of £36,000 for a cable that was now at the bottom of the Red Sea. The bargain with the company was very carelessly drawn, and ocean telegraphy was then in its infancy. Having burnt their fingers with this line, the Home Government were not in a hurry to interfere again, and the matter was next taken up by the Government of India, which selected perhaps the worst route that could have been chosen—namely, through the Persian Gulf and the Asiatic dominions of the Sultan to Constantinople. It was neither a land nor an ocean line, but was exposed to the worst risks of both. The land route was beset with physical difficulties, and the line from the Persian Gulf to Kurrachee was exposed to monsoons, and the coast was remarkably unfavourable to a telegraphic line. A Parliamentary Return of an important character had just been published, which represented the revenue and expenditure of the lines opened in February, 1865. The line in Persia made by the British Government cost £100,000, and the line from the Gulf of Persia to Kurrachee cost £494,950. To this must be added the cost of working the line for the last three years, which, at £20,000 a year, amounted to £60,000, making a total of £654,950. The Indian Government stated in the Return that they were unable to find more than an "estimate" of the expenditure, which, as the lines were opened in 1865, seemed somewhat strange. Two other lines—a land and a ocean line—had received the sanction of the Secretary of State for India, the cost of which, £197,000, being added to the others, would make a total capital account of £851,950. The estimated revenue on these lines was £92,000 a year, but against that the working expenses of £63,600 must be debited, together with £20,000 a year the cost of working the lines in Persia and £8,000 a year deterioration, making a total annual outlay of £91,000 against an estimated income of £92,000. But this only took the communication to Kurrachee, and a line to Kurrachee did not mean a line to India. So defective was the communication by the line between Kurrachee and Bombay that it was necessary to have a submarine line besides the land line, which would cost £200,000 in addition. These things being true, the capital expended was raised to about £900,000, and £200,000 more was required to reach Bombay, so that the expenditure would be upwards of £1,000,000, and the interest would be raised to about £50,000. We might safely say that the loss upon the working of this line was certainly £40,000, and might be estimated at £50,000 a year. For this we got an exceedingly bad line, passing through countries beset with political and physical difficulties. He would read a passage from the recently published despatches which really seemed to be written in irony—

> "Scarcity of water and fodder for camels, paucity of inhabitants, and the usual difficulties of working with large bodies of men through an utterly desert country, are the only obstacles to be overcome."

The writer added that the double line should be completed within six months of the material reaching Kurrachee, if he was provided with the means, and no political difficulties were thrown in his way. It might be said with truth that in a short time there would be another line passing through Persia, the Black Sea, and Russia, and he believed it would be worked with great success; but the effect of that would be to drive out of the field the line through Constantinople, and to leave a single line passing through the country which everybody knew was our commercial and political rival. Setting aside political considerations, if the company failed for a year to repair the Black Sea portion of the line, the whole line passed into the hands of the Russian Government, and we might find ourselves with no line to India, after spending £900,000 or £1,000,000. To show that he had abstained from exaggeration, he would quote unbiassed authorities. A Commission had reported in favour of an alternative line, and the Governor General of India used this strong language—

> "On the other hand, the question of providing a second or alternative line between England and India is of great and growing importance. It will be seen from the memorial now forwarded that complaint is made of imperfections in the messages by the Persian line, which passes through countries altogether out of British jurisdiction, and having several varieties of race and language. And certainly we apprehend that there is something of precariousness about the Persian line, and that circumstances might at any moment arise to cause either a temporary suspension or a more lengthened interruption of that communication. From every point of view, then, whether political or commercial, the provision of an alternative line becomes important. And any line by the Red Sea is more under our control and protection, and therefore more reliable and permanent, than any line through Persia could be."

The testimony of Lieutenant Colonel Pelly was even more to the point. He said—

> "Indeed, referring to our Asiatic land lines in general, I would submit that the more I learn of these regions the more strongly I am impressed that large political considerations point to a sea line from England to Alexandria, and from Suez to Bombay, provided such line be practicable; and even if such a sea line should have to be made in duplicate, in view to providing for interruption, still the cost of even this duplicate sea line might, perhaps, in the long run, prove economical from a political point of view."

He was in India when its safety depended upon telegraphic communication with England, and he hoped he should not live to see the day when India might be lost to us for want of telegraphic communication. The Government, having taken this matter into its own hands, had given us only one line, and that a bad one; and it was impossible for private enterprize to enter into competition with the Government, which had at its disposal a revenue of £50,000,000. If the Government undertook any responsibility at all, it ought to make the communication satisfactory and complete.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Correspondence which may have passed between the Secretary of State for India and the local authorities relative to the proposed Deep Sea Telegraphic Line from Bombay to Kurrachee, and the sanctioned lines from Gwadur to Jask, and from Jask to Bushire,"—(*Lord William Hay.*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, there would be no objection to give the Papers moved for by the noble Lord. In answer to the question of the noble Lord whether the Government would be prepared to give any assistance towards the formation of a new line from India by way of the Red Sea, he thought the noble Lord had been aware that the Government of India had decided not to give any assistance or grant for that purpose. He would shortly state how the question at present stood. The noble Lord had represented that the Government of India had spent something like £900,000 on these communications, and that the receipts from the line were only £92,000 a year. He thought his noble Friend's (Lord William Hay's) calculations were not altogether fair, for he added the cost of the lines constructed to those in course of construction, but considered only the revenue derived from the former, without making any allowance for the increased revenue to be derived from improved communication. However, he (Sir Stafford Northcote) was not careful to argue that point minutely because, as the noble Lord had said, the question was one of Imperial importance, and if they had not received the full value for their money, yet the bringing of India into more immediate communication with this country was worth the loss of a moderate sum. Even if we were now laying out £40,000 a year—which he did not admit to be the case—for a limited time, in the shape of expenditure on those lines, he thought the money would be well spent. But the noble Lord had very much under-rated the work which was being done. The noble Lord complained that no steps were being taken to provide an alternative line. Such steps were, in point of fact, being taken. They had already two lines in operation. There was on the one hand the Indo-Ottoman line through Turkey to the head of the Persian Gulf, and so on to Kurrachee, while there was the other line to which the noble Lord had referred, the Messrs. Siemen's line, which was now being materially improved, through Prussia, Russia, and Persia. He had just heard that a message had been received by the Messrs. Siemen through their line of no less than eighty words, which reached this country, through Teheran, in the space of five hours. The company had got their concession from Russia, Prussia, and Persia, and there was but a very small portion of their line to be completed, and that was the submarine portion under the Black Sea. He hoped that as early as November, or, at all events, before next summer that line would be in full working order. We had concluded a treaty with Persia for the laying of the land line, and there was every prospect of having a good duplicate line from Bushire to Kurrachee. That being so, he did not think that either Her Majesty's Government or the Government of India had been neglectful of the great object of improving telegraphic communication with that country. Siemen's line, he might add, was one which was formed on the principle that the company were to confine their attention to the through traffic. They were to have two special wires allotted to them for that traffic, and by that means the repetition of messages and other matters of embarrassment would be avoided. He did not, however, by any means intend to say that there was not still room for improvement. He was informed that considerable improvement in the rapidity with which messages were transmitted was being made. From a communication he had received from a gentleman in charge of a Department, it appeared that, in the first four months of the present year, 15 per cent more messages passed between England and India than in the corresponding months of 1867. For a time the cable was broken. Before the cable broke, and after it was repaired, the transmission of a message occupied, on an average, three and a half days, and while the interruption continued the average rate was five and a half to eleven days. If no future breaks should occur it might be assumed that when the new Siemen line was completed the average rate would be reduced ordinarily to a day. If no political complications should arise, therefore, the wants of the community with respect to telegraphic communication with India would be very fairly supplied. No doubt the noble Lord would reply to him and say that those political combinations were just the point to which he wished to direct the attention of the Government. He knew that the commercial interests were very much afraid of political combinations. But he thought it would not be well to be over-wise or over-prudent in the matter, and that it would be desirable to improve the lines in hand instead of seeking to meet imaginary evils. The Government had a proposal from a company for laying a line down the Red Sea, for which they asked that the interest might be guaranteed; but he, for one, objected to the extension of such guarantees and the consequent interference of the Government with private enterprize. With regard to submarine cables, the policy of the Imperial Government was settled, and the conclusion came to was that these cables were not a proper subject for a Government guarantee; for the Government considered that those who had taken an active part in laying the cables down had succeeded and found their profit in them. That being the policy of the Imperial Government, the decided principle of the Indian Government was not to undertake any such guarantee, and charge it on the Indian revenues alone. There was this further mischief connected with Government guarantees to Indian companies, that companies not possessing them were viewed with suspicion. He had represented this view to the deputation of promoters that had come before him to solicit a guarantee for a Red Sea line.

They said that would be correct if it was only physical difficulties that were to be overcome; but that the great difficulties were the political ones. The Red Sea line was advocated by such men as Sir Robert Napier, and he admitted it was difficult to stand up against the authority of such men. But he found that the deputation only used the Abyssinian expedition as a shoeing-horn to draw on a guarantee for the Red Sea line. For the purpose of having a line under purely British control something more must be done than merely laying down a Red Sea cable, because the communication with Alexandria must go through France or Italy; and unless a line were laid down by way of Gibraltar and the Mediterranean there would be no approach to the possession of a line under purely British control. Even then there would be the difficulty of crossing Egypt, so that the idea of a line entirely under British control was very much like a chimera. While the Government were working a line by the Persian Gulf they were asked to guarantee a telegraphic communication in competition with it, and the promoters made the ingenious proposal to lease a portion of the Persian Gulf line and take upon themselves the charge of the cable lost in the Red Sea if the Government would grant them the guarantee they wanted in respect to a Red Sea cable. However, when they had got the lines in their possession they might then have cut the Persian Gulf line altogether, finding it useless to have the two lines in operation. The probable effect of accepting their offer would have been that the Government would have thrown away what they had expended on the lines which they held, and have substituted for them another line, not laid down independently of foreign nations, but passing to a certain extent through Egypt. The Indian authorities intimated that, though they would be glad to see as many lines as possible established, it would be unwise, in their opinion, to break off from the undertaking in which they were engaged in order to begin something new. Therefore, without saying that great advantages might not be anticipated from the Red Sea line, they thought that they would be unwise to undertake the grant of a guarantee on the part of the Indian Government, the revenues of India being at present charged with large sums for various purposes of improvement. The commercial community had a claim to have the best telegraphic communication with India, and the Indian Government were endeavouring to establish such communication by means of the routes in their hands; but when proposals were brought forward, based partly on political and partly on commercial considerations, he must decline to undertake the expense which they would necessitate. He had no objection to give the Papers moved for.

Mr. CRAWFORD said, he had not heard the statement of the right hon. Baronet with great satisfaction. It was only a repetition of what the right hon. Baronet had stated to the deputation that waited on him a short time ago. But those gentlemen were promoters of the Red Sea line. [Sir Stafford Northcote: I did not refer to that deputation.] He thought the right hon. Baronet might have referred to that deputation. They consisted of delegates from the commercial bodies of London, Manchester, Liverpool, and other places, yet they had made so little impression on the right hon. Baronet that he forgot to refer to them. It was dangerous to trust to a system any portion of which was under the control of foreign Governments. The exigencies of war would immediately affect telegraphic communication in Europe. Our experience taught us to be suspicious of all telegrams passing along Continental lines, for all those telegrams were examined, and cases were known in which English commercial telegrams were handed to those who were the competitors in trade of England. It was therefore desirable that we should be independent of foreign Powers in our private telegraphic communications. The right hon. Baronet said that the Government were charged with supineness with regard to telegraphic communication, but that was not so; all that they were charged with was persisting in the attempt to establish a line of communication which was certain to be a failure. The mercantile community wished to be permitted to communicate with India by way of Egypt, as they would then be independent of political combinations, and also of the difficulties arising from the extremes of climate which were to be found on the Persian route. The northern part of Persia was covered with snow for many months in the year, and during some portion of that period the proposed line would be entirely useless. With regard to management, the business at present was carried on with the greatest carelessness, and he knew of more than one instance in which messages had been wholly perverted or rendered unintelligible. Whether the mischief was done in Ceylon or in England he did not know, but the mercantile body had lost all confidence in the present system of transmitting telegrams through the Continent. Messages had been altered to suit the exigencies of foreign Governments, and therefore it would be absurd in the Government to trust their most private communications respecting the government of India through a Continental line. The line through Egypt would be entirely independent of the Government of that country, and would be so superior to other lines that it could not fail to attract to itself the chief share of the business, while the Government of this country would naturally obtain a preference for their messages. Under these circumstances it was hoped that the Government of this country would be inclined to step in and take some portion of the risk. There was no similarity between the line from this country to America and that between this country and India. In the first case there was the whole of the Old World at one end of the line, and the whole of the New World at the other. The line to India would be beneficial principally to the Government of England by maintaining their communications with that country. Moreover, following recent precedent, if it became a successful line, the Government might step in and assume the whole control of it. It was felt, therefore, that it was not a project in which private individuals could be expected to bear the whole onus of a project of which the chief benefit would in the long run fall to the share of the Government.

Mr. H. D. SEYMOUR said, that the first great object to be considered in reference to telegraphic communication with India was to preserve the control of the line in our own hands. The question was whether either of the two alternative lines which the Government of India proposed, both of which passed through Central Asia, and were equally exposed to risk in passing through barbarous countries, should be adopted. He was astonished that the Indian officials, in their communications on this subject, should evince so much ignorance. Each of the telegraph lines proposed was liable to be cut off in the event of war, or to be taken up by foreign Governments. Along the coast line beyond Persia black mail was levied by the chiefs, and those who interfered were liable to be hung on the telegraph lines. In consequence of the telegraph clerks in many cases not understanding English the messages were often unintelligible. In one of the places through which one of the proposed lines was to pass cholera was so prevalent that on the slightest alarm all the telegraph clerks ran away and left the line to take care of itself. He was surprised to hear that these two lines offered the only alternatives. The proposition of Mr. Stiff to establish a coast line *viâ* Aden, through an inhospitable region and so on by the Persian Gulf to Bombay, when they could have a far better line by submarine cable from Alexandria to Bombay, was altogether preposterous. Between Alexandria and Bombay a cable might be laid in what was now deemed to be the best depth of water for the purpose — namely, from 1,000 to 2,000 fathoms. He trusted the Government would seriously consider whether it was worth while to perpetuate a system of telegraphic communication through inhospitable regions inhabited by barbarous tribes, instead of laying a cable themselves, or at least encouraging a private company to do so?

Sir HENRY RAWLINSON said, there were at present, or shortly would be, two lines of telegraphic communication connecting India with Europe, but he could not regard either of those lines as at all satisfactory. The Turkish line would, he believed, never be in a state of efficiency, and with regard to the other line, it was under the control of Russia, and in the event of war would be useless to us. In the case of any disturbance they would be absolutely at the mercy of the Russian Government, and looking at the gradual approach of Russia towards India, he did not see how we could continue to rely upon such a broken reed as a telegraph line in the power of the Russians. He therefore felt it was very desirable that we should consider some other means of securing telegraphic communication with India. Looking at the matter in all points of view, however, difficulties seemed to meet them everywhere, both financial and political. It would be a hazardous matter to lay down a submarine telegraph by way of Gibraltar to Alexandria, and again from Suez to India. All that he could venture to do would be to recommend some means to be taken to induce some private company, though not by way of guarantee, to undertake the work on its own responsibility.

Mr. GRAHAM said, that the commercial community had no confidence in the present telegraphic lines to India. The intelligence transmitted by them was often betrayed or falsified from corrupt motives. He thought the case might be met by the Government consenting to take a share in a direct line by way of the Red Sea. Even if no dividend at all could be derived from a new line the increase of commerce and general benefit to the two countries would more than re-pay the cost. He was quite certain, however, that a handsome revenue would, under ordinary circumstances, be secured from such a line; but how could any private company be expected to construct it when there was a rival line backed up by the revenue of India and the patronage of the Government?

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he was ready to give the Papers.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE RECORD PUBLICATIONS.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. PIM said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the Record Publications relating to Great Britain and Ireland, published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, and to propose means of rendering these valuable works more useful to the Public; and also to call attention to some valuable Irish Records which had been long ready for publication, but were still unpublished. Great expense had been incurred in publishing the Records to which his Motion referred. They had been published in an unwieldy form, in folio, and in consequence of that useless and cumbrous form great loss had been the result of this publication. What he wanted to see was that the Records should be issued in a useful form, and if this were done he should not object to the considerable expense annually incurred in the work of publication. Historically valuable as the Record Publications were, and well worthy of a place in good libraries, either their prices or ignorance of their existence caused them to be neglected, and to remain as useless stores on the shelves of the Stationery Office; and he therefore suggested, as it was better they should be sold at a loss rather than remain unused, that the prices should be reduced, and that copies should be presented to every free library in towns of over 5,000 inhabitants in the kingdom. There were many valuable Irish Records which had long been ready for publication, and it was desirable that the issue of them should be expedited. The Irish statutes from Henry I. to Henry VII. should be published, for they would throw great light on the social and political state of the country at the time they were passed. He begged to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the prices of the Record Publications ought to be reduced from fifteen shillings to ten shillings, and from ten shillings to six shillings, and that the Statutes of Ireland, from the first meeting of the Irish Parliament to the Union with England, ought to be published at the national expense,"—(*Mr. Pim,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

General DUNNE said, great credit was due to the present Master of the Rolls for the care and pains which he had taken in having these State Papers given to the public. Still if it were the fact that the public did not buy them, he agreed with the hon. Member for Dublin (Mr. Pim) that the remedy for this was to lower the price. As to the Patent Rolls and other State Papers a portion of them had been published, and then a stop had been put to the publication of the remainder. The Calendars, from the reign of Henry VIII. to that of Charles I., of the Patent Rolls, had been published, edited by Mr. Morrins, but they had omitted the Records of the time of James I., which were most interesting to the Irish historian. The Records of this reign, or most of it, had been edited by a Commission composed of most able men, some years since, and prepared and published in folio. The Government of each succeeding Ministry had promised either to re-publish them in that form or uniformly with the Calendars of Mr. Morrins, yet none had kept their promise, and they remained inaccessible to the public. The Calendars of Mr. Morrins were severely criticized, and he thought somewhat severely, for he attributed most of the scanty notices in them to the penury of the Treasury which prevented the original being given *in extenso*, or at least more fully, and some errors would naturally occur in a work of the kind. The

Government had promised to correct them in a supplement, but equally failed to redeem these promises. There were but few of the more ancient Records in the Irish Office. One of Henry III. was considered apocryphal; but in the English Office there were Records of the earliest date, even to Henry II. He had suggested that where those Records were so mixed with English that they could not be separated, they should be copied, and the copies sent to Ireland, where they would be of infinite value. This, also, was promised. He could not understand the reason of this apathy on the part of the Government. It was unfair to neglect, on account of the expense, to publish Records of the greatest importance to Ireland and without which no satisfactory history of that country could be written, while the English Records were being proceeded with without any reference to cost.

Mr. BLAKE suggested that the tens of thousands of copies lying in Dublin Castle and becoming mouldy, should be issued to the public at a reasonable rate. The matter was as important for the whole of the country as for Ireland itself.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he had been taken by surprise, the hon. Member for Dublin (Mr. Pim) having concluded his speech with a specific Motion of which no Notice had been given, and he should object to the House pledging itself to any expenditure in reference to these documents without obtaining the advice of the officers conversant with the subject. According to arrangement, these publications were offered for sale at the cost of printing and publishing, but still they were not purchased. The country was under obligation to the noble Lord (Lord Romilly) at the head of the Record-Office and his able staff for their services, and this subject had frequently been brought under the notice of the Government. In 1857 an annual sum was voted for the publication of the Records, at a reasonable price. With respect to the suggestion that those books, instead of being kept in store at the Record Office, should be sold at a cheap price or given away, he could state that the giving of them away had been found of no benefit, for nearly all of those which had been so disposed of found their way to second-hand booksellers' stalls, or into waste-paper shops. The only mode by which the documents could be brought to the knowledge of the public was by the labours of literary men, who published their contents in a condensed and sifted form. The volumes of Froude showed in every page the assistance he had derived from his researches in the Record Office. A Treasury Minute of the 23rd of April, 1866, contained a statement of all that had occurred in reference to these documents. If copies were given gratuitously to public libraries great expense would be incurred to little purpose, and it was not thought advisable that they should to any extent be gratuitously circulated. The hon. Member might rest assured that the attention of the Government was directed to the Records, not only in Dublin, but in Edinburgh and London. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press his Resolution.

Mr. BENTINCK said, he thought the hon. Member for Dublin (Mr. Pim) had done good service in bringing the question before the House, and it was highly desirable to show that there were some Members of the House who took an interest in matters of such importance. After hearing the statement of his hon. Friend the Secretary for the Treasury, he was bound to say that he did not think it was desirable that any further reduction of price should take place. Great credit was due to the Government for the endeavours they had made to place at the service of the public Records and ancient documents, not only those belonging to England, but also those belonging to foreign countries. They could not expect Her Majesty's Government to incur a loss in publishing those Calendars, considering the liberality which they and their predecessors had evinced in regard to the compilation of them. It might be a question whether the prefaces to the Records might not be produced separately in a cheap form. The services of Messrs. Burganrot and Brown in connection with this subject were worthy of great praise. A key had been discovered by which to read some most interesting historical documents connected with the history of Isabella of Spain, and other matters intimately connected with important portions of English history. The Government had displayed no parsimony on the subject.

Amendment and Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

COLONIAL GOVERNORS' PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Resolution *reported;*

"That it is expedient to extend the provisions of the Act 28 and 29 Vic. c. 113, for authorising the payment of retiring Pensions to Colonial Governors to persons who have held the office of Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands."

Resolution *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DODSON and Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH.

MEDWAY REGULATION ACT CONTINUANCE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. STEPHEN CAVE, Bill to continue in force an Act of the second year of King George the Second, chapter nineteen, for the better Regulation of the Oyster Fishery in the River Medway, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. STEPHEN CAVE and Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 196.]

House adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, June 29, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Admiralty Suits* (182); Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment* (185); Lodgers Property Protection* (186); Children, &c. Protection* (187).

Second Reading—Fairs* (141); Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* (158); Inclosure (No. 2)* (159); Local Government Supplemental (No. 4)* (165); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* (166); Established Church (Ireland) (157), *negatived.*

Third Reading—Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) Act Amendment* (156); City of London Gas* (168).

ESTABLISHED CHURCH (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 157.)

(*The Earl Granville.*)

SECOND READING.

DEBATE RESUMED. [THIRD NIGHT].

Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned Debate on the Amendment to the Motion for the Second Reading, read.

Debate *resumed* accordingly.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: My Lords, it was not possible, and, in my opinion, it was not desirable that this debate should be confined within the narrow limits of the Bill before us. The truth is that all eyes, and I think I may say all hearts, are fixed on the great questions which lie behind it; and this Bill has no interest whatever except in the relation which it bears to these; and yet, my Lords, I cannot help observing that, since the speech of my noble Friend who proposed the second reading of this Bill—the able and exhaustive speech of my noble Friend—attacks have been made and arguments employed against those who sit on this side the House which impose upon those who have had any responsibility in this measure the duty of giving to the House some further explanations of its origin and of its object. My Lords, the first great object of this Bill has been this—to give an assurance to the Irish people that the Imperial Parliament will deal, without unnecessary delay, with the whole question of the Established Church of Ireland. My Lords, I rejoice to say I believe that object has been gained. Not even an adverse vote of this House upon the Bill which is now before us can prevent the substantial accomplishment of that object. We have raised the question of the Irish Church out of the domain of abstract and somewhat languid speculation, and we have placed it in the fore-front of the living politics of the English people. We have—I avow it, I claim it as an honour, and I do not repudiate it as an accusation—we have made the disestablishment of the Irish Church a great party question. This has been the accusation of noble Lords opposite—they have flung it in our teeth in every form of language. For this we have been censured severely, but not, I think, offensively, by many members of the right rev. Bench. For this we have been censured in somewhat coarser tones by the members of the Government. The noble Duke the President of the Council (the Duke of Marlborough), who spoke on Friday night, told us in so many words that our policy was a dishonest policy. The noble Earl (the Earl of Derby), who was lately at the head of the Government, and who is still, I presume, its guardian angel, talked on the preceding night of the personal ambition of my right hon. Friend the Leader of the Liberal party in the House of Commons; and he added some insinuations still more offensive, as it appeared to me, which he was good enough to say that he nevertheless did not insinuate. I can assure both the noble Duke and the noble Earl that this language excited in me no feelings either of irritation or of surprise. It is perfectly natural that men in whose hands the noble instrument of party government has been for more than two years so much degraded, by whom it has been entirely dissociated from all definite political opinions, and therefore from all public principle—it is perfectly natural that they should denounce party government and party movements as opprobrious imputations. My Lords, I have not so learnt the Constitution of this country. I hold it to be the duty of great party leaders to associate their party with great public principles. I hold it to be their bounden duty and their highest honour to place in the hands of their party a standard, and to give them a political faith, provided that standard be a noble standard and that faith be a true faith. And, my Lords, I can understand also the denunciations of my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey). He likewise complained of what he called our party movements. I can understand this from him, because my noble Friend—with all his powers, with his long experience, his great abilities, and his incorruptible honesty—is nevertheless the very type and leader of what may be called—I do not say crotchety politicians, but at least of eclectic politicians. But I was surprised to hear my noble Friend, in his speech on the first night of this debate, say that our conduct in this respect had given offence, and would ultimately give greater offence, to those wise and moderate men who ultimately, he said, had in their hands the destinies of this country. If my noble Friend really means those who are in the position that he occupies, and that in their hands are the destinies of the country, he is much mistaken. My Lords, it is perfectly true that it is very often in the power of third parties—small third parties, such as that with which my noble Friend is connected—to upset a Government; but it is hardly ever in their power to determine a policy. It was in the power of a third party in the year 1866 to turn out the Government of my noble Friend (Earl Russell); but it was not in their power to turn out the question of Reform. On the contrary, their conduct and their language did but precipitate Reform, and compelled it to be granted, even with larger concessions to extreme opinions than if they had never interfered. And I warn my noble Friend—indeed, he almost seemed to be conscious of the fact — I warn him that the small party he represents in this House — I am not sure that he represents any party at all, for he appeared to stand absolutely alone—will, on these great questions of public policy which are coming on in respect to the Irish Church, be absolutely powerless and without any influence on the course of public affairs. Well, my Lords, that was our first object—to assure the Irish people that this question of the Irish Church would be dealt without unnecessary delay; and in order to give that assurance it was our bounden duty to connect our opinions, whatever they might be, with the conduct and with the fate of our political party. My Lords, there is no other test in this country, under our system of government, of the sincerity of a great public party than that of being willing to connect their fortunes with the measures which they propose. But, my Lords, we had also another object; and this object, I frankly confess may be entirely frustrated by the vote of your Lordships' House. That object was to save unnecessary waste in the funds of the Irish Church. I own I was infinitely surprised to hear the observations on this subject that fell from my noble Friend who moved the rejection of the Bill. He said he thought the only conceivable object of the measure was a little saving of money, and that he held to be an object of perfect indifference; that there was no want of money; in fact, there was such an abundance of money that he did not know what to do with it. This is the opinion of a noble Lord whose own project it is to divide that £650,000 a year of the Irish Church—which we are told is barely sufficient for the spiritual wants of the 700,000 Protestants—among the whole 6,000,000 of the Irish people! That is the project of my noble Friend; and yet he is the man who tells us that the funds are so ample that in point of amount he does not know what to do with them. My Lords, I apprehend that if there is one man in this House who, to be consistent with himself, ought, above all others, to desire to save money and economize the funds of the Irish Church, it is that Peer who proposes to divide them among all the sects of Ireland, and to introduce religious equality by the indiscriminate distribution of the revenue among the various Churches. I beg the House to observe that even in the Conservative view of the question it is no unimportant matter to save the funds of the Established Church from needless waste. We have not before us as yet the Report of the Royal Commission; we do not know exactly what amount of surplus they may think may be derived from the funds of the Established Church; but we all know this, that there are more Bishops than are necessary for that Church, and more livings than there are congregations requiring spiritual provision; and we cannot for a moment doubt that among the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners must be, in any case, a certain diminution of bishoprics and a certain amount of consolidation of livings. Well, then, I say that every year you lose you are running the risk of losing the value of money, even although you should apply it strictly to the purposes of the Irish Church. For remember this,—that the Crown has not the power or the right of keeping vacant bishoprics that fall vacant—the Crown is bound to fill up the bishoprics; and, therefore, if one fell vacant next year when two, three, four, five, or six bishoprics might be deducted from the Irish Establishment, you are burdening the funds and the assets of the Established Church in Ireland with a new life-interest, to the detriment of those to whom Parliament may ultimately determine to apply those funds. Therefore, in rejecting the Bill you are doing nothing but pure mischief, even though you determine to apply these funds in the most Conservative sense to a system of redistribution among the members of the Established Church alone.

My Lords, having said so much with regard to the two objects of the Bill—and I frankly admit that the latter is one of comparatively small importance—I wish to say a few words on another point connected with this Bill to which reference has been made in the course of this debate, and that is the relation which this Bill bears to the Resolution which has been passed by the House of Commons. It appears to me that a very indistinct conception of that Resolution is entertained by many Members of this House. The noble Earl lately at the head of the Government, in speaking the other night, referred to the fact that the Resolution of the House of Commons did not contain the word "disendowment." He was cheered from this side of the House, and in noticing that cheer he said he hoped we did not mean to take refuge in the quibble of a distinction between disendowment and disestablishment. I can assure the noble Earl that no quibble was intended by that cheer. There is a great distinction between disendowment and disestablishment, and it was not without a set purpose and deliberate and careful intention that the word disendowment was avoided and disestablishment was inserted in the Resolution. That course was adopted for the very good reason that, as far as I know, no human being proposes to disendow the Established Church altogether. The noble Earl referred to endowments derived from private benefactions. Although I think there has been some misunderstanding on that point, nobody has ever proposed to derive the Church of endowments derived from private benefactions. But more than this, under the scheme sketched by Mr. Gladstone, the Church is to be left in possession of the churches and parsonages and of some land adjacent, so that it could not in perfect strictness be said that the Church under that scheme is to be wholly deprived of its endowments. Besides, it is at the option and discretion of Parliament to what extent disendowment shall go; and an uncertainty would be created if the word disendowment were introduced. Therefore those Members of the House of Commons who voted for that Resolution are perfectly free to vote for any sort of compromise in respect to the endowment of the Church. There is another point which I wish to notice with regard to the Resolution of the House of Commons. That Resolution distinctly pledged the House to the principle of disestablishment, and it has been argued in this House during the progress of this debate that the Bill is to be read as one for disestablishment — not necessarily a Bill for disendowment, but for disestablishment. Now, I entirely deny that statement. It is perfectly open to any Member of this House to vote for this Bill and afterwards vote against any Bill, even for the disestablishment of the Irish Church. This is a Bill in its terms for the purpose of saving the waste of funds, and nothing else; the ultimate disposal of those funds will remain at the discretion of Parliament, and of this or of any future Government. Now, with regard to one of the accusations brought against us on account of this Bill, I wish to notice an observation made by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) who spoke the other night with such distinguished ability. If, he asked, this Bill had been aimed only at the saving of funds, why did we not adopt the usual and well-known course under such circumstances, and bring in a Bill that all Bishops appointed during the period of transition should hold their offices subject to the pleasure of Parliament? I can assure the noble

Marquess—and I am sorry that he is not here to hear me—that this course also was carefully considered by those who framed this Bill, and it was rejected for reasons which, I think, would be respected by the noble Marquess himself. We thought it inconsistent with the dignity and functions of such high officers in the Church that Bishops should be appointed to sees with an uncertain vote of Parliament hanging over them as to the emoluments afterwards to be attached to their position. The most rev. Prelate who presides over the Northern Province in England, and who spoke with so much energy on Friday night, said that, even with regard to vacant parishes, it would be difficult to get competent men to fill parishes under such conditions as this Bill imposed. With how much greater reason would the most rev. Prelate have argued that it was impossible to ask any clergyman to accept the office of Bishop under such conditions as those indicated by the noble Marquess? This argument seemed conclusive. We conceived it impossible to propose that such high officers should be appointed under such restrictions, and therefore we took the only other course which was open to us for the purpose of saving the funds of the Church—namely, by providing that during the interval no new appointment should be made to vacant bishoprics. Before passing from the immediate provisions of this Bill, allow me to notice some of the objections taken with regard to the interim arrangements which are contemplated. The most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of York) argued strongly that these interim arrangements would kill the Church by inches. Of course, that argument was entirely founded on the supposition that this Bill would not last only for one or two years, but for five or ten years, and that the Church would, therefore, be brought into a state of complete anarchy. Now, I can assure the most rev. Prelate that I agree with him that nothing could be more dangerous or more fatal to the interests of the Church in Ireland than such a state of uncertainty and confusion, and I must say that if I thought this would be the result of the Bill I should not support it. But I believe the only effect of this Bill would be to place all parties—the Church and Parliament, too—under such conditions that a compromise would certainly be come to in one, or, at the most, in two years. And on this point let me remind your Lordships that the renewal of this state of suspension will remain absolutely in the hands of the House of Lords. This Bill cannot be renewed without the assent of your Lordships' House; and, therefore, I would say that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack who to-night will probably direct his great legal knowledge to show the technical difficulties that are in the way of the Bill, that if these are his only objections to the Bill—if he is willing to save the funds of the Church from needless waste, for purposes of which he might approve—then I beg him to allow the second reading of the Bill, and to propose in Committee such Amendments as he thinks necessary for carrying on fully the spiritual jurisdiction and functions of the Church; and I believe these Amendments would meet with no opposition from this side of the House.

I pass now to another question — not to the object but the origin of the Bill; to the question how and why it is that we came to propose it. On this point also we have been vehemently attacked. Your Lordships must have seen lately an account of a great public banquet given by certain Merchant Taylors, at which addresses were delivered by the Prime Minister, and by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. The noble and learned Lord said that during the last thirty years the Liberal party had been smothering their convictions on this question. Well, I am going to confess to the noble and learned Lord that, putting aside the ironical tone of this remark, I do not think his observation was substantially unfair. It is perfectly true of the convictions which on this subject have been long in the minds of men, and especially of the great majority of the Liberal party, that in one sense they have long been smothered. Your Lordships all know that public men cannot act upon their abstract convictions, except under certain conditions of the public mind. Every man concerned in public life must know that public men have many opinions in regard to the institutions of the country which they would be willing, if they could, to put into the shape of measures, but which the existing conditions of public feeling render it hopeless or even harmful to propose; and this has been long the case with the convictions of the Liberal party respecting the Irish Church. Can any one doubt—has it not been in fact notorious—that the Liberal Leaders, whether speaking in Parliament or writing in reviews or in more substantial works, have uniformly declared that in point of argument the Irish Church Establishment was absolutely indefensible? It is true that thirty years ago, and perhaps at later times, my right hon. Friend who is now the great Leader in this movement (Mr. Gladstone) entertained different convictions, and I confess I was somewhat surprised at the interest and amusement which some noble Lords seemed to have in reading extracts from Mr. Gladstone's book upon Church principles, as to which it is sufficiently notorious that for the last thirty or twenty-five years he never thought that these abstract principles were reducible to practice. But I must complain of one quotation made by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby). In the course of his speech he referred to a speech made by Sir George Grey in 1865, and when he was reading the quotation my noble Friend near me said, "Why not read the speech of Mr. Gladstone?" "Oh, Mr. Gladstone," said the noble Earl; "certainly!" And with that almost lightning-like quickness for which he is famous, he immediately favoured the House, not with extracts from Mr. Gladstone's speech, but with what he represented to be the substance of particular passages.

THE EARL OF DERBY: No, I read from *Hansard* the precise words of Mr. Gladstone's speech.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: Well, my Lords, I remember being told by the late Lord Aberdeen, in rebuking me on one occasion for a quotation I had myself made, that he had never known but one debater in this House who was perfectly fair in quoting his opponents; but I am bound to say that, of all the Members of this House who require to have their quotations very closely looked after, the noble Earl is the chief. Now, I am not going to trouble the House with quotations, but I will refer the House to the speech made by Mr. Gladstone on the 28th of March, 1865. But I must observe that so notorious is it that this speech was wholly adverse to the Irish Church that it was published, I believe, as a pamphlet by the Liberation Society. There is not a single argument in favour of the Irish Establishment which the right hon. Gentleman did not then take up and traverse, with the obvious intention of cutting at the very roots and foundations of the existing public sentiment on this subject. It is perfectly true that my right hon. Friend had to resist a proposal of bringing forward, at that particular time, active measures with regard to the Irish Church; and, of course, nothing is easier than to cite isolated sentences used in urging that argument which may appear, without reading the whole speech, to make his present course inconsistent with the course he took then; whereas any representation of that speech, as a whole, which would be even tolerably just, must exhibit it as a direct and obvious preparation for such measures as are now proposed. I must complain also of my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey), who likewise referred to this subject, and who is very fond of twitting us, and my noble Friend near me (Earl Russell) with having resisted his proposals in 1866. Why, what was the object of my noble Friend on the cross-Benches? We were then engaged with the question of Reform; my noble Friend hated Reform, and he wished to draw a red herring across our path. Is it not worse than idle—is it not childish—to blame us for not having brought forward the question of the Irish Church at a time when we had the great question of Reform in hand? And if, indeed, my noble Friend is as anxious as I believe he is for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, he ought to be grateful to us for our exertions and for the concessions which they ultimately produced from a Tory Government, for I can tell him this—that if he has any immediate prospect of seeing the disestablishment of the Irish Church, it is entirely owing to the passing of the Reform Act of last year, which is already casting its shadow before it. I have not a moment's doubt that the successive votes of the House of Commons on this subject this Session were votes which were entirely due to the sense which that House entertained of the public convictions of the country, and of the result of the coming General Election. Such, then, being the convictions of the Liberal party, and, of late years, the notorious convictions also of my right hon. Friend, what was it, I ask, that awoke those convictions into active life? I confess I was surprised at the tone which was adopted by my noble Friend on the cross-Benches with regard to the phenomena of Fenianism. He blamed my noble Friend (Earl Granville) for having even mentioned Fenianism, and said it was a most dangerous argument to state that the British Parliament was actuated by any considerations arising out of the atrocities of Fenianism. Now, I hope neither side of the

House will take so shallow a view of Fenianism. For my part I shall never forget the beginning of that movement. I remember very well that when the first letters came from my noble Friend, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (the Earl of Kimberley), telling the Cabinet that ships were likely to arrive with cargoes of arms for some secret conspiracy, and that the Government must take immediate measures for the defence of law and order in Ireland,—I really believed—I speak for myself and not for others—that my noble Friend, able as he is, and certainly not imaginative or likely to be imposed upon, was the victim of a hoax. When, however, that conspiracy became fully developed, when the Habeas Corpus Act had to be suspended in Ireland, I cannot understand how any noble Lord, no matter on which side of the House he sits, should speak lightly or slightingly of that movement. Remember, we are not acting while Fenianism is still alive, from any present fear. Fenianism has been put down—at least in its outward manifestations; but are you not willing to confess that making every allowance for the officers released from the civil war in America, and for the foreign element introduced into Ireland—making every possible allowance for these considerations, are you not struck with the amount of support which that movement received among great masses of the population in Ireland? And do you not remember this significant fact, that until the explosion in Clerkenwell gave forcible demonstration of the atrocity and recklesness of those conspirators, that movement was not only unchecked, but was spreading its sympathy over larger and larger circles of the people, thus showing a most dangerous condition of the public mind in Ireland? If you doubt this, I trust your Lordships will allow me to quote the confession made by Lord Mayo on the part of the Government. Lord Mayo says—

> "I do not deny that a great amount of dissatisfaction, I might almost say of disloyalty and dislike, to England and to English rule exists."

That is the formal confession of the Government with regard to the condition of Ireland. Now, I ask was it not necessary—was it not essential—that the attention of public men should be called to this condition of things, after Fenianism as an active conspiracy had been put down? Was it not right that the conscience of the English people should be awakened to their dealings with Ireland? Was it not necessary that, under these circumstance, we should turn our attention to the remedies which were to be proposed? I do not wish, I never have desired, to connect the Fenian conspiracy directly with the existence of the Established Church in Ireland. I believe it to be perfectly true that you never will content the Fenians by disestablishing the Irish Church. But what has that to do with the question? It is not in order to content the Fenians that we desire to act. It is to content that great mass of the Irish people in which Fenian conspirators find the *pabulum* on which they feed. It is to content that great mass of the Irish people whom, we know as a fact, the Fenians were able, working upon the old leaven, to excite to discontent and disaffection. I sincerely believe that a great deal of the disaffection of the Irish people is purely traditional. My Lords, there is a wonderful continuity in the life of nations: terrible where the antecedents have been bad — happy, even blessed, where the antecedents have been good. And herein consists the folly—I do not use the word in a disrespectful sense—of connecting the cause of the Irish Church with the cause of the Established Church in England. Whatever else may be said against the Church of England—this, at least, must be said in her favour — she has been the symbol of national life at great periods of our history, and that she has been—and, I trust, still is—the standard-bearer of the Protestant feelings and opinions of the people. But can it be said of the Irish Church that she ever has been the symbol of national life to the Irish people? Can it be said that she represents the religious feelings of the people? No, the contrary is the fact; and if the disaffection of the Irish people is a purely traditional disaffection, at least you must admit that the Established Church is a traditional remembrance of the miseries and oppressions of their former history. In this respect I cannot for a moment doubt that it will to a very great extent pacify and conciliate the thinking and moderate people of Ireland, that this great anomaly and injustice, as we think it, should be removed from among them. Let me remind the House, before passing from the effects which Fenianism has produced, that it is not we alone on this side who may plead with truth that we were awakened to a stronger sense of our responsibilities in reference to this subject, and that we felt we were able to act with more effect upon the public mind, in consequence of the outbreak of Fenianism. What happened in your Lordships' House on the very first night of the Session? Why, a noble Earl behind me (the Earl of Ellenborough), one of our most distinguished Members, whom we now hear far too seldom, confessed the impression which the events had made upon his mind, and suggested that we should endow the Roman Catholic priesthood as the true remedy for the evils of Ireland. My noble and gallant Friend on the cross-Benches (the Earl of Hardwicke), as gallant a politician as he is an Admiral, who never hoisted a false flag, and would never haul down a flag which he had once raised—he, too, suggested that we should aim at equalizing the position of the Irish Churches not by disendowing or disestablishing the Protestant Church, but by recurring to the old scheme of endowing the Roman Catholic priesthood. My Lords, I believe those two noble Earls were right in this at least, that such is really the alternative which is now placed before the statesmen and Parliament of England. You must arrive at equality either by levelling down or by levelling up. There is no question whatever as to what was the decision and the intention of Her Majesty's Government at the beginning of this Session. The noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey)—who was so lavish of his censure on those with whom he substantially agrees, and so chary of his censure on those with whom he substantially disagrees—found great fault with us because we "took hold"—that is what he called it—of certain expressions as showing an intention on the part of the Government to endow the Roman Catholic priesthood. My Lords, I say at once that I think it was our duty to watch very closely the conduct of this Government in order to see what might be the direction in which they were moving. We have looked to the speeches of the Premier and other Members of the Government, and I should now like to read to your Lordships one or two extracts from those speeches, and I ask you what is the interpretation which ought to be put on them. In the first place, I find in the authorized speech—not the speech found in *Hansard*, but the authorized edition of the speech made by Lord Mayo on the 10th of March, these remarks—

> "The question must be dealt with in a very different spirit from that which the advocates of entire abolition profess. The Presbyterians now receive a grant from this House which is miserable in amount, and wholly inadequate to their requirements."

Well, of course that points to an increase of the *Regium Donum*. There can be no doubt about it. The noble Earl proceeded—

> "The Protestants of Ireland are content with the system which prevails, but are not averse to improvements and to such alterations of ecclesiastical arrangements as would make their Church better fitted to meet the wants of modern times. But we must not prescribe hastily. Of all the schemes which have been proposed, I object pre-eminently to that known as the process of 'levelling down.' It is said that if you cannot elevate and raise the institutions so as to make them equal, the only thing to do is to abolish them altogether. I object to that policy."

The noble Earl goes on—

> "If it is desired to make our Churches more equal in position than they are, this result should be secured by elevation and restoration, and not by confiscation and degradation."

Now, my Lords, there is only one interpretation possible to be put upon that. If you are to bring about equality, not by levelling down but by levelling up, clearly you must endow the Roman Catholic priesthood; and you must give them not a small endowment as if by way of compensation for existing privileges, but an endowment of a substantial amount, such as would be equal to the endowment of the Protestant clergy. But, my Lords, that is not all. The Prime Minister, speaking only one week later, said—

> "What always strikes me with regard to Ireland as a general principle is that you should create and not destroy. . . Nor do I wish to conceal my strong opinion that we are approaching the time when there must be a change in the *status* of the unendowed clergy of Ireland. . . I do not believe that the Irish Established Church will remain with respect to the other portions of the population—with regard to the clergy of the other portions of the population—in the identical position which she now occupies."—[3 *Hansard*, cxc. 1788-9-90.]

Here, again, there can be no mistake as to the scope and direction of these words. The Prime Minister expresses his opinion that we are approaching a time when there must be a change in the *status* of the Roman Catholic Clergy in regard to the clergy of the Established Church. This can only mean that we should give them something of the privileges and something of the advantages now enjoyed by the clergy of a small minority of the people. Then, with respect to the endowment of the Catholic University, I confess I admired the simplicity of the noble Duke the President of the Council, when, after reading passages from Lord Mayo's speech, he added that if what Lord Mayo spoke of was an endowment, he did not know what an endowment was. Let me again quote the words of Lord Mayo, from the authorized edition of his speech. I do not use the term in an offensive sense, but, if there be not exactly a quibble, it appears to me that there is an evasion on the part of the Government in reference to this matter. They deny that they proposed an "endowment." Well, of course, if they did not make a Motion there was no formal proposition; but the question is, can anyone read this statement of Lord Mayo's without coming to the conclusion that the Government were ready to bring about an endowment of the Roman Catholic University, and did substantially propose it to the House of Commons?—

> "With regard to endowment, it will be essential, of course, if Parliament agrees to the proposal, in the first instance, to provide for the necessary expenses of the University—that is to say, the expenses of officers of the University, of the University Professors, and also to make some provision for a building."

Why, my Lords, Professors are the very men we endow, if we endow anyone, when endowing Universities. If that is not endowing a University, I hope the noble Duke will explain what is.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I ask the noble Duke whether he considers the University of London endowed?

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: I consider any University endowed in which the Professors are paid by the State. Your Lordships will observe that the sentence concludes with the words, "and also to make some provision for a building." The noble Earl goes on to say, "But with regard to the endowment of Colleges, it is impossible to make any proposal of that nature at present." I repeat that to deny that a proposal of endowment was really made is a mere evasion. It was not a Vote, but it was a proposition which was to have resulted in a more definite proposal.

Well, my Lords, the Tory party having agreed that we must proceed to bring about equality, either by levelling up or by levelling down, the Liberal party had to consider — were bound to consider — what course they should take in this great contingency of public affairs. And now, my Lords, I wish to represent to the House the opinion I have formed on this question of indiscriminate endowment. In the first place, I believe it to be impossible. You cannot do it. Public opinion, the public feeling of the country, would not allow you to do it. To prove this I refer to the conduct of the Government. What are all these attempts to get rid of the obvious meaning of those statements in the other House of Parliament? No one shows more caution than the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government in feeling the ground he is about to tread. Wishing to know how the wind blew, he sent up those pilot balloons; but they did not float in the direction he desired. My Lords, here I must say that in these proceedings we see the full mischief of government by a minority. It is a great law of nature that all creatures which cannot live by strength are obliged to live by cunning. The present Government lives by cunning. It is a Government of manœuvre, and all Governments of minorities must more or less be in that position. But I hope that no Government, even of a minority, that may ever exist again, will govern so much by ambiguous phrases and by trying public opinion without committing itself to any particular policy. I say that an endowment of the Roman Catholic priesthood is impossible, and I refer to the consciousness of the Government that it is so as evidence of the fact. I will take another proof. I believe the language of the right rev. Prelates whom I have now the honour to address is witness of the fact that such endowment is impossible. I listened very attentively, and I assure them with very great respect, to the speeches they have made during the course of this debate, and I read carefully the speeches delivered by them at a great public meeting, at which I think there was a somewhat freer expression of opinion by the right rev. Prelates. Their position with reference to the endowment of the Established Church in Ireland is simply the position of "no surrender." They have argued the question on the principle of property, and nothing else. There is in that language no concession, and no possibility of any compromise. The right rev. Prelates give no sign of their readiness to let a single shilling of the funds of that Church go towards the endowment of the Roman Catholic priesthood. More than this, my Lords, I have observed no indications that they have considered the state of Ireland as a whole. There is no suggestion from them as to how this dangerous disaffection, the existence of which has been conceded by the Government of Canada, by Lord Mayo in the House of Commons, is to be met. I think the motto of all ecclesiastical governments might be written over every one of these speeches—"*Non possumus.*" They may say that to devise remedies for Ireland is our business and not theirs. I admit it; but I say, under these circumstances, we are not bound—we are not even entitled—to listen to their advice. They speak as ecclesiastics, and not as statesmen. And when the right rev. Prelates—as I fully admit they are entitled to do—complain of our having acted in a party spirit, I beg of them to remember that they are victims of a party spirit with whose strength no other can compare. No kind of government, no *esprit de corps*, is so overpowering to those subjected to it as the feeling of fraternity among the members of Established Churches. My Lords, I do not complain of that. I consider it an honourable feeling on their part; but in considering the wrongs of Ireland it is impossible for us to follow their advice. The right rev. Prelate who, I believe, is to follow me in this debate (the Bishop of Oxford) wound up his speech at the meeting to which I have referred by saying, "Let us go to the support of our suffering sister." Let us then, my Lords, consider the advice given by the right rev. Prelates simply as the advice naturally arising from a strong feeling, almost amounting to personal honour, as to their duty in supporting the Established Church in Ireland. The right rev. Prelates may be actuated also by a feeling as to the ultimate effect of this measure upon the Church of England. But I beg your Lordships to remember that we have had long experience in this House of the tendencies of the same feeling among the occupants of the Episcopal Bench. There never was a time when that Bench did not contain some of the ablest and certainly the best instructed men of the day, and I believe at no time has it contained abler, more noble, or higher-minded men than at the present moment. But I wish to put this question. Of those great changes made during the last thirty or forty years, the object of which has been to assail and remove invidious privileges of the Church of England, and which have all been productive of ultimate benefits, have they not been almost universally opposed by the great majority of the Episcopal Bench? I was very much struck with this when looking back a few years ago to some old debates, upon a question deemed at that time of immense importance to the Church—the repeal of the Test and Corporations Act. We younger men look back with perfect horror to a system of making the sacraments of the Church of Christ the test for civil office; and yet a large portion of the Episcopal Bench opposed the change, and one of the Bishops said he believed the measure was only a step to other changes, using precisely the same language which is used now with regard to the Church of Ireland, and which has been used with regard to every change of a similar kind. That Bishop added that hardly a petition was presented to the House of Lords which did not contain a spirit of hatred against the Established Church of England. Where is that spirit of hatred now? I believe it to be utterly gone; and it is gone because of those very changes which were resisted by the Episcopal Bench. And so I believe the Church of England would gain strength by being dissociated from an institution which sins against every consideration of natural justice.

And now, my Lords, I wish to say a few words upon this question of indiscriminate endowment from a different point of view. We are twitted by my noble Friend upon the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) with great cowardice in not avowing our sentiments as to the endowment of the Roman Catholic priesthood. He says, knowing what is the best thing to do, all politicians are so cowardly that they will not propose what they yet consider to be right. I am bound to say here—speaking for myself and not for others—that, in my opinion, such a measure would not only not be possible, but that it would not be desirable. If I were a Member to-morrow of a Committee, with absolute power to do what we thought best for Ireland, I would not vote for the alternative of indiscriminate religious endowment. My Lords, I have many objections to such a proposal. In the first place, I say that in the case of indiscriminate religious endowments you have none of the peculiar advantages of an Established Church; you have none of that connection between Church and State which so many persons value, and in which (though in this I do not agree) some persons see the very essence of the Church of England as it now exists. My second objection is, that the funds of the Established Church are utterly inadequate for the purposes of division. If you divide some £600,000 a year, the income of the Established Church, among all the different sects in Ireland, you do nothing but damp their energies, giving them in return a mere pittance in no respect adequate to promote their spiritual or temporal objects. Then, again, if you once begin to endow religious sects, where are you to stop? I do not see where you are to stop short of the Belgian or French system, which is that whenever a congregation, whatever its religion, amounts to a certain number, a right is thereby acquired to demand from the Government an endowment from the State. I say that is contrary to the whole genius of the English people; it never could be carried into effect here, and I believe it ought not to be carried into effect. A Church in such a position as that I have referred to is a very different thing from an Established Church—it is merely a paid Church. What we mean by an Established Church is a Church in close connection—almost identified—with the institutions of the State. We have a noble example of what is meant by an Established Church in the Bench which I have now the the honour to address. There we see in the highest Court of Parliament, the great officers of the Church joined with laymen in the consideration of public affairs. In the northern part of this country, in the Church to which I myself belong, we have the same principle exhibited, only in a different order, and directed to a different object. Instead of having ministers of the Church sitting in Parliament, we have lay members from every Royal borough in Scotland sitting in the Convocation of the clergy. Under such conditions as these, I say you have a power and a spirit given to religious bodies which you never could have by mere stipendiary clergymen not otherwise connected with the State. I beg your Lordships to observe that all these are arguments against the system of indiscriminate endowment which are entirely apart from what may be called the bigotry of Protestant feeling in this country. I say again that if I had to vote as a member of an absolute Committee, I should not vote for the indiscriminate endowment of Churches in Ireland. Then, my Lords, if this alternative cannot be accepted—and in the opinion of many ought not to be accepted—we have but one remaining, the alternative of the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland.

And upon this point I wish to say a few words on the main argument of the noble Earl and the noble Marquess who spoke with such ability on Friday night—that is to say, with regard to what they call corporate property. In the first place, I must observe that I think it a most dangerous argument to use to try and do away with the distinction which is inborn in the minds of all of us—the distinction between individual and corporate property. Talk of inflammatory speeches and Fenian addresses! I never heard such inflammatory speeches as I have heard in this debate from Tory Peers and Conservative Ministers. Some of those arguments will be repeated and studied and quoted in contests which may be coming—and this by men to whose opinions your Lordships will not be favourably disposed. I repeat that there is a radical and fundamental distinction between individual and corporate property, and that the State may deal with one in a different manner from that in which it may deal with the other. But I say further, that even this is not the question before us. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) talked throughout his speech of the corporation of the Irish Church. The Irish Church, in that sense, is not in any way a corporation, and it can possess no corporate property whatever. Of course, it may be said that this is purely a technical argument, but I am answering one technical argument by another; and it is of immense importance not to use loose language with regard to a principle upon which the property of all of us depends. The Irish Church—meaning by that phrase the individual Irishmen all over Ireland who happen to be Protestants—is not a corporation, and has no property. Each individual Bishop is a corporation, and each holder of a living is a corporation; but Parliament has already assumed the right to deal with the property of these corporations. When you suppressed ten Bishoprics in 1833, you suppressed ten independent corporations, and you distributed their property among other corporations to whom it had never previously belonged. This is an indisputable fact, and I challenge any lawyer to contradict it. When the noble Marquess talked of property depending upon title I was about to ask him what is the title under which tithes derived from one of the suppressed bishoprics and given to some diocese near Dublin are held. There is no title whatever except the Act of 1833. I am not disputing the policy of the transfer at all, but I say it is a question of policy and not a question of property; that is my argument. Then your Lordships know perfectly well that whatever may be the abuses, or what are called the anomalies, of the Irish Church, whatever may be the over-proportion of Bishops or clergy to the congregations, these are not the anomalies or abuses which have raised any spirit of disaffection in the Irish people. It is idle to talk, in this point of view, of any mere re-distribution of funds within the Irish Church itself as a question of policy. It may be right or not; but no measure of that kind can be tried with any hope of success as a means of ameliorating the condition of the Irish people. One word before I pass from the question of property. I entreat your Lordships to observe that the doctrine of absolute property in the funds of the Church is absolutely inconsistent with any compromise whatever. If you stand upon the doctrine of property, you say that you never will consent to any compromise with regard to the division or appropriation of any part of the funds of the Established Church of Ireland. I ask the House to consider well whether that is a position to which they will be able to adhere.

Before I conclude, let me say a few words as to the very alarming opinions of my noble Friend the Chairman of Committees. The noble Lord said we have no right to deal with what he calls the property of the Church, because it is property "devoted to the service of God." Now, I have this fundamental objection to my noble Friend's doctrine,—I deny that money given to the service of the Church for what may be considered religious purposes is necessarily—observe, I say necessarily—given to the service of God. All the monastic property of the Middle Ages represented gifts for purposes which the donors regarded as religious, and yet I say boldly that those donations were not serving God's truth or cause. My Lords, we must judge whether money is or is not given to the service of God by the results which it produces. And we are free to judge of this from age to age. Our fathers so judged of the lands held by the monasteries, given, as regards the intentions of the donors, in a thoroughly religious spirit, and devoted by them, as far as that intention was concerned, to the service of God; but I say that our fathers judged, and all the civilized Governments in the world have judged, that practically that property was not spent in the service of God. And so I say you must judge of Churches in these matters precisely as you judge of all other human institutions. "By their fruits ye shall know them." If Churches produce good-will and peace among men, then the money given to them is indeed devoted to the service of God; but if we, in the exercise of our reason, and judging from all the circumstances before us, political, social, and individual, come to the conclusion that the money given to the service of any Church is producing evil effects, we are entitled to judge that that money is not being spent in the service of Almighty God. My Lords, I believe there is a great confusion of thought in men's minds upon this important subject; I believe, and I think I may conclude from the argument of my noble Friend the Chairman of Committees, as well as from some of the speeches which have been delivered by right rev. Prelates, that there is some confused notion in men's minds to this effect, that endowments are the fulfilment of the great duty of Christian giving. Now, my Lords, the chief element in Christian giving is self-sacrifice. But there is no self-sacrifice in endowments. So far from it, indeed, that endowments seem very often to have a damping effect on the inclination of members of Christian Churches to give. I was much struck by a remark which fell from the Primate of Ireland on this subject; he told us on Friday of the immense difficulty experienced by the clergy in getting in small subscriptions from rich members and rich supporters of the Established Church in Ireland. It is true he said things were mending in this respect, and I believe they are. I rejoice that they are mending, not only in Ireland but in England also and in Scotland. But, my Lords, I say it is a notorious experience of Established Churches that where you have the clergy provided for, not by our charity, not by our self-sacrifice, but by the charity and self-sacrifice of former generations, there is a tendency to make this an excuse for laziness and idleness, and for penuriousness in the Christian duty of giving. My Lords, I utterly repudiate the doctrine that we are not entitled to judge of the fruits produced by money given to Churches, and to deal with that money as statesmen are bound to deal with the revenues of all the other national institutions of this land. My Lords, I have never ridiculed, as many do, the doctrine of a State conscience, so strongly urged in his younger years as the foundation of Church Establishments, by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone). I believe that States have a conscience, and that Parliaments are bound to act by their consciences:—but for Heaven's sake let us remember that consciences must be enlightened, that they must be enlightened by argument and by reason; because the most horrible crimes ever perpetrated by mankind—crimes which have been the opprobrium of great men, and, alas! the scandal of the Church of Christ have too often been prompted by what men call their consciences. Not merely has the plea of conscience been put in in mitigation of guilt, but these crimes have absolutely been committed from the sincere promptings of a darkened, an unenlightened conscience. My Lords, the first dictate of my conscience in regard to such matters as those now raised, is this—that a Member of this House, a Member of Parliament, or a Member of a Government, is not only free to act, but is bound to act respecting matters of religion upon principles which may materially differ from those in which he should act as an individual. I cannot believe, for example, that my own private opinions in respect to religious truth entitle me to give the whole of a common and national fund to the support of the religion of a small minority of the people. My Lords, I am I confess a Protestant among Protestants; I hate the whole ecclesiastical system of the Romish Church; I believe it to be dangerous to the faith and injurious to the liberties of mankind. But I have the fullest confidence that the Protestant Church will be able to meet her opponents as well as and better than before, under the voluntary system. Let conscience be consulted—our State conscience—our conscience as public men. I entreat the right rev. Prelates, I entreat the Members of the great Conservative party, to put to their consciences this question—What would they feel as Irish Catholics if they saw a small minority of their countrymen in exclusive possession of the ancient ecclesiastical property of this country? I maintain that if there is any claim of property in the endowments of the Irish Church, the Irish Catholics have as good a plea as any others; for those who hold to the ancient mediæval faith of Christendom may most naturally claim that they should continue to enjoy the use of the funds originally given to those of that faith. The only answer to that claim is to assert, as I have asserted and do assert, the absolute right of the State to dispose of those funds as may be best and wisest under all the conditions of the case. I therefore entreat noble Lords opposite and right rev. Prelates to sweep away this injustice, remembering this above all things—that injustice in all its forms—political injustice not less, but more than others, as affecting the character and temper of whole generations of men—is contrary to the law of God, and injurious to the interests of His Church.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: My Lords, although it may seem almost presumptuous for one sitting upon these Benches to venture to address your Lordships upon this subject after the denunciations of the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll)—after having been told that, being ecclesiastics, and necessarily bound to regard matters from an ecclesiastical point of view, we are no longer entitled to deliver any judgment upon any statesmanlike matter upon any statesmanlike principle; yet I venture to believe that not all the House of Lords will endorse that sentiment, in which my—perhaps prejudiced—eyes see written in large and broad characters the word "Presbyterian." Now, my Lords, the noble Duke has not only given us this proof of his determination to put us down, but he has, I think, shown to-night a courage—I will not say an audacity—which has exceeded the bounds even of his ordinary daring. The noble Duke began by dealing with the Bill and not with the general subject which is occupying your Lordships' attention, and in doing so he first of all fell upon the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey)—which is, I think, a great mark of courage—and it was with some warmth that he assaulted the noble Earl—whose speech, by the way, seemed to me so entirely to demolish this Bill, that I could hardly conceive what could be said in its favour after that speech was delivered; and what very much bears out the truth of my view of that speech is this—that until this brave man came into the field not a single person has dared to deal with the arguments of the noble Earl. Falling upon the noble Earl, the noble Duke attacked him for having said that really the funds of the Church were so ample that it did not matter if a little more was spent rather than have this Bill passed, which was to kill the Church by inches. But, my Lords, what did the noble Earl say? Instead of saying that the funds of the Church were so ample that it did not matter what was done with them, he said that if you put side by side the two great principles of justice to the Church in Ireland

and to its funds and the comparatively little loss which would be entailed by letting the appointments of another year or another six months go on, he esteemed but lightly the money that was to be saved compared with the principle that was to be lost. The noble Duke then proceeded to assert, among other remarkable facts, that there were at this time in the Church of Ireland more livings than there were people, and that therefore there was nothing——

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: I beg your pardon; I said nothing of the kind.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I wrote the words down. I am quite sure they did not convey the noble Duke's meaning; but that he said what I have stated there is no doubt. "There are in Ireland more livings than people to supply them" fell from the noble Duke's mouth. [The Duke of ARGYLL dissented.] No, you did not mean that, of course; but as it has been said perhaps I may as well say that I hold in my hand at this moment a list, which I shall be glad to place at the disposal of the noble Duke, of twenty-two parishes in Ireland, the Church population of which varies from 8,000 to 1,000, and the revenues, including pew rents, from £188, the highest, to £89 per annum, the lowest. There is therefore certainly a considerable number of livings very ill-endowed indeed at present in the Irish Established Church. I think, at all events, that I do not misunderstand the noble Duke's argument about disendowment. When the noble Duke told us that the word had been left out intentionally after the most solemn consideration of what the case required, and that the Resolutions which pledged the House of Commons to disestablishment were purposely not intended to pledge the House of Commons to disendowment, I began to breathe—I began to think that we must all have been misled, and that the organs which represent with such marvellous accuracy all that passes in "another place" had in this instance been mistaken, and had led us to believe that hon. Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen had spoken words which conveyed a meaning exactly the reverse of what they intended—because the impression that those words conveyed to my mind, and to the minds of most of those who read them, was that not only the disestablishment but also the disendowment of the Irish Church were the objects which it was sought to attain. But I had hardly taken that consolation to myself when the noble Duke's succeeding remarks carried me back into the midst of my distress; because the noble Duke explained what he meant by saying that there was to be no disendowment. There was to be no disendowment, because the churches were not to be taken away—churches which, as the Returns show, have been mostly built during the present century; because the houses were not to be taken away—houses that in still greater numbers have been built during the present century; and because the glebes are to be given back to the clergy, or rather a small bit of the glebe is in each case to remain untouched, that there may be just something to delight the poor man's eyes as he looks out of the window—glebes which for the most part have been given to the Church since she was reformed, which are still being given to her—so much so that there are no less than four now being conveyed to the Church in the diocese of Limerick alone. So much for disendowment. The proposal of the noble Duke certainly appeared to me somewhat to resemble the conduct of a highwayman who, after having robbed a carriage and taken away all the jewels and gold, in the greatness of his liberality gave back sixpence to pay the next turnpike. But, my Lords, the noble Earl on the front Opposition Bench (the Earl of Clarendon), not the latest but one of the former Lord Lieutenants of Ireland, did make it abundantly clear that he at least perceived that the disendowment of the Established Church was intended. Now, my Lords, the noble Duke was afterwards kind enough to take notice of the speeches delivered by my humble self and two of my right rev. Brethren in another place, and the main fault that he found with us was that we spoke very ecclesiastically, because we did not propose that the money which was now devoted to the maintenance of the Established Church should go towards the support of the Roman Catholics. But anyone who could suppose that conscientious Bishops of the Established Church, holding the positions we do, and professing the doctrines we profess, could propose that the money devoted to the teaching of the Reformed Faith and to the maintenance of the teachers of the Reformed Faith should be devoted to teaching and to the teachers of a religion whose doctrines are entirely opposed to our own, must, indeed, entertain a strange and an extraordinary opinion. Indeed, it reminds me of a sentence of the late Mr.

Henry Drummond, who in what was apparently absurd, frequently conveyed much that was sensible. "It seems to me exactly as if the head of a great house should pay his butler a small premium to preach in the servants' hall against their coming to family prayers." Now, my Lords, when I listened to those parts of the noble Duke's speech, I could not see why he could not concur with the alternative of this Bill suggested the other evening by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury), who showed that if the real object were to prevent the creation of new vested interests the usual form of enactment ought to have been resorted to, and those who accepted any appointments which might become vacant should do so on the distinct understanding that they accepted them subject to the will of Parliament. Now, my Lords, it was quite refreshing to hear that the noble Duke and those who differed from this course objected to it, because the high respect in which they held the Episcopal Office would not permit them to leave its holders in a state of uncertainty. And here, my Lords, I must remark that I have noticed a great inconsistency in this Bill, for the Maynooth Professors—for whom I entertain the same sort of respect as the noble Duke entertains for those who occupy these Benches —are to have their places filled up, and those who take them are to take them subject to any alteration that Parliament may make. There must be some reason for making this distinction. I did not know what that reason was, but we now learn that it really arose from a desire to honour the Episcopal Bench—a feeling which I, for one, should be glad to cherish and nourish in the noble Duke and his Friends.

The noble Duke, however, turned from the consideration of the Bill itself to the consideration of that which, after all, is the great question before your Lordships —not this particular Bill with its absurdities and impossibilities, but the great question on which this Bill is intended to prepare the minds of the people of this country — the disestablishment of the Irish branch of the Church. That, my Lords, is the real question; and that is the question which will be submitted to the constituencies of the country in the course of a few weeks. That is the question upon which, I believe, your judgment even upon this Bill itself ought to be founded. It is for that reason, and not on account of its own intrinsic value—it is in itself insignificant, it is a mere pilot balloon on a greater subject—and merely to prevent the mischief of this Bill a bare majority against it would be sufficient—that I desire to see, as I hope I shall see, its rejection insured by a great majority of your Lordships' House; and I desire this to be the case in order that the country may be made to understand that the Peers of England are not prepared to secularize ecclesiastical property. Is it possible to separate the two things? It is said that the Government of England may accept this Bill, and that as they intend to pass some remedial measures and to distribute things much better, they really ought to pass it, because it will come in just in time to save a preliminary bit of legislation when they proceed to pass their own measure. But when I am told that this Bill is proposed in connection with the Resolutions carried in "another place," and that those who bring it in, bring it in with a view of carrying out the Resolutions, is it possible that, as a man of common sense, I can separate this Bill from that intention? Supposing a very good and wise member of the Society of Friends wanted to get rid of a "steeple house" in my diocese, and came to me straight from a meeting where it had not only been decided to pull down the church, but where the very scaffolding itself, necessary for the purpose, had been determined upon—would it not be absurd to imagine that I should listen to some such argument as this— "You won't, I am sure, object to my putting up a scaffolding against your church. You know you have often said that the little window near the top wants repairing, and you will find this scaffolding very convenient for the purpose. It is quite true that in some quarters there is an evident intention to pull down the entire building, but never mind what they say—recollect that your fane wants repairing, and let me put up the scaffolding." But I quite agree in one of the remarks that the noble Duke made towards the end of his speech—our decision on this subject ought to be dictated by the justice of the case. And, my Lords, whatever may be the other sins of my conduct in this House, I have not shrunk from the odium which my conduct in many cases entailed upon me, because I believed I was voting for what was just, and I believe that whatever is just is expedient.

Now, my Lords, to take one single subject which was dwelt upon very much by the noble Earl (Earl Granville), whose speech in bringing this Bill forward was a most masterly speech—I do not say convincing, I will not flatter my noble Friend so far as to say that—but his argument appeared to be much like that of the counsel in Court, who, when the character of the unhappy man in the dock precluded the idea of saying anything in its favour—when the evidence was so strong as not to admit of contradiction, with a skill which could not fail to excite admiration, went round every promontory of danger, threaded each troublesome path, and wound up by an appeal to the jury, in which he covered the man, to his own wonder and astonishment, with every rainbow hue of excellence and prosecuted virtue, and appealed to their sense of truth and justice to send him back without a stain to his sorrowing friends. Now, among other arguments employed by my noble Friend, there was that great argument about the clergy reserves in Canada. First of all, my noble Friend urged that everything that it was now proposed to do in Ireland had already been done in Canada; that though every kind of evil had been prophesied, every kind of good had actually been the result; and that so it would be in the case of Ireland. But, my Lords, the change made in Canada with regard to the clergy reserves was not a disendowing of the Church. We gave an independent Legislature to that country; and the question was whether, having given that Legislature, we should refuse to allow it to act on this subject-matter, or leave it to them to form their determination. My Lords, following as I have always endeavoured to do in the path of justice, notwithstanding the enormous obloquy to which I was exposed, I ventured to say that I felt bound to leave the matter to that Legislature. But the Duke of Newcastle, who brought forward the subject, instead of assuming that there was to be a disendowment of the Church there, said in the speech in which he introduced the measure that he trusted the Legislature of that country were too wise and just to use the power we were going to give them for the disendowment of the clergy. The case was this—The clergy reserves consisted of an immense extent of land, little of it brought into cultivation, and presenting a bar to the cultivation of the back settlements; the clergy had no means of cultivating the land and making roads, and what the country desired was that this should not be a continued bar to the progress of the colony. And when the measure was carried what did they do? By a liberal calculation the Canadian Government gave a large part of the value of these reserves to a corporation they founded to administer the funds for the benefit of the clergy; and so far was this from being any injury to them that it is a remarkable fact—and I mention it as greatly to his honour—the then Bishop of Toronto, one of the most outspoken men that ever lived, who sent his archdeacon over to pronounce almost a sentence of excommunication upon me for having supported the Bill, some six years afterwards sent the same man to tell me, "You were right; I was wrong"—that was the disestablishment—it gave us an immediate use of the property that was ours at a small sacrifice, which we could not otherwise have got. I ask your Lordships is that a parallel, a precedent, or argument for what you are now proposing to do with regard to the Church of Ireland?

My Lords, this is a very important question. We have been met with this taunt, that if we did indeed believe in the spiritual power which belongs to the Church of Christ we should not cry out so much about endowments. My Lords, no one has more implicit faith than I have in the power of the Church of Christ as a spiritual body—given a fair start—to do all that is needful for herself in this matter. But do not be deceived by these great sounding phrases. If you now disendow the Church of Ireland, do you put that Church in a fair position for providing for her own spiritual needs? The history of all countries and all times teaches you this—that the time of endowment is the time of a nation's youth; whether it be for ecclesiastical purposes or for educational purposes, for Universities or for Churches, it belongs to a nation's youth, not to a nation's age, to raise endowments. You might just as well, when you see a man cutting from off an ancient oak a certain part of the branches, tell him to go and plant it in the ground, and it will grow up another oak like that which sprung from an acorn, as say to me now in its age, "Disendow the Irish Church and trust to the vitality of your religion to re-endow it." And then, remember, bodies of men, laity as well as clergy, form habits, and the habit of an old endowed Church is to look at those endowments as their right, and not to look for money to other sources; and if at this period of the Church's history you suddenly disendow and cast it free of endowments, you are not giving it the ordinary advantage for maintaining the support of her clergy that you do at the period of starting a new institution. But, my Lords, this is not all. We are told that we are to disendow this Church because she is convicted in the face of the nation of a glaring injustice. We are told even that it does not matter what is done with that which is taken from her. What is that but saying we are dealing here with so open and convicted a felon that it is enough for justice to take from her all she has, although we cannot get the proper owner to restore it to —she must be stripped of everything because she is such a convicted robber? The argument of voluntaryism is a very favourite one; and a very remarkable statement has recently been made on this subject, to which I would wish to call your Lordships' attention—made not by the noble Duke, but by one to whom a great many look up —I mean Mr. Spurgeon. Mr. Spurgeon has written this letter concerning it. He was unable to attend the meeting respecting the Irish Church because—I mention it because I have a sympathy with him—of a severe attack of rheumatic gout; but he wrote a letter. He says—"It is in no spirit of opposition to the Irish clergy"—no, my Lords, nobody has any enmity to the Irish clergy when they propose to disendow them—everybody has the most wonderfuly feeling of interest in them, regard for them, anxiety for their welfare, and so has Mr. Spurgeon. He says—

> "It is in no spirit of opposition to the Irish clergy that I would urge upon the House of Commons to carry out the proposed Resolution, for I believe them as a body to be among the best part of the Episcopal clergy and to hold evangelical truths most earnestly. But because they are the best of the clergy they should be the first to be favoured with the great blessing of disestablishment. They will only be called to do what some of us have for years found a pleasure and advantage in doing—namely, to trust to the noble spirit of generosity which true religion is sure to evoke. They little know how grandly the giant of voluntaryism will draw the chariot when the pitiful State dwarf is dismissed."

Now, my Lords, allow me to set before you the other side of the picture—not by another writer, but by the same writer, viewing the same question from another aspect. In *An Epistle addressed to the Members of the Baptized Churches of Jesus Christ*, Mr. Spurgeon thus writes—

> "Beloved Brethren,—An exceedingly great and bitter cry has gone up unto Heaven concerning many of us. It is not a cry from the world which hates us, nor from our fellow-members whom we may have offended, but (alas that it should be so!) it is wrung from hundreds of poor but faithful ministers of Christ Jesus who labour in our midst in word and doctrine, and are daily oppressed by the niggardliness of churls among us. Hundreds of our ministers would improve their circumstances if they were to follow the commonest handicrafts. The earnings of artizans of but ordinary skill are far above the stipends of those among us who are considered to be comfortably maintained. We are asked repeatedly to send students to spheres where £40 is mentioned as if it were a competence, if not more, and those who so write are not always farm labourers, but frequently tradesmen, who must know what penury £40 implies."

Is that the provision the Irish clergy are to have?

> "I speak not without abundant cause. I am no retailer of baseless scandal. I am no advocate for an idle and ill-deserving ministry. I open my mouth for a really earnest, godly, laborious, gracious body of men, who are men of God, and approved of His Church. Are these for ever to be starved?"

Now, my Lords, it is because I do not wish to see the Irish clergy reduced to such a state that I protest against their being left to this specious protection of voluntaryism.

But, my Lords, the real point of the question comes back—is the assertion that the Church of Ireland is not in justice entitled to its endowments capable of being maintained? I maintain that it is not. The argument advanced for it will not bear investigation, and, on the other hand, the taking away of this property from the Church is an injustice. On what possible grounds can you say you are entitled to take it away? Does it not belong to the same body to whom it was originally given? Do they not do the same work—honourably, and as far as they could do it? If that be so the title to this property cannot be gainsayed. If you can show that a corporation does its duty no longer, you can only take away the property they enjoy where a *cy près* application is made by the Court, carrying out the spirit of the testator. Nor is the Church of Ireland the body to which these endowments were originally given. Her possessions may be divided into three portions. First, three-fourths of the whole of the Irish Church property was given between the time of St. Patrick and the conquest of Ireland by Henry II. to the native Irish Church. Do they teach the same doctrine? I maintain, and I defy anyone to contradict it, that the Church of Ireland at that time agreed more completely with the High Churchmen of England at this time than with the Ultramontanists on the other side the Channel. In the first place they were jealous of the sway of the Church of Rome. They boldly refused to come under the Romish yoke. They were condemned by the Church of Rome as schismatics, if not as heretics, because they resisted the oppressions which were brought upon them. The Church of Rome forbids the marriage of the clergy; the Church of Ireland allowed it. St. Patrick's father and grandfather were married clergymen. Which, then, did the ancient Church of Ireland agree with—our Church or the Church of Rome? The errors of Popery have been from age to age wrong developments drawn out of truth. There is no original error in the teaching of the Church of Rome—it is all truth travestied—the worst of all error, because there the savour of the old truth mingles with the poison of the new error. But, my Lords, observe—the lands which were given to the Church of Ireland were given when those evils in the Church of Rome had not yet risen to their height; but, such as they were, the Church of France and the Church of Ireland rejected them. St. Patrick learnt his Christianity in France, and, therefore, you may trace the tone he gave to the Irish Church to his training in the free Gallican Church, before he set forth on his mission to evangelize Ireland. The Irish Church as it then existed as a corporation is the Church which now exists. The Bishops and clergy of that Church, by lineal descent, have come down to the present time, and my most rev. Friend, the Archbishop of Armagh, can trace up his lineage to St. Patrick himself, whereas the Bishops of the Roman Church who claim that descent are but the pastors of an intruded branch of a foreign communion, and are not part of the Native Irish Church. Now, my Lords, how is it possible to deny these two facts—first, the comparative identity of doctrine at the time when the lands were given, and next the certain identity of body, the historical unity of the Church then with the Church now? How can any man, therefore, say that the Irish Church has not a just claim? But the lands were only one part of their possessions; tithes were also given. Now, when were the tithes secured to the Church? I ask noble Lords who are pressing this Bill to attend to this argument. The tithes were given when Henry II. conquered Ireland. They were given to the Church at the Synod of Cashel, which declared it to be an essential part for ever of that Church that in all Divine things it should be one with the Church of England. Well, the tithes were given to a Church which had a two-fold character—it was to represent the nationality not of what then was a conquered country, but of the whole Empire into which Ireland was then inserted, and it was to be governed by the laws which governed the English Church, and to be in full communion with it in all Divine matters. I ask you, therefore, on that principle which is the Church in full communion with the English Church and with the English nation—the body to which some would give these funds, or the body to which our fathers gave them, and to which I trust we shall preserve them? My Lords, I need not trouble you with any remarks about the third part of the possessions of the Irish Church, because it is admitted by everybody—even by the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll)—although the noble Duke is only for giving back a bit of each glebe—that all the glebes have been acquired by the Church of Ireland since the Reformation. Therefore, upon what possible ground of justice would you take away these glebes? Even the noble Duke would give the clergyman a bit of land at which he could look out from his cabin window. I say, then, that the claim of justice to these possessions rests with the Church of Ireland, and that it would be an injustice to take them from her. But is that all? That is only justice for the clergy. What of the laymen whom you have allowed to settle in different parts of Ireland? What of the 700,000 souls for whom you as a nation are mainly responsible that they are in Ireland? What about the poor man, cultivating the soil, and wholly unable if you pass such a Bill to obtain the ministrations of a clergyman? What of the farmers who sow the ground, and to a great degree have brought the soil of Ireland under cultivation? What of the small landed proprietors who have settled in every part of the country? Have they not a claim of justice? Are they not to be heard at your Lordships' Bar? Are you going to take away from them the provision which has been made for the souls of themselves and of their children, only because you are told that there are people who will never be easy until they abolish the Church? I say, therefore, quite as much for the lay people as for their clergy, the claim of justice is with the Irish Church.

And now, my Lords, there is an argument with regard to the Church of Ireland as to which I desire to say a word—as to whether that Church has done its duty. It has been argued that it was the bounden duty of the Church to convert the whole Roman Catholic population of Ireland, and that in that duty it has failed. Now, no one would have more rejoiced than I had the Irish Church succeeded in that great enterprize. But when you proceed to allot the blame—and if you do not allot the blame, what right have you to allot the punishment?—you must allot it to those on whom it ought to fall. And where is the blame to fall—upon the Church of Ireland, or the State of England? My Lords, I believe the great and master-reason of the failure of the Irish Church—for which you now taunt her—is because that Church was made the worst and meanest instrument of English misrule. Read, my Lords, the burning words of Primate Boulter—or, I will grant you, the exaggerations of the poet Spenser—or come down, if you like, to one soul incapable, as it seems to me, of a poetical idea—come down to Dean Swift, in all the hardness, the narrowness, and perhaps even the insanity, of his mind, and you will see who was to blame. Dean Swift describes what used to happen. He says—

> "No doubt the Queen's Government takes the best possible means of sending Bishops to Ireland. But, unhappily for poor Ireland, the holy man after his consecration sets out in his chariot to travel down to the West Coast. But, as by the laws of geography he has to pass over Hounslow Heath, the highwaymen beset his cattle, they murder his servants, and pitch himself into a ditch. The captain of the highwaymen then puts on his small clothes and goes over to Ireland, where he acts as Bishop in his stead."

My Lords, that is not at all such an over-coloured statement. If you go to Primate Boulter's correspondence you will find that if a clergyman lost his character here he was provided for in Ireland. That was the rule and not the exception. And then there were the penal laws forbidding the Irish people to learn to read. Did the Irish Church pass those laws? No; the Irish Church in those times was unable to do the work of an Apostle, and now, when she is able to do that work, men rise up, and for the ills that were committed by our forefathers they would visit her with extermination.

But then we are told that the object to be gained is so great that we must not look very closely into the matter. My noble Friend who moved the second reading of the Bill (Earl Granville) indulged in some exceedingly useful lectures upon the dangers that would result if we did not assent to the passing of this Bill. He told us, when we said that evil would come to the Church of Ireland, that we were indulging in vaticinations which we had no sort of right to indulge in, and which would be probably contradicted by time. Allow me to remind my noble Friend that there are vaticinations, which are not unfrequent, as to bright schemes of future felicity if we only make such and such concessions—but which not as unfrequently turn out to be fallacious. We have been told that peace and concord will dawn upon Ireland, and that true religious knowledge will be diffused over the land when the Church is disestablished. Will you allow me to read one of those vaticinations, because it appears to me to bear somewhat on the subject? It is a vaticination of a great man, J. K. Z.—I know him best by that name—the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle. Dr. Doyle was asked on a memorable occasion—

> "Would the objection to tithes as they now stand be removed in any degree by giving admissibility to political power to the Roman Catholic laity?"

His reply was—

> "Yes, I do conceive that they would be greatly removed." "In what way?—I conceive that the removal of disqualifications under which Roman Catholics labour would lessen considerably those feelings of opposition which they may at present entertain with regard to the Establishment, chiefly for this reason, that while we labour under the disabilities which now weigh upon us, we find that the clergy of the Establishment, being very numerous and very opulent, employ their influence and their opulence in various ways in opposing the progress of our claims; and I do think that, if those claims were once adjusted, and the concessions which we desire granted, the country would settle down into a habit of quiet, and that we should no longer feel the jealousy against the clergy of the Establishment which we now feel; because that jealousy which we do feel arises chiefly from the unrelaxed efforts which they have almost universally made to oppose our claims. We would view them then, if those claims were granted, as brethren labouring in the same vineyard as ourselves, seeking to promote the interests of our common country."

How far these rose-coloured visions have been fulfilled in unhappy Ireland every Member of your Lordship's House must know. Whenever, therefore, we are told that this or that new concession is to remove those difficulties, I confess there arise in my mind new doubts as to the fulfilment of these prophecies. And when I tried to satisfy my mind on the comfortable side I had recourse to what I think is, perhaps, the best evidence—that of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland—because they are more likely to know than other people what would probably be the result. There was a great meeting of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy, with the Very Rev. R. B. O'Brien, D.D., V.G., Dean of Limerick, at their head, at which they drew up a declaration, in these words—

> "Before the face of Ireland and the whole world we make this declaration."

Your Lordships may see from that how great the gravity and solemnity of the declaration is. The declaration goes on to say—

> "We solemnly declare that the only means of effectually tranquillizing Ireland is by a restoration of her nationality. General legislation by the Parliament of Great Britain will never be equal to the task of teaching, cherishing, developing, and raising Ireland. Political economy will never do for a country like Ireland, any more than the ordinary food of health and vigour would do for the weak and sickly. The most exceptional legislation must be employed, the minutest knowlege must be obtained, the most persevering local inquiry must be instituted, and a full, heart-whole, and we would say, exclusive attention, province by province, must be directed to discover and remedy Ireland's wants ; and these things an English Parliament cannot perform. An English Parliament has already too much to occupy it ; an English Parliament will always proceed by fixed principles applicable only to organized communities, and they will not do for Ireland ; an English Parliament will have to command a combination of parties who know little of Ireland, and cannot understand the necessity of entirely exceptional legislation—a thing absolutely essential to Ireland. And, above all, such a Parliament will never satisfy the yearnings of a whole people, whose intellects and whose hearts combine in the cry for nationality. A land tenure will accomplish something ; removal of the Prorestant ascendancy, by placing the Protestant Church in the same position before the State as the Catholic Church, will accomplish much."

(*Cheers.*) Yes, wait—

> "Equality in education, and the removal of the anomaly of giving a freedom of education on the condition of people giving up freedom, will do its share—and we will hail any and all of them with thankfulness."

Now for the cheer—

> "But we feel bound to say that when all of them have been granted, safety from foreign danger, perfect development of home resources, and we repeat, above all, the heart of this country will require nationality."

Now, is it not written in a book with which the noble Duke is perhaps familiar, "Surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird ?" If those whom you are to make eternal friends by the sacrifice of the Established Church of Ireland tell you, as they hold out their hands to receive the boon, "It will do nothing ; it is only an instalment ; it is not what we want ; it is valuable to us as a means, as a pledge, as a step towards separation from England, but without that separation it will be worth nothing to us ;" surely, I say, one must have even less sense than is possessed by a certain bird to be deceived by these assurances. Well, then, the argument of expediency breaks down altogether.

I have been told by an authority I cannot doubt that certain words used by me at a certain meeting at Oxford will be very likely to be rudely handled by a noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell), who is to speak presently. I suppose I must make up my mind to that, but I adhere to those words, and think I can prove the truth of them. They were delivered under peculiar circumstances, and when I mention what these were there is not one of your Lordships who will not understand my feelings. I was standing among the youth of Oxford when the news arrived of the murderous attempt made upon the life of our Royal Prince. The meeting was thrilling with excitement, and I did say, and am not prepared to withdraw the words, "We are asked to confiscate the revenues of our Church to buy off assassins." ["Oh!"] I say I am not prepared to withdraw the words. We have heard a good deal about foreign friends and their opinions on matters which they, perhaps, know very little about ; but there are certain things as to which it is safer to appeal to other men's judgments than our own, and, as the Scottish poet so earnestly desired, "see ourselves as others see us." One of the greatest of our foreign friends, Count Montalembert, attributes this movement against the Irish Church to the Fenian insurrection. Is our foreign friend to be trusted whenever he comes to a conclusion based upon misrepresentation, and is he to be cast aside when he is judging for himself what is the temper of the times ? Is it, then, entirely untrue that this is an attempt to buy off this terrible and disgraceful insurrection ? My Lords, I adhere to the assertion. Look at the newspapers published in the interest of these unhappy men. How do they receive the boon you offer them ? One of their journals speak of this measure as "Our first victory." They connect together the two movements—their movements of evil, your movements of conciliation. But suppose for a moment that there was not this coherence between the two things—the belief that such a connection exists is still most fatal to Ireland, and therefore, ecclesiastic as I am, I say that the bringing forward of this measure at this time was an unstatesmanlike proceeding, because it was so certain that the sacrifice of the Irish Church would appear to be a sacrifice to the Fenian insurrection. If, then, the Irish people will not be satisfied—if we are told that nothing but nationality or separation from England will satisfy them—is it not altogether inexpedient to introduce this measure? Is it not one of the most unstatesmanlike and unjust proceedings that a Legislature could devise? Is it not notorious that you are offering them a boon in a sense different from that in which you know they are prepared to receive it? And not only will their appetite not be satisfied, but they will take it as an attempt to deceive and cajole them, and will probably turn upon the giver with renewed vigour. Therefore, the measure is most inexpedient and most unstatesmanlike.

But then, I am told, we must remember that this is a sentimental grievance; that the Irish are a very sentimental people, and unless you remove their sentimental grievances you cannot get them to be at peace with England. Now, I know something about sentimental grievances. They mean this, either in individuals or in States,—a morbid sensitiveness as to some fancied wrong which, because it has not a real existence, is all the more difficult to remove. That is a sentimental grievance, and if given way to it becomes the most deadly poison. A man has a sentimental grievance against his elder brother because he cheats him out of the estate; and if we were in the days in which mad passion broke out into mad action, the tragedy of Cain and Abel would be enacted over again. Morally, the most dangerous thing a man can do is to cherish a sentimental grievance. We have sometimes heard of destroying a sentimental grievance by creating a real grievance, and I cannot help thinking that has been the attempt here, though it has been made in rather an Irish way. A real grievance is indeed to be created, only it is not in the minds of those who have got the sentimental grievance—it is on the opposite side. In old times, when a Royal pupil committed a fault, a boy was kept to be whipped for him, and it was supposed that the Royal pupil would in that way learn his lessons better for the future by seeing another boy whipped in his stead. That practice was not, I suppose, found to work very well, for it has been abandoned. But it is revived now, and my most rev. Brother and the rest of the Irish prelates and clergy are to be whipped in order to heal the sentimental grievances of the Irish people. I do not think that is a very wise course to pursue.

It seems to me, indeed, that all the arguments advanced in favour of this measure break down when you come to look at them. There is, to my mind, the prime argument of justice, and the argument, which stands next, of expediency. Then there is the fact that you will not be able to support the Church throughout all Ireland if you deal thus rudely with it, and that, in sweeping away from Ireland that presence, you will be doing a deep injury to Ireland itself—not only to your co-religionists, supposing that you are Protestants, but to the Roman Catholics who reside in Ireland quite as much as to the English residents. I believe that the effect upon the whole of Irish society of the residence in that country of the men who are acting as now the Irish clergy as a body are acting is one which cannot be easily calculated. They spread good around them upon every side; they raise the tone of honour, of truth, and of piety; they exhibit what it is to have a conscience capable of acting in the concerns of a man with his God. I believe there never was a time when the Irish Church was doing its duty as it is doing its duty at this moment. Try it by any test. After the Revolution they received 100,000 members of their Church; there are now 700,000 members of that Church. And of whom do these consist? I venture to say it—they are the salt of the society of Ireland. They are, as a body, the men of the greatest education; they are the men who undertake the greatest labour; they are the men who set an example to their fellow-citizens in all the relative duties of social life. These are the fruit of the work of the Church in that land. Do not tell me that they would have been there equally if you had not had that Church. I point to the example of Cromwell's soldiers, who settled in parts of Ireland where there is no Established Church, and whose descendants are now, many of them, the hottest representatives of the Roman Catholic religion. There is not among individuals religious depth and fidelity enough to maintain old impressions for long if these individuals are cast into the midst of a hostile communion with none of the advantages of their Church. Even in its days of weakness you had in the Church of Ireland that which you have now. To whom did we look in troublous times for the maintenance of the full connection between the two islands? Was it not to those, in the main, whom the Church of Ireland had leavened with principles of order, loyalty, and submission? Is this a time when you can afford to throw these men aside, when churches are being built every day, when schools are being multiplied, when glebe-houses are rising, when the clergy are improving in every one of their moral characteristics; when, I venture to say, they are becoming much better Churchmen and far less Calvinistic—is this a time when you should turn round on this Church, which has done so much for you, and with nothing to gain by the sacrifice, to slay her that you may appease a fancied sense of grievance? I, my Lords, cannot receive the noble Duke's statement that we are to regard this measure as a party question. I feel that if it were propounded to this House nakedly as a party move it would be rejected with the ignominy which I think it would deserve. But I cannot believe that it is so proposed. I believe that noble Lords opposite have persuaded themselves that they would promote the peace of Ireland by such a sacrifice; and therefore I have endeavoured briefly, but in the best manner I could do, to show that justice does not allow the sacrifice, and that expediency does not counsel it. I have no doubt how your Lordships will decide; but I ask you to give your decision with the unwavering voice of those who are acting on high Imperial principles. I have heard it whispered that men have said they would vote for this measure, although they felt that it would be an evil thing, because they knew it would not be carried. God forbid that there should be such an utterance from any one! God forbid that the great moral issues involved in this case should be decided in that way by any man, as though they were the sport of a party move! No, my Lords, if you do not look as much as I do to the religious aspect of the question, let me ask you to look at it as it affects the future state of England. It is not a question of the Reformation only. For 700 years, in Roman Catholic times as well as in the Reformed, your forefathers have been striving against the usurpations of Rome in a free country. The Statutes of Provisors came far before the Reformation. Your Plantagenet monarchs carried them and enforced them too. Henry III.'s reign gives you some grand examples of them. They knew the evil they were keeping out of Ireland. Are you prepared, upon the darkening of a summer cloud, to give up that which your Roman Catholic forefathers refused to sacrifice to the arrogant demands of Rome? Are you prepared to give to Rome — to give to the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, and through them to the clergy under them, the power of nominating the representatives of that country in the Lower House of Parliament? My Lords, I heartily wish that all to whom the Reformed Faith is dear would carefully ponder this certain issue. What if by driving from the remoter parts of Ireland the scattered members of your Church now living there you should hand over the representation of the sister island to the Bishop of Rome? If he is represented in the Lower House of Parliament by a serried phalanx of men bound above every other obligation to receive his commands and to carry out his will, what is the worth of the liberties of Great Britain, what the worth of the freedom of your Church of England?

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY: My Lords, I have from the first felt it quite impossible to discuss this great—this unspeakably great—question in all its length and breadth upon the immediate issue before us; and that impression has been confirmed by what fell from the noble Duke who opened the debate to-night, and who spoke of the distinction between disestablishment and disendowment. When we were told that disendowment was not intended, and that a compromise would be made, I think your Lordships must have felt that we cannot properly discuss this question until the whole scheme is before us. We are now all engaged in dealing with different issues; some of us looking to the Bill itself, others to the consequences of disestablishment, others to the consequences of disendowment; and we cannot come to any consecutive and uniform treatment of the subject. When I first looked at this Bill I confess it seemed to me a measure of a most meagre and insignificant character, and one that would do neither good nor harm. No doubt, the argument of the most rev. Prelate who presides over the Archdiocese of York showed that certain inconveniences would result from the provisions of the Bill if it were continued in operation for any considerable time; but I do not believe, after the Reformed Parliament has met, that any long time will elapse before a substantial plan will be submitted to this House. But, be that as it may, the rejection of this Bill will not retard or advance by a single hour the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Disconnecting the Bill from all argument as to the extreme consequences which may ensue, and disconnecting it also from the Resolutions adopted by the other House, but which do not appear here, I confess I am at a loss to conceive why the Opposition should be so anxious to carry and the Government so anxious to defeat this meagre and insignificant measure—a Bill that, it seems to me, derives its main importance from the resistance that has been offered to it. My Lords, I am prepared to maintain, as strongly as any man can do, the integrity of the Church of Ireland—subject, I mean, to all those necessary and wise reforms which it must undergo; and I sincerely hope that whenever a full and substantial plan shall be submitted to this House, in the next Session of Parliament, we shall find your Lordships ready to maintain the Church, even at the hazard of your own extinction, and that your attitude will be as bold and fearless as on the present occasion. But I think the House should look at this question in the way in which I feel assured it is looked at by the country. Observe how the Bill has come up to this House. It came up backed by a very large majority of the House of Commons on its second reading. All its subsequent stages were there passed almost in silence, and, therefore, it reaches us with the apparent sanction of the whole of that House. I must say we have a right to complain that the House of Commons should have intended to throw upon us the responsibility of rejecting the measure. Moreover, it comes before us in a peculiar form, not only as bearing the sanction of the other House, but also the sanction of Her Majesty herself, whose name and authority are recited in the Preamble. Therefore we have two branches of the Legislature against one in this matter. The Bill also professes, and will go out to the country—although I do not say it is the actual intention—as demanding no more than a full and fair opportunity for discussing this question. Its rejection, therefore, by this House will be regarded as a refusal of that demand—a demand in itself legitimate. That is the light in which I am certain the Bill and its rejection will be viewed by the country. I now speak in the interest of the House of Lords, and I solemnly declare that I view with dismay—on an issue such as this, so feeble, so powerless, so totally unaffecting the great issue to be raised hereafter—I view with dismay its going out to the country, on the eve of a General Election, that this House had set itself against giving the opportunity of a full, fair, and legitimate inquiry. I know very well that will be the way in which the whole thing will be perverted. I know that is the sentiment which is already beginning to prevail. I am not speaking my own sentiments alone, but that of many persons out-of-doors who are as anxious as your Lordships for the maintenance of the Church of Ireland. Thousands of those, who wish well neither to your Lordships nor to the Church are panting with eagerness for your Lordship's decision to-night, knowing that it is so liable to be perverted into an argument against you. If the elections were to be held a twelvemonth hence there would be time for public opinion to right itself: but as the elections will occur in two or three months, with all this mis-statement, calumny, and violence prevalent, I must say I do not wish this House to be exposed to the danger of misrepresentation without the possibility of explanation. It appears to me that this Bill has been constructed with a strategical purpose, as if with the object of inviting your Lordships to come down from the strong position you have occupied, and as you are descending the hill depend upon it there are thousands of Cromwells who will say, "The Lord hath delivered them into our hand." In a party sense, I can have no interest in the result of this contest, but I am bound to say that Her Majesty's Government could not have given to their Liberal rivals a heavier blow and a sorer discouragement than they would have done by passing this measure without a division. I am aware it may be said that this is the first step towards the main question—the disestablishment of the Irish Church. I think those who argue thus are justified in so arguing; but, on the other hand, I think others may be equally justified in maintaining, as I do, that this, though apparently a step in advance, is in fact no step at all, and yet it is a measure which, if resisted, will expose this House to no end of censure and calumny. Most earnestly so I say, that if we are to come into collision with the House of Commons and with the country, let it be upon some grand and vital measure; let it be upon something that the country can feel and understand, and not upon an issue so paltry, mean, and insignificant as this. I readily admit—indeed, I feel it intensely, that the main question with which we shall have to deal is, perhaps, the most solemn and most important ever submitted to our consideration. It has not only a civil, but it partakes very largely of a religious character. There are very good men who see their way clearly and conscientiously to the disestablishment of the Protestant

Church of Ireland. I venture to take an opposite view, and, perhaps, in taking that view I run into the opposite extreme, because I do as conscientiously believe from the bottom of my heart that if you proceed to overthrow the Protestant Church of Ireland by such means and for such purposes you will break up the foundations of our national existence, and take the first step towards a national apostasy. Now this Bill involves no principle, and is entirely a matter of policy or expediency. I had at at one time determined, with the view of escaping the snare which I think has been laid for the House of Lords, to vote for it. But I have now determined to take no part in the division. It is, I know, a pusillanimous course, and one which I am half-ashamed of; but I have taken it in deference to the most urgent entreaties and to the deep conscientious feelings of many who take a solemn, vital, and religious interest in this question. I confess my weakness in so doing, but I am willing to surrender that portion of my consistency in deference to the deep and earnest solicitations of persons for whom I have so profound and constant a regard.

The Duke of RICHMOND: My Lords, I shall not detain your Lordships any long time after the lengthened discussion that has taken place; but, holding the position I do as one of Her Majesty's Ministers, I do not think it would be right to remain silent upon so great an occasion—especially as to do so would be contrary to my inclinations. The noble Earl who has just addressed you (the Earl of Shaftesbury) described this Bill as a paltry one, and of such insignificant dimensions that your Lordships might have passed it without opposition; whilst the noble Earl who introduced it to your Lordships' notice (Earl Granville) described it as one of the greatest importance. I incline to take the view of the latter noble Earl. Since its introduction to your Lordships I have vainly endeavoured to ascertain from the speeches of its supporters the character of the measure and the probable results which may be anticipated should we pass it, and what are the special grounds which exist at the present time that did not previously exist, to induce your Lordships to adopt the measure. In endeavouring to discover its objects and its probable results, I am somewhat indebted to the noble Duke who spoke on Friday evening (the Duke of Somerset) with a candour which is so characteristic of his conduct both in and out of this House. I must say I sympathize with him on the exceedingly uncomfortable position in which he must find himself placed—namely, the position of supporting a Bill which he described as perfectly unworkable, to be followed by measures of the purport of which he was entirely ignorant. Nevertheless, though he had not been asked to take any part in the Resolutions on which this unworkable Bill was founded, and though he is quite in the dark as to what is to follow, the noble Duke with exemplary faith in the party to which he belongs, intends to give it his support. Now one of the great objections I have to the passing of the present Bill is that it is the forerunner of some scheme for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. If any such scheme be in existence your Lordships have a right to demand that it be laid before you. But if there be no such scheme then that is a sufficient ground why your Lordships should refuse your assent to this Bill. I am forced to the conclusion that the Bill is brought forward merely in order to prejudge and prejudice a question which is avowedly remitted by common consent to the decision of a new Parliament. The operation of the Bill extends only to the 1st of August in next year; but is there a man in the country who will pretend to say that there is any possibility of a scheme for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church, and for the appropriation of the funds which will accrue if such a measure be carried, passing in the meantime through this or the other House? This Bill virtually says to the members of the Established Church in Ireland,—"We have in our minds the disestablishment of your Church; we are not able at this moment to say whether it is possible to carry such a measure or not; but in the meantime and until we can carry it, we will hamper and cripple your ministrations, and, if we can do nothing else, we will bring your Church into such discredit as to render it powerless for good." It is not my intention to cite *Hansard* in order to prove the change of opinion which has taken place in many noble Lords on the other side the House in reference to this subject. I find no fault with those who honestly change their convictions, believing that the opinions they have held are no longer tenable, and that the progress of events and the force of circumstances required the adoption of a different policy. What, however, I do complain of is the fluctuation of opinion which has been exhibited by the other side on this question. The noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) the other evening quoted the speech of Sir George Grey who, in 1865, speaking on the part of the Government in opposition to Mr. Dillwyn's Resolution declared that no practical grievance existed, and that in attempting to redress the theoretical a great shock would be given to our laws and institutions. He went further, and said that it was—

> "The firm belief of the Government that the Irish Church could not be subverted without revolution and all the horrors that attend revolution."

It would seem, however, as if the right hon. Gentleman had one set of opinions when in Office, and another set when out of Office. In 1844, when in Opposition, he thought the Irish Church a grievance, and we find him using much the same arguments and language as we hear now. He said in 1844—

> "Among all the nations of Europe we find that Ireland alone is so peculiarly circumstanced that while seven-eighths of the population are Roman Catholics, and the remainder divided between Episcopalians and Presbyterians, there exists in that country an exclusive Church Establishment for the Episcopalian minority. This is a grievance that comes home to every man irrespective of the question of payment. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that this question is one beset with difficulty, but I deny that it is a difficulty sufficient to deter a Minister of the Crown from dealing with it."—[3 *Hansard*, lxxiv. 841.]

In 1865, being in Office, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "For these reasons, believing that the object avowed by those who have brought forward the Resolution is one which could not be attained without great mischief, being of opinion that no practical grievance exists, and that in attempting to redress the theoretical grievance a great shock would be given to our laws and institutions, I can have no hesitation on the part of the Government in opposing the Motion."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxviii. 402.]

My Lords, I cannot help thinking that these fluctuations, these changes of opinion are somewhat traditional in the policy of noble Lords opposite. I will remind your Lordships of two lines written some forty years ago by a famous poet, whose works have been edited by a noble Earl, a Member of your Lordships' House. Moore tells us that—

> "As bees on flowers alighting cease their hum,
> So settling into places Whigs are dumb."

During all the years the present Opposition were in Office, and when they could have calmly and quietly considered the subject of the Irish Church, they would not entertain it, and I hope that the poet may prove in this case a prophet also, and that if noble Lords opposite succeed to our places on these Benches we shall hear no more of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. My noble Friend who introduced this Bill (Earl Granville) spoke of the Fenian insurrection as if to show your Lordships the necessity for adopting such a measure; but, my Lords, the grievance of the Established Church, if it be one, existed in 1848, when, during the administration of the Government, of which my noble Friend was a Member, an insurrection broke out in Ireland; and yet that Government did not then propose any such Bill. They relied on force—they trusted to the strong arm of the law; but they never suggested the expediency of destroying this Church as a remedial measure. There is another argument which my noble Friend made use of—namely, that the members of the Established Church in Ireland were in a minority as compared with the whole population. But is this new? Why they have been in a minority ever since the Reformation—it was so at the Revolution, it was so at the Union, it was so at the passing of Catholic Emancipation—and I ask is there any man alive who thinks that if a clause had been introduced into that measure for disestablishing and disendowing the Established Church, on the ground that the Protestants were in a minority, there would have been the slightest chance of that Bill passing? And it so happens that the Established Church in Ireland are in a less minority now than they were at any former time. Take three periods during the last 200 years at which the comparative numbers of the Established Church and the Roman Catholics have been taken. In 1672 they were as one in eight to the Roman Catholics; in 1824 as one in twelve; and in 1861 as one in six and a half. Again, my Lords, if you allow this argument of minority to prevail in respect of the Church, I venture to submit that you will be admitting a very dangerous principle. I do not see how you will be able to limit it to the case of the Irish Church. Are not the landlords in a minority? are not the fundholders in a minority? are not the possessors of every kind of accumulated wealth in a minority? I do not see why the argument now sought to be applied to the Irish Church may not, if it be admitted in this case, be applied to them. Then we are told that Ireland will be pacified by this measure, or rather by the great measure which is dawning into existence, but which is still in a haze, even for my noble Friend who introduced this Bill. If it would pacify Ireland I admit there would be something gained by it; but first of all will it satisfy any one? We know pretty well whom it will dissatisfy. It will dissatisfy the Protestant population of the country. The right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Oxford) read to your Lordships an account of a meeting held at Limerick, from which it is perfectly clear that the Roman Catholic clergy who took part in that meeting would not be satisfied with the disestablishment of the Irish Church, because the Resolutions which were agreed to at that meeting point to the repeal of the Union as the measure which alone can satisfy them. They will take this and other measures if they can get them, but they will be satisfied with nothing short of a repeal of the Union. It may be said that the meeting in Limerick was held some time ago; but I hold in my hand a Resolution passed at a meeting which, as it so happened, was held on the very day my noble Friend introduced this measure. It was a meeting of the National Association held in Dublin, Mr. Alderman M'Swiney in the chair. In an account of the proceedings I find the following statement:—

> "The Rev. John Boylan, P.P., Crosserlough, diocese of Kilmore, proposed the following Resolution:—'That while the action of political parties in the House of Commons has brought into bold prominence, at the present crisis, the Church question, we are compelled to declare that the settlement of the land question—the primary grievance of Ireland—claims our earnest and unabated attention; and we are determined to urge at the forthcoming elections the settlement of the land question, without which there can be no industrial progress, no permanent peace, no fixity of the people on their own soil.'"

So that, my Lords, we find that at one meeting the clergymen present will be satisfied with nothing short of a repeal of the Union, while at another we find a reverend gentleman proposing a Resolution which declares that no remedy will be effectual till the land question is settled. Your Lordships will observe that the proposer of that Resolution attributes to "the action of political parties" the fact that this Church question has been brought before Parliament. I made no such accusation; because, as my noble Friend (Earl Granville) has disclaimed any party motive in the matter, I felt bound to accept that disclaimer. I merely refer to the statement in the Resolution to show you the way in which the question is viewed by the Roman Catholic clergy themselves. I say, my Lords, that if you are prepared for such changes as this you ought at all events to be sure that you are going to satisfy those for whom you intend to legislate. Another argument put forward in support of this Motion is that the Established Church in Ireland has not fulfilled the purpose for which she was intended—that she has failed as a Missionary Church. Now, my Lords, whatever may have been the case in former times, this reason cannot, with any fairness, be assigned at present, I find it stated that the Society for Irish Church Missions has raised within the last nineteen years, for exclusively Church work in Ireland, nearly £500,000; and that the operations of this Society have been carried on entirely through the machinery of the Established Church. It maintains 54 Sunday schools and 86 week-day schools, and its missionary agency comprises 34 ordained clergymen, 225 trained agents and Scripture readers, and 160 inferior teachers. 200 Sunday and 193 week-day services are held in each month, and the Scripture readers make about 9,700 visits during the same period. Then, my Lords, the Church Temporalities Act has been frequently alluded to. We are told that, as Parliament dealt with the Church by that Act, there is no reason why we should not deal with it now. But, my Lords, the Parliament of that day dealt with the Irish Church on a totally opposite principle from that now proposed—the two cases are entirely distinct the one from the other, as I shall show your Lordships by referring to the Preambles of the two Bills. The Bill now before your Lordships has scarcely any Preamble in the ordinary form; and accordingly when we want to see what its clauses are founded upon we must refer to the Resolutions which preceded it in the House of Commons. The first of those Resolutions, which declares that the Established Church in Ireland ought to cease to exist, is the real Preamble to this Bill. But here is the declaration in the Preamble of the Church Temporalities Act—

> "Whereas the number of Bishops in Ireland may conveniently be diminished, and the revenues of certain of the Bishoprics applied to building, re-building, and repairing of Churches and other such like ecclesiastical purposes, and to augmentation of small Livings and to such other purposes as may conduce to the advancement of religion and the efficiency, permanence, and stability of the United Church of England and Ireland."

Is there any similarity, my Lords, between a Bill having for its object "the efficiency, permanence, and stability of the United Church of England and Ireland," and one having for its object the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish branch of that Church? But, my Lords, what is this Church which you are asked to disestablish and disendow? It is the one Church established in England and Ireland. Of the Irish landowners it has the support of eight-ninths; and to disestablish a Church which is supported by eight-ninths of the landowners of a country seems to me an exceedingly unjust measure. I have endeavoured to put before your Lordships, with very few quotations, the views which I entertain upon this subject; but I must ask your Lordships' attention to a few words which describe, in better terms than I can employ, the exact position of the Irish Church. The passage is taken from a speech delivered in this House many years ago by a former Bishop of Limerick, who described the English and Irish Church in this manner. He said—

> "On the whole, then, I would exhort those who love and venerate our Constitution, both in Church and State, to consider what we have at stake—the integrity of our United Kingdom and the Protestant Faith of this Protestant Empire. If one portion of the Church suffer, all must suffer with it. The Church in England and the Church in Ireland have no separate interests, have no separate being—they must stand or fall together. The united Church of England and Ireland is one and indivisible. It was made so by solemn national compact in the Act of Union. This identity constitutes the fundamental Article of Union; we might as properly speak of two Houses of Commons, two Houses of Peers, two Sovereigns, two complete Legislatures, the one for England, the other for Ireland, as speak of two distinct Churches. The national faith of both countries is pledged equally to maintain one Church, one King, one House of Commons, one House of Lords. If Parliament, therefore, were to subvert or to re-model the Church Establishment in Ireland it would break the Union; and if it break the Union it will enact its own destruction; it will enact a revolution; and of such a revolution the fruit would be nothing else than anarchy and public ruin."

I fully concur with the right rev. Prelate that the compact so entered into between the Parliaments of the two countries has up to this time been solemnly and religiously observed. I believe the Church to be a bond of union between the two countries; and therefore nothing upon my part shall be done to strengthen the hands of the enemies of that Church to proceed with the work which they have commenced. But if this attempt upon the Established Church in Ireland be successful, it will be followed by other attempts to subvert the Protestant Constitution in England and Scotland. I should be very sorry to see the balance of the Constitution thus destroyed; and I believe that if this attempt be successful such will be the result. Recollect, my Lords, if you destroy this Establishment you will by no means have destroyed all Establishments; you will be left with one great Establishment which owns its allegiance not to the Queen of England, but to the Pope of Rome, against the aggressions of whom this country has successfully and manfully striven for the last 300 years. I believe that this successful resistance has been mainly owing to the union in this country of a Protestant Church with a Protestant State; and upon the continuance of that connection will mainly depend the permanence of the Constitution as by law established in this country, and the maintenance of the rights and privileges of all denominations of Her Majesty's subjects.

Lord HOUGHTON: My Lords, your Lordships, by the long and serious attention given to this subject have shown, I think, your conviction that it is one which cannot be disposed of by an abstract vote or by a Suspensory Bill. It is fully understood that we are now standing in the vestibule merely of a great national discussion, without any hope or desire to close it by our vote to-night. The greatness of this question can be only appreciated by men who, having studied the history of their country, have seen how this question of the Established Church of Ireland has mixed itself up with other matters, and how, having been discussed and thought about almost during a century, has burst out in the front rank. The question has been surrounded with many collateral issues; but as to the main question—that of the right of the State to deal with the Irish Church—I can have no doubt whatever; for to entertain a contrary opinion it would be necessary, as it seems to me, to go contrary, not only to the very spirit of Protestantism, but to the course of Church reformation of any kind. What has been the course of reformation in all Churches but to deprive them, to a greater or less extent, of properties received from the pious bequests of bygone generations, but which, in the opinion of these times, can no longer be beneficially applied to the purposes for which they were given? We have seen in Spain — a most essentially Catholic country, under the regency of Queen Christina, herself a most devoted Catholic—one-third of the land taken out of the hands of the clergy; and that has been since recognized as "an accomplished fact." The change certainly has not been productive of the great advantages which were expected; nevertheless, it has had the effect of placing the ecclesiastical system of Spain on an entirely new footing. The same process is going on in Italy, and is being carried out, notwithstanding opposition in Rome. And there are many more instances of a like character. I cannot see, therefore, how, in a Protestant country, and surrounded, as I am, by so many of your Lordships, who are possessors of property which formerly belonged to the Church, it can be contended that to touch any portion of the property of the Irish Church is an act of sacrilege. The right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Oxford) tried to be very jocular on the subject of what he called sentimental grievances; and he wished your Lordships to believe that these meant nothing more than wounded vanity, or feelings worthy of no serious attention. But I think that if we pay heed to the history of the world, all the great tumults, and difficulties, and revolutions, have sprung from what are called sentimental grievances; the line between sentimental and material grievance is so narrow that you never can tell when one will run into the other. Sentimental grievances have this peculiarity—that if you do not touch them in the right way and at the right time they become material grievances, and prove the source of great danger. Another point put forward is the supposed identity of the Churches of England and Ireland, as to which the noble Duke who spoke last read a quotation in which that identity was asserted in the baldest form. My own opinion is that if it is held that the few hundreds of thousands of Irish Protestants form an integral part of the Church of England, then it must with equal force be held that the millions of those who do not belong to that Church must be held to form part of the great Nonconformist body. The Church of Ireland must, in fact, be taken upon its own merits, and must be regarded in the light of its own political circumstances. Disestablishment will certainly not utterly destroy the usefulness of the Irish Church as has been alleged. Let us consider what that Church might become; and become in consequence of her disestablishment. Have we not, for instance, a Church in India admirably served as to all its offices, affording to English Protestants the necessary ministrations, and yet it is not a State Church in the Irish sense of the word, and it exists in the midst of a population, very greatly superior in proportion of numbers to the Roman Catholic population of Ireland? I see no reason why the same should not be the case in Ireland. Take it how you like, with regard to the Irish Church, as long as that disproportion of numbers exists it must still be the Church of the Conqueror—the Church of the Garrison. If I am asked how the question comes before your Lordships, I am told it has been brought forward as a party movement. The noble Duke said so to-night; but I cannot see why that should be made an objection to doing what is in itself right; those who wish earnestly that a thing should be done are most likely to find the best way of accomplishing it. I think, however, some injustice has been done to the Government in respect of the Irish question. In this I think the effort made by Her Majesty's Government to conciliate the Irish Roman Catholics—although I do not think it was made in a wise direction, for national education ought not, in my opinion, to have been the first thing modified—was, nevertheless, and I do believe a good and generous effort, and I regret that it was not appreciated as it as it deserved. To apply a quotation which must be familiar to your Lordships —"*Quod beni cogitasti aliquando laudo; quod non fecisti ignosco; virum illa res quærebat.*" It did require a great man to do this: it required a great man because it was necessary that he should have the courage and the power to set himself in a great degree against what I will not call the common sense, but the common nonsense of the country. My Lords, had Her Majesty's Government boldly avowed the intention, even at the sacrifice of power, of conciliating the Roman Catholics, as Mr. Pitt proposed and as George III. approved, I verily believe they would have been successful. But I do not mean to say that it would be possible to introduce religious equality by placing the Roman Catholic Church in a position of dignity. I do not believe that the Roman Catholics will go against this Bill, because such a course would be contrary to their history and traditions. I believe that the only satisfactory way of solving the difficulty will be to place the Roman Catholics and the Protestants upon the same footing. At the present time no person can say that they are upon a basis of equality. Your Lordships must come sooner or later to the resolution to place the Protestant population of Ireland on the same footing as the Roman Catholics, among whom they are sparsely scattered. The Roman Catholics of Ireland have won the respect of the whole of Europe by the tenacity with which they hold to their faith, and the greatness of their sacrifices to maintain that faith inviolate. I therefore trust your Lordships will throw no impediment whatever in the way of this Bill, but will clear the way to a statesmanlike solution of the greatest difficulty of modern times.

THE EARL OF BANDON: My Lords, my apology for venturing to address you on this subject is that I have been called upon to preside at one of the largest Protestant meetings held in Ireland during the last quarter of a century. I hope, as a layman, you will let me put in my plea in support of my claim to a vested interest in the Church of Ireland. I am merely repeating the sentiment of that vast assemblage when I declare my conviction that the property of the Irish Church cannot be confiscated. Those who attended that meeting in no way desired to curtail the privileges their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects enjoyed, but they were determined to maintain inviolate the great principles of the Reformation. They sought for no Protestant ascendancy, except that which was inseparable from the supremacy of their Queen and the security of the Crown. As a specimen of the manner in which the Suspensory Bill would work let me adduce an example from my own parish. The parish is large, but the income is so small that the clergyman would naturally not employ more assistance that is absolutely necessary, but he has two curates; and if we should happen to lose our incumbent in the course of this summer with this Bill in operation it would be in the power of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to place only one clergyman in their stead, or even to join the parish to another. If the Bishop were to die the case would be even more deplorable; the whole of the clergy would be without their chief. And what does this clergyman receive as his share of the enormous revenues of the United Church of England and Ireland? The net revenue of the parish is £19 19*s.* 3*d.* I have inquired into our title to this property, and I find it originally belonged to the Knights of Jerusalem, from whom it was confiscated and given to the Abbey of Mowone, in the county of Cork; but in course of time it was again confiscated. Well, you come to the question upon what higher grounds does the property of my noble Friend, who receives the rectorial tithes, depend than the property of the vicar of the parish—for both were taken at the same time? But this Suspensory Bill not only suspended the property of the Established Church, but it stopped the grant to Maynooth. Were the present assailants of the Church prepared to say that all their legislation for the last thirty years with regard to Maynooth was totally wrong? Such, however, was the logical conclusion of their proceedings. Now, there was one statement made by the noble Lord who introduced this Bill to which I am anxious to allude, inasmuch as I think some refutation is necessary. The noble Earl repeated the accusation which has so often been made—that the Reformed Church robbed the Roman Catholic Church of its revenues at the time of the Reformation. But it is somewhat extraordinary that if such were the case there should be no record of the fact. By the Acts of Parliament of Henry VIII. the taking away of the property of the monasteries was recorded; but there was no record to be found of any transfer of property from the Roman Catholic Church to the Established Church. Now, my Lords, we are told by those who support this that the whole of this Irish Church agitation is the result of the Fenian conspiracy. I happen to be a resident in that part of Ireland unfortunately where the Fenian boats lately landed. Being so near, I listened with the greatest attention to all that occurred at the time, and it struck me as somewhat curious that the connection between Fenianism and the Irish Church was never discovered till the late Government lost power. The Attorney General and Solicitor General of Ireland for the late Government, while conducting the trials against those members of the conspiracy who had been arrested, never even hinted at this alleged cause of Irish discontent. It is said we ought to defer to the feelings of the majority of the people in Ireland, and that it is for them to decide what should be the established religion. But, my Lords, how is that opinion to be ascertained, and to whom are we to refer the question? There are more than 2,000,000 people in Ireland who can neither read nor write, and are they to have a voice in the question, and to decide which Church shall be the established one of the country? I have been a good deal in the habit of mixing with the people of Ireland, but I never hear a single word said about the Established Church. It is not until I come to London that I hear of complaint as to its existence. Let us pass a decree for its abolition and our difficulties only commence, for to what purposes will you apply the money which you will obtain? The Roman Catholics profess—whether sincerely or not I do not pretend to say—that they will not consent to receive any of the emoluments of the Established Church. Do you intend to apply them to the reduction of the burdens borne by the public Treasury, or to the erection of harbours or other public works? And, my Lords, there is this extraordinary fact in connection with this Bill—that this is the first time that it has been proposed to the members of a Church to destroy that Church for its own benefit. It is a curious circumstance that in the time of James II. there was a Suspensory Bill brought forward for Ireland, which also passed the House of Commons, and there appears to have been some similarity between the Bill and one lately brought up to your Lordships' House, for Archbishop King told us that life-interests were to be preserved by James II.; but the Roman Catholic clergy of that day, not satisfied to wait their time, came, and before the livings were vacant took possession of them. I might quote the testimony of Lord Coke, to the effect that nobody will bring up his sons to study for a profession like the Church when they would have, after painful study, nothing to live upon. I might also quote from Sir Henry Bulwer's *Historical Characters* with reference to the property of the French clergy during the Revolution when Prince Talleyrand proposed to preserve the rights of the existing clergymen. Sir Henry Bulwer says that the clergy complained, not so much of the insufficiency of the provision made for them as of the grievance that their income of proprietors was changed into that of life-renters, and that the Bishop of Autun had mis-stated their case and justified this robbery. But, my Lords, we have been told that the Irish has failed as a Missionary Church. That statement I entirely deny. It is now thirty-four years since I defended the Irish Church in the House of Commons, and its condition has been greatly improved since then. Many new churches have been built, and the clergy are active and zealous; the Protestant population has enormously increased in proportion to the Roman Catholics; and although in some instances there has been a slight diminution in the number of the Protestants, and I can state on the authority of the clergymen, that in the county of Cork, with which I am more particularly connected, the zeal of the Protestant portion of the population and their attendance at the services of religion has increased in a remarkable proportion. The clergy never were so active. The late lamented Primate said he found the Irish Church in difficulty and he left her in spiritual efficiency. Even of Roman Catholics there are many who regard the Irish Church as a barrier against the tyranny of their own clergy. If absenteeism is an evil, this Bill will greatly aggravate it, for its natural tendency must be to lessen the desire of the Protestant proprietors to reside in a country in which they are deprived of the services of their religion. Are you prepared to take away that property which has belonged to the Irish Church from time immemorial, which was secured by the Act of Settlement, and guaranteed by an essential Article of the Union? The very basis of that Union was that there should be one united Church. If your Lordships will suspend nothing else by this Bill you will suspend the future peace, happiness, and prosperity of Ireland. The result will be that landlords will seek to have tenants of their own religion. I do not say that is the right thing to do, but it will be the inevitable result. We are told that the Church of England will not suffer if you attack the Church of Ireland. I think the noble Earl who held the Seals of the Foreign Office told us something that we should beware of. He said that to the Church of England the danger was not from without but from within. My Lords, we know what that danger is, and will you increase it by demolishing a Church, which, poor though she may be in this world's wealth, has been always pure in her faith and true in her adherence to the glorious principles of the Reformation. Dr. Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, says, "I know the State knows no separate Church of England or Ireland. The State knows of one United Church of England and Ireland." My Lords, I wish you would read a speech made by the late Bishop of London, (Bishop Blomfield), in which he told this House that if the Opposition were to destroy the Church of Ireland they would not be content. He says, that having once gained a victory over the weaker Church, they would be only encouraged to go on when the prize before them was so much greater. I firmly believe that it would be the greatest possible evil for Ireland if you were to destroy the Established Church. If you were to ask me what I would do in a political sense for Ireland I would implore you to leave her alone. If you would ask me what I would have you do to satisfy her people, I would say develop her resources, extend her railways, make her great harbours available to the shipping of the world. That will secure peace, which alone will enable capital to be introduced into the country. We are told that the people of Ireland are disaffected and disloyal. Was that found to be so when the Prince of Wales visited Dublin? I do not speak now of the reception he met with within the ancient walls of St. Patrick, but of the reception which greeted him from the people themselves in the streets of Dublin and the racecourse of Punchestown. My solemn belief is that if his Royal Highness were to visit Ireland again, be it in the South, West, or North, his reception would be equally enthusiastic, and if he were to visit the beautiful scenery of Killarney the mountains would be made to echo with the cordial cheers of a loyal people. My Lords, I would implore you to reject this Suspensory Bill. It is ruinous, mischievous, and would make Ireland miserable. I pray you, by the martyred blood of the Reformers, by the memory of your ancestors, who gained the glorious revolution of 1688, by the present peace and the future prosperity of Ireland, to reject the Bill. I would remind those who are about to appeal to the country of the oft-repeated but true lines—

> "Facilis descensus Averni;
> Sed revocare gradum superasque evadere
> ad auras,
> Hic labor, hoc opus est."

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, as one of the Peers who signed the declaration of the Roman Catholic laity in favour of religious equality I have some right to be heard upon this question. That declaration was a disclaimer of the statements so offensively reiterated that in Ireland there was a feeling of apathy upon this subject. That declaration was signed by the Irish Roman Catholic Peers, by all Roman Catholic Members of the House of Commons except two, and by the most eminent members of the professional and commercial classes in Ireland; and such a declaration must be looked upon as representing the opinion of the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland. In the course of this debate we have heard a good deal about spoliation of the Church. But we have not heard of the alienation by the Protestant Bishops of so much of the landed property of the Church for the benefit of their relations, until the abuse was checked some years ago by an Act of Parliament, which made it illegal for Bishops to let see lands at a lower rent than two-thirds of their market value. Every Bishop, on appointment, refused the renewal fines; and when from this procedure the existing leases expired at the end of twenty-one years, he then let the lands at a merely nominal rent to some member of of his own family. Instances of this alienation have been frequent in most of the Irish dioceses. For instance there was a property worth £8,000 a year sold in the county of Meath, which had been bequeathed by a Bishop of that diocese (Dr. Dopping) to his descendants; and I believe that a great proportion of that property, like many others of a similar class, consisted of Church lands, which, being converted into perpetuities, are now lost to the Church and the State for ever—unless, indeed, the consciences of the present possessors are smitten by their own argument, and they restore the property. It certainly is remarkable that the persons most vehement against the spoliation of the Irish Church should be those who profited in a great degree by a similar line of conduct. My Lords, if you throw out this Bill, in what spirit will the great majority of the Irish people approach the hustings next November? With feelings of the greatest irritation—feelings, indeed, almost of despair at ever obtaining redress from the Imperial Parliament for the grievances from which they have so long suffered. Then there will be the smouldering embers of Fenianism. I do not know that Fenianism has much to do with this subject; but a passage from Mr. Maguire's book may be usefully remembered by your Lordships, in which it is stated that the Fenians in America would greatly deplore to see the grievances of Ireland redressed, because in that case their occupation would be gone. Lord Cornwallis described what occurred in the days of Protestant ascendancy, and the sort of conversation which was held at his table about the hanging, and shooting, and burning that went on. He says—

"The conversation of the principal persons of the country all tends to encourage this system of blood; and the conversation at my table, where you will suppose I do all I can to prevent it, always turns on hanging, shooting, burning; and if a priest has been put to death, the greatest joy is expressed by the whole company. So much for Ireland and my wretched situation."

In another he writes of the principal persons of the country—

"The words Papists and Priests are for ever in their mouths; and by their unaccountable policy they would drive four-fifths of the community into irreconcilable rebellion."

Such were the feelings of the ascendancy party in the days of Lord Cornwallis. And that this spirit is still rife in Ireland I think the language held at recent meetings of that party sufficiently proves. At a meeting held in the holy city of Orangeism,—its Mecca Enniskillen, — presided over by the rector, resolutions were passed that, if necessary, the Protestants would shed their blood as their ancestors had done; and one rev. gentleman, referring to the Coronation Oath, reminded the meeting that an English monarch had lost his crown at the Boyne, and warned Her Majesty of what would happen if she broke her Oath. I will now quote from one of their lyrics, popularly ascribed to an ecclesiastic of the Province of Armagh; it is to the tune of "Lisnaglad," a well-known party tune—

"Woe worth the day that Erin's Isle
To a Popish King did bow;
And Protestants, without a cause,
Were hanged to feed the crow.
Then Pope and Priest our pockets fleeced,
And Protestant blood did flow.

"They took our Churches from us,
And in them mumbled Mass;
They cramped our feet in wooden shoes,
And our money they made of brass.
They wanted us to cross ourselves,
And learn their Popish tricks;
To scrape and nod to a wafer God,
And worship the Crucifix."

Is this the language of the mild and tolerant almoners—of the gentlemen who live among us as civilizers, while the rest of the nation, as the right rev. Prelate would have us believe, is a nation of assassins? ["No, no!"] The assertion that the removal of such persons would be a great injury to Ireland is almost as ridiculous as that if the Protestant Church were disestablished the Protestants of Belfast would leave that place in a body. I must say that I regret that all the past history of Ireland cannot be buried in oblivion. But there can be no *tabula rasa*—these sad recollections affect the Ireland of to-day, and therefore we must deal with this question. Depend upon it the Irish people will never forget the past, and the future of Ireland can never be one of contentment and of peace so long as the Established Church lasts; there will be neither peace nor prosperity in that country so long as the laws are not administered equally for the benefit of the whole people.

THE EARL OF CLANCARTY: My Lords, I am very sorry to interpose between your Lordships and the noble Earl who has just given way (Earl Russell); but connected as I am by birth, by property, and by every tie of sympathy and affection, with Ireland, so often, as now, selected as the battle-field for the conflict of parties in Parliament, I am anxious to address to your Lordships a few words, and they shall be very few, arising out of this debate. Although I shall give my vote with the noble Earl who has moved to defer the second reading of the Bill, I do not concur with him in the view he has taken of the Protestant Church in Ireland as an injustice or offence to my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. As a constant resident in Ireland, I am enabled with confidence to affirm that the Roman Catholics in general entertain no unfriendly feelings towards the Protestant Establishment. It is undoubtedly denounced, and in no measured terms, by the Romish hierarchy, who before the Emancipation Act professed such different views regarding it, but who now see no occasion to make such profession. By their influence the signatures of many of the Roman Catholic laity were procured to that declaration against the Established Church to which the noble Earl who spoke last alluded as having been signed by himself; but I am credibly informed that in the county of Galway, one of the largest counties in Ireland, and in which are very many and most respectable Roman Catholic landowners, only two of them would sign it, others having refused to do so, and that, too, in a county where a great missionary work has been and is in active progress. My Lords, as an Irishman I protest against the wrong done to my country in stirring up religious dissensions and making her highest interests the sport of party. Ireland is often reproached for her backwardness in civilization and general improvement, and with being a disunited nation; but nothing so much tends to impede her improvement, nothing has operated so much to produce disunion and to stir up sectarian animosities among the Irish people, as the wanton and ignorant meddling with their religious interests. As a member of the Established Church I protest against this measure as a first step towards the suppression of the Reformed Faith in Ireland. Settlers in Ireland have been for the most part Protestants, and have purchased their lands subject to a deduction or rent-charge for the support of the Protestant Church, and on the faith of that Church being maintained—an assurance fully warranted by the Act of Union. Towards these the overthrow of the Protestant Establishment would be manifestly a breach of faith, no less dishonouring to the British Parliament than the proposal of it is to the character of British statesmen. Individually, as a member of the proscribed communion, I might complain of the wrong done to myself; but what is that compared to the wrong done to the humbler classes of Protestants? I may provide for my immediate dependants as in a foreign land, where the profession of the Reformed Faith is only recognized as an offence; but what is to become of the Protestant peasantry, scattered, it may be, in small numbers through the country, thenceforward as sheep without a shepherd? Thirty-six years ago you deprived them of the blessing of Scriptural education for their children by the suppression of the use of the Bible in the National schoolrooms; but you reserved to the parson the right, and you imposed it upon him as a duty, that, after school hours, he should give religious instruction to such children of his flock as he could get together. The clergy very properly declined to dishonour their mission as ministers of God's Word by accepting so impracticable an arrangement, and have done their best, without the aid or countenance of the State, to provide Scriptural education for the poor of Ireland. Carry out the policy of this Bill, and the Protestant poor will be for ever deprived, not only of the means of education for their children, but of the means of grace for themselves. Reference has been made to the shortcomings and abuses of the Church for a long period up to the beginning of the present century. They are undeniable; and though my most rev. Friend the Lord Primate of Ireland, and the right rev. Prelate who so ably addressed you this day, have with historical truth pointed out how much the British Government was responsible for those abuses, I cannot consider that the Church itself—by which I mean not alone the clergy but the educated classes of the laity—was, therefore, in any degree excusable. When the mission was accepted to instruct the people in the Reformed Faith, it was no excuse for the neglect of doing so that the English Government acted in error, as they so often now do, with respect to the requirements of the Irish people. Dealing, however, with the Church Establishment as it now is, it is not in a satisfactory state, and presents anomalies that require to be corrected; but I trust that remedies for these may shortly be proposed as the result of the inquiry now before the Church Commission, and that your Lordships will be thereby enabled to assist in placing the Establishment henceforward upon a footing of greater efficiency, and that, instead of severing, you will draw closer, in the interests of the people of Ireland, no less than of the Empire at large, the union of Church and State. If the friends of the Constitution have seen with some alarm a Bill of so revolutionary a kind as that we are now considering sent up from the House of Commons, I think they may find comfort in the manifest growth of public opinion in condemnation of the measure. The discussions that have taken place upon it, and the influence of this debate, but especially the unanswered and unanswerable address of the noble Earl the late Prime Minister, cannot but conduce to a better understanding and appreciation of the security afforded to our civil and religious liberties by the maintenance of the Protestant Church in connection with the State. I regret that this Bill should have received the support of the noble Earl opposite who spoke third in this debate. His long residence in Ireland, prior to and during the period he held the Office of Lord Lieutenant, gave him a right to speak as one who knew the country. I was, therefore, much surprised and grieved to hear him speak as he did of the Established Church as an offence and constant source of grievance to the Roman Catholics, and that he should have pointed to it as among the causes of the Fenian insurrection. The aspersions cast upon the Church by the noble Earl will undoubtedly cause pain and disappointment to many who knew and respected him while acting as Lord Lieutenant. But the noble Earl himself has happily spared me the necessity of vindicating the character of the Irish clergy; for when the fire of his zeal in support of this party movement had in some degree subsided, he appeared to have forgotten the strong but probably unconsidered expressions he had used; and, prompted by his honest recollection of the true character of that Church he had so condemned, he gave utterance to the following just eulogy of its ministry, which I have copied from the report of *The Times :—*

> "I have not lived so long in Ireland without having learned to appreciate the signal virtues of the Irish clergy, more especially of the working clergy. I know there are exceptions, but still the conduct of the Protestant clergy of Ireland, as a body, is most exemplary. To the extent of their means they are very charitable. They are not distrusted by their Catholic neighbours, and their removal from the parishes in which they labour would give cause for much regret."

A stronger denial than this there could not be of his own statement in the beginning of his speech, that the Protestant Church—

> "Is a constant source of grievance to millions of your fellow-subjects whom it is our interest to conciliate, and whom we have no right to offend."

The noble Earl's predilections were, however, more towards the Roman Catholics than Protestants. He was accordingly among the supporters of the Maynooth Bill, and as there is some analogy between the proposal of the present measure and the introduction of the Bill for the establishment of Maynooth College, I would beg to call your Lordships' attention to it. Upon that occasion the country had been much disturbed by the agitation for the Repeal of the Union, and the monster meetings held in furtherance of that movement became exhibitions of physical force imperilling the public peace, and manifestly designed to overawe the Government. Sir Robert Peel resolved to put them down, and succeeded; and, having vindicated the law, he announced, and had immediate recourse to, a policy of conciliation. This was shown in measures for the advancement of Roman Catholic ecclesiastical interests, but chiefly in the permanent endowment of Maynooth College, and its establishment as a Royal Institution. We now have the Fenian conspiracy nearly if not quite put down by the strong arm of the law. Though a movement essentially American, it has been imputed to Ireland, to the Irish Roman Catholics, and therefore, as after the Repeal movement, it seems in the view of noble Lords opposite to have entitled them to the inauguration anew of a policy of conciliation—a new concession to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, in the overthrow of the Protestant Establishment. But the noble Earl and the Liberal promoters of the Bill appear to have overlooked a rather remarkable fact connected with it—namely, that it contains similar provision for the suppression of Maynooth College as for the suppression of the Church Establishment: that this act of justice to Roman Catholics of 1868 cancels that act of justice and conciliation to the same body that was voted by such large Parliamentary majorities in 1845. Can this have been mere accident, or have the friends of Maynooth discovered that the endowment of that College was not an act of justice, and, though announced by Sir Robert Peel as a message of peace, has not conduced to that end? If so, I would suggest to noble Lords opposite to pause and consider well, before they proceed further with their attack upon the Protestant Establishment, whether they may not be doing, instead of an act of justice to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, an act of dire wrong to the whole country, by destroying what, to the Irish no less than to the English people, is the surest bulwark of our national liberties—Protestantism in Church and State. But the promoters of this Bill appear to have overlooked also another of its provisions of a like character—I mean the arrangement for the withdrawal of the *Regium Donum* from the Presbyterians; that, in fact, this measure of so-called justice and liberality is simply a Bill for the total disendowment of all religious denominations in Ireland, and of confiscation to the Imperial Treasury, not only of all that was chargeable upon the revenue of the country, but of the property of the Church, deemed from time immemorial to have been consecrated to the purposes of religion. I do not think the interests of religion should be trifled with. Demands upon the Church funds are daily increasing, for carrying on the ministrations of religion. I hold in my hand notice of a meeting of the West Connaught Church Endowment Society, for the 4th of next month, to make arrangement for the endowment of three additional churches. The practice has been for the subscribers to the endowment of a parish or district church to make permanent provision for a salary of £75 a year to the incumbent, and the Church Commissioners, in that case, have augmented the salary to £100. Already in West Connaught, nine churches have been thus endowed, three are now to be added, and there will still remain seven in which congregations have been formed to be similarly provided for. If you pass this Bill, all this must be put a stop to. What is there to justify you in arresting the progress of truth — the spread of the Reformed Faith among the poor of Ireland? I trust your Lordships will, by a large majority, condemn such a proceeding, and that the encroachments made upon the principles of our Protestant Constitution may be henceforth withstood. Religion is not a thing that a nation should disregard. I will conclude my address with the words of Mr. Gladstone, taken from his celebrated book on *Church and State*, as no words could more forcibly enjoin the duty of the State to uphold the Church—

> "The time is now arrived when, with a view, if to no higher end, yet to decency and dignity of conduct, an answer should, if possible, be had to the question, whether it be or be not the manifest ordinance of Almighty God, that Governments have active duties towards religion — Christian Governments to the Christian Church. As was said of old—'If the Lord be God, serve Him; but if Baal, then serve him.' So it should now be said of the English people—if there be no conscience in States, and if unity in the body be no law of the Church, let us abandon the ancient policy under which this land has consolidated her strength and matured her happiness and earned her fame; but if the reverse of both these propositions be true, then, in the sacred name of God, to the utmost and to the latest of our power let us persist."

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, I will endeavour, in consideration of the lateness of the hour, to compress as much as possible the remarks which I wish to offer to your Lordships on this important question. I have been struck with two things in the course of this debate; one is the great ability with which the question has been argued; the other is the great art which has been shown in avoiding the main question at issue, and in diverting your Lordships' attention to other and irrelevant issues. That course was begun by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby), who, I am happy to say, spoke with his usual talent and energy, but likewise with some of the unfairness which I think is apt to characterize him. The noble Earl was the first speaker who attributed to personal motives the conduct of Mr. Gladstone and of those who have brought forward this question; for he said it was in order to further his ambition that Mr. Gladstone had brought the question forward. The noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Marlborough) said likewise that it was evident that there was some political dishonesty in the course which had been taken by the Liberal party. To-night, too, the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Oxford) said the object of the Bill was to buy off traitorous assassins. Now I confess it appears to me that this question is grave enough and important enough to demand your Lordships' attention; and I think noble Lords might believe that the men who bring so important a question forward do so in the belief that it is for the benefit of the country that such a measure should be carried, and that they ought not to employ themselves in throwing dirt upon those who differ from them. This might be expected in particular of the noble Earl, because he is almost the only man whom I remember—he is the only Minister I ever heard of—who brought forward a measure avowedly for the purpose of maintaining his own position, expressing no confident hope that it would be for the advantage of the country. With regard to the insinuations of the noble Duke, I perfectly remember—being, unfortunately, old enough to have taken part in those transactions—that when in 1828 a proposal in favour of the Roman Catholic claims—then the question of paramount importance—was carried in the other House by a majority of 6, and being introduced into this House by the Marquess of Lansdowne, and here opposed and defeated by the Duke of Wellington, the Duke of Wellington had far too noble a mind to impute to Lord Lansdowne that he brought forward the question from any other motive than a belief that it was for the good of the country that the Catholics should be relieved from the disabilities under which they laboured. Now, I really do not see why the noble Duke should not have followed the great example of the Duke of Wellington, nor why noble Lords should not have stated their views of the advantage or disadvantage of this measure without imputing dishonourable motives to their adversaries. The noble Earl, not content with imputing motives, introduced into the discussion what certainly did not appear to me to be very pertinent to the subject—the grants which were made to the first Earl of Bedford — a question which was discussed long ago by Mr. Burke and Sir James Mackintosh, and which I thought, having been treated by those two great writers, might have been left for the future undisturbed. The noble Earl having alluded to that subject, I looked to what I had been lately reading in a volume of Froude respecting the conduct of the Earl of Derby at that time. I find that the Earl of Derby had a grudge against Lord Burleigh and the Earl of Bedford, and wished to clap them into the Tower. I find, also, that the Earl of Derby was expected to join in a great conspiracy, the object of which was to depose Elizabeth and put Mary, Queen of Scots in her place, and to restore the Catholic religion in this country. That was expected of the Earl of Derby, or, at all events, of his sons. Unfortunately there have been few families so much opposed as the Earls of Derby and the Earls of Bedford—they were as much opposed in that day as they are at present. Another topic which noble Lords have thought it necessary to introduce into their speeches, but which does not appear to me at all needed—it was especially the subject of the able speech of the most rev. Prelate who presides over the Northern Province—is the question whether the details of this Bill effect the purpose for which it is intended. The object of the Bill, as my noble Friend the late Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (the Earl of Clarendon) stated, is that the measure should be a preliminary to the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and its immediate effect is intended to be to prevent the filling up of any vacancies which may occur within the next twelve months, and so save some portion of the funds of the Church during that preliminary period. It may be, my Lords, that in the details of the Bill those objects are not provided for as they would have been if the Bill had been brought forward by a Government in a majority in the House of Commons, and favourable to the views of those who have framed this measure. But whether it be framed in the most satisfactory way or not, that is a subject entirely for the Committee. If the most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of York) who objected so strongly to the Bill on that ground, and other Members of your Lordships' House who agree with him, enable us to carry the second reading, we promise him — as a noble Friend of mine has already promised this evening—that we shall be as complying as possible with regard to the details of the Bill. All their suggestions in Committee will receive our most careful consideration. Well, my Lords, however that may be, this is a great question, and one that deserves from your Lordships the utmost attention. You may think it right to further the Bill, or you may be of opinion that the prescription of many centuries ought not to be disposed of so hastily, as it is said by those who oppose the Bill that we are asking your Lordships to deal with it ; but, at all events, you will admit that the question is a great one, and one that deserves the consideration of Parliament. It has been said by, I believe, all authors who have written on the subject, that the use of an Established Church is to promote morality and religion, and thus to further the great ends of society. The Church of England does promote that object. If one goes into a village church he will see there, in the first place, the chief landowners of the parish ; and, further, he will see all grades of people in the village, down to the labourers, attending there, listening to thanks being returned to God for His mercies—listening to the reading of the Holy Scriptures—and hearing spiritual instruction from the parish clergyman. We see, therefore, that in this country the Church fulfils the office of an Established Church—it promotes religion and morality. But if we go to Ireland and enter a church, will you find there the population of a parish ? You will find on the average, perhaps, 12 per cent of them. You may find a larger proportion in some churches, but you will find a much smaller proportion in others. The people—the real people of Ireland—are attending in other places of worship, where they are attending the services of a different religion and joining in a form of prayer different from that used in the Established Church. Therefore, in Ireland the Established Church fails in the object of promoting religion and morality among the great bulk of the population. Well, then, there is another duty discharged by the Established Church in England. The clergyman of the parish visits the inhabitants, attends the bedside of the sick, and exhorts them to repentance and administers religious consolation to them—he holds out to them the promise of peace in this world and salvation in the next. But in Ireland in similar circumstances the people never think of sending for the parish clergyman—they look for spiritual consolation to other sources. It is true that in time of any general calamity—in any misfortune of a temporal kind —the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland extend words and acts of kindness to people of all religious persuasions, and in this way they are useful in that country. But is an Established Church intended for that purpose ? According to Paley, Bishop

Warburton, Hallam, and other authors, its office is to promote religion, morality, and order among the people; and in this respect the Established Church in Ireland has failed—failed almost from the beginning. In this country the people joined the Reformed Church. We introduced that Church in Ireland, where the people did not change, but remained constant to the Roman Catholic religion. Well, but if the Church is no good in Ireland, does it not do some harm? It is obvious that the Roman Catholics in that country are placed in a position of inferiority as compared with the Protestants. It is singular that throughout this debate the fact of there being 4,500,000 of Roman Catholics in Ireland has scarcely been alluded to. Scarcely any speaker on the other side has taken notice of that proportion. They have commented on the fact of the clergy of the Established Church doing their duty towards the 700,000 members of that Church, as if the fact that the 4,500,000 received no benefit from their ministrations was not one worthy of notice. I think it fair to say that nothing can be higher. both as regards their education and their moral qualities, than the character of the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland; but when the clergy of one-eighth of the people are placed in a position of superiority over the clergy of the majority—when they have all the titles and dignities of an Establishment, it must be galling to the people to see inequality established among them. Of course, if the Roman Catholic priests have any influence—and it is well known that they have great influence—it must be, in some degree at least, exercised in showing the Irish people that they are considered to be degraded, that this Church has been introduced among them in the spirit of conquest, and that they are not in a position of spiritual equality. There is a third argument against the continued establishment and endowment of this Church—namely, that the promise made by Mr. Pitt at the time of the Union has not been kept. Mr. Pitt promised over and over again when introducing the Act of Union that he would carry out that Act on equal terms—that there should be equality as regarded all religions in Ireland. In 1805, on Mr. Fox's Motion, he explained what he meant by that declaration. He said that the Roman Catholics should have an endowment, and that this endowment would be given in such a way as that there should be equality. That promise of Mr. Pitt, on the faith of which the Roman Catholics agreed to and promoted the Union, has never been fulfilled. I think it would be a relief to Ireland at the present day to have the priests paid by the State, so that the people should not be liable for those so-called voluntary payments now made to those clergymen, but we find that to be impracticable. My noble Friend who moved the Amendment (Earl Grey) would not concede that it is impracticable; but I own, from what I have heard for months past, that, desirable as I think it would be that the Irish Roman Catholic priests should be endowed, and the Established Church, though very much diminished, should still exist, I nevertheless consider that the project is now entirely impracticable, and that the only way by which equality can now be produced is by disendowing and disestablishing the Irish Church. Then why is this equality not to be thought of? It could not but happen if you were to introduce a plan of this sort that there would be many difficulties in the way of disendowment—that disendowment would require adequate preparation; but the question of disestablishment is entirely different. Disestablishment might be effected without any great trouble or delay; and thus the people of Ireland would feel, and the clergy especially would feel, that the ministers of all creeds—the clergy of the Protestant Episcopalian Church, the clergy of the Presbyterian Church, and the Roman Catholic clergy—were all upon equal terms. I have read with great interest the speech of Lord Mayo on the subject of Ireland. It appears a very fair speech—a speech very well considered and only failing in one point, and that the most important—namely, the conclusions at which he arrives. It is evident Lord Mayo thought—and I dare say the Government to which he belonged thought—at the commencement of the Session that it was possible to establish equality in Ireland by what Lord Mayo called "levelling up"—namely, by providing State incomes for the Roman Catholic clergy, and so placing them on equal terms with the clergy of the Established Church. That, perhaps, was not an unnatural impression. I am only sorry to see that Lord Mayo, instead of saying that the Ministry were now convinced that the attempt is impracticable, utterly denies having said anything of the kind. He now says that all which the Government have in view is to give some salaries to chaplains of gaols and so forth—that is to say, perhaps, one-tenth or one-twentieth of what is given to the Established Church; and that he calls equality in the treatment of the different classes. It is evident this is no remedy at all—this is no fulfilment of the promise which he gave. As to what has been said on the question of disendowment there can be no doubt that in many cases the clergy would retain their glebes and glebe-houses; in many cases also there would be gifts of land to the Presbyterians and to the Roman Catholics. But these are questions of detail, which can only be settled as part of a great scheme. In former days it was the custom with your Lordships to inaugurate in this House measures of great public advantage. One noble Lord belonging to the party which sits upon this side of the House introduced a measure for "for the furtherance of public liberty;" a noble Earl at the head of the Tory party introduced another great measure called the Toleration Act. These were two great measures introduced in and carried through the House of Lords agreeably to the wishes of the people, and reflecting great credit upon this House. In the present century your Lordships have taken another course; I will not say whether it is as dignified or as safe as regards your Lordships, or as beneficial in the public interest. The Catholic claims were brought forward in 1805 by Lord Granville, and defeated by a majority of 129; in 1828 they were again brought forward by Lord Lansdowne, and rejected by a majority of 45. But the very next year the Duke of Wellington brought forward the subject, and carried his measure by over 100 majority. So likewise with regard to the Corn Laws. In 1843 a mere inquiry into the operation of those laws was defeated by a majority of 128; while a few years later the measure for their abolition was brought from the House of Commons and carried. With regard, therefore, to the Catholic Relief Bill, the repeal of the Corn Laws, and conspicuously, also, with regard to the Reform Bill, this House uniformly resisted, and then gave way. We may therefore expect—and we shall expect—that if the pending election produces in the House of Commons a majority equal to or greater than that which now appears in that House in favour of this Bill, your Lordships will then yield to the public voice and disestablish and disendow the Church which so many of your Lordships now are actively supporting. From the speech of the noble Earl and of the noble Marquess who spoke late on Friday (the Marquess of Salisbury) I conclude that such is the course which they would recommend; and if they find by the working of the Reform Bill, of which the noble Earl is the author, that there is a great majority in favour of disestablishment and disendowment, they will be willing to give effect to that decision. But, if this be so, is it wise to throw out this Bill? Is it wise to refuse to suspend appointments which would facilitate the consideration of the subject hereafter; and in order simply to present an appearance of strength and force, to do an act with which you yourselves are not satisfied? It is, of course, quite uncertain what the Government will do. The strongest declamations have been made by the Premier; according to the right hon. Gentleman the whole foundations of the civil and religious liberties of the kingdom will be destroyed if Church and State are separated in Ireland, and results worse than foreign conquest will ensue. But we remember the speech of the Queen in *Hamlet*—

> "Methinks the lady doth protest too much."

Strong words and declarations are quite reconcilable with the design of poisoning the object of such exaggerated affection. I am not surprised, though I am much grieved, that my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey), who is in favour of a complete re-arrangement of the Church in Ireland, should have been the person to move this Amendment. It is quite true, as he says, that I did not favour his Motion in 1866. And I think if I had come forward as First Lord of the Treasury, and told your Lordships, or if Mr. Gladstone had come forward and told the House of Commons that we had two measures in contemplation—one for the reform of the representation from top to bottom, and the other for the reform of the Irish Church, persons would have concluded that we were quite mad. But I did not conceal at that time, and I never have concealed, that I thought the existence of the Irish Church was felt as a grievance by the majority of the Irish people. My noble Friend (Earl Grey) had a scheme for dealing with the Irish Church which I did not approve in 1866, and which I do not approve at the present time, because it is, in point of fact, impracticable. But during the time that he and I were in Office together, and when he conducted, with great ability, the administration of the Colonies, we did not think it advisable to bring forward the Irish Church question, and we never did bring it forward; and I do not remember that my noble Friend ever insisted, during those five or six years, that the proper time had come for bringing forward the question. Measures ought to be brought forward at a time when public opinion will support a Government or an Opposition with regard to them; for it is obvious that a Minister may think a particular measure would be useful, but may see no possible chance of carrying it. Sir Robert Walpole chose his own time for bringing forward proposals which he desired to carry; and Mr. Pitt, in his second Ministry, did not bring forward the Catholic claims. In 1833, immediately after the Reform Bill had passed, the state of Ireland was taken into consideration; and now having again passed a Reform measure—it matters not under what Ministry—the time is again appropriate for dealing with the Irish Church. I may be asked to what I looked forward as the result of disestablishment and disendowment. What I trust will happen, and what I think is the tendency not only in England and in Ireland, but on the Continent of Europe and throughout the world, is that the differences which separated men belonging to the different divisions of Christianity will cease to have so much effect; and that men, call themselves by what names they may, will combine for great purposes, like those of charity, and will assist in their mutual relations only upon those great points of doctrine which they hold in common. My belief is that when the Church of Ireland has been abolished as an Establishment we shall see among Christians of all sects a greater and more general love for one another. It has been said that the splendour of the Crown will be dimmed if the Church be disestablished. I do not believe it; on the contrary, I believe that the Crown will possess no brighter gem than the country of Ireland pacified and drawn to us by a large measure of justice; I believe, moreover, that the three kingdoms will be joined by this act in stronger bonds of union, and the people of England, of Scotland, and of Ireland would vie with each other in the exhibitions of loyalty to the person and to the Throne of Her Majesty.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR*: My Lords, it has been my fortune to attend to the course of this debate more closely than most of your Lordships, and I must say, that however widely the views expressed may have differed, I think it cannot fail to be a satisfaction to your Lordships that the general current of the debate has proceeded with a fulness, an energy, and an ability, worthy both of the question and of the reputation of your Lordships' House. My Lords, if with regard to so much that has been excellent, I might venture to express anything of regret, it would be that there appeared to be in the minds of some of the speakers something of a doubt as to what was the precise significance of the Bill now before your Lordships. That such a doubt should exist is, I think, not to be attributed to us, but rather to the manner in which the measure has come before the House. My Lords, in the House of Commons it was stated on one side of the House, and accepted as correct upon the other, that this Bill was merely a "corollary." A "corollary" signifies an inference from a preceding proposition. In the other House the preceding proposition had been discussed, and had become the subject of a Resolution. That Resolution assumed this form—

> "That it is necessary that the Established Church of Ireland should cease to exist as an Establishment, due regard being had to all personal interests and to all individual rights of property."

My Lords, if I understand the meaning of words, that Resolution involves two consequences; it involves and implies the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and it involves and implies also its disendowment; because if it does not imply its disendowment, I would ask, what was the meaning of the reservation of one particular kind of property, the only property that was to be reserved — namely, individual property? The course adopted in the other House was convenient and distinct, because when the time came for the Suspensory Bill to be introduced it would have been vain in the face of this Resolution for those who promoted the Bill to have offered it to the House as anything but a Bill designed to promote the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. And accordingly in that sense, and in that sense only, was it treated. But, my Lords, what have we seen in the course of the present debate? I am bound to say that the noble Earl (Earl Granville) who moved the second reading of the measure, in a speech to the great ability of which, if it were not presumptuous for me to do so, I would venture to offer my sincere tribute of admiration, the noble Earl frankly stated that the Resolutions of the House of Commons were involved in the present Bill; but to-night we have had new ground broken. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) who opened the discussion this evening, and who came forward, taking upon his own shoulders the responsibility of this measure, and putting himself forward almost as the originator of the measure, and certainly as the expositor of the motives and designs of those who introduced it before the public; that noble Duke, speaking as one of the authors of the Bill, stated it had not a word of disestablishment in it; and as to disendowment it was the greatest mistake to suppose, not merely that this Bill had anything to say to disendowment, but that disendowment had ever been gravely or actually considered or discussed even in the House of Commons. Now I want to ask the noble Duke, as he appears before your Lordships as one of the coadjutors in the preparation and launching of this Bill, does he mean to maintain that this Bill was not proposed to the House of Commons as a measure of disendowment? That question can easily be put beyond the possibility of doubt. The noble Duke was somewhat severe as to the use of quotations from debates in Parliament; and speaking of my noble Friend lately at the head of the Government (the Earl of Derby) with a courtesy which I think might be disputed, and a good taste that some persons might be disposed to challenge, he said that there was no person in the House who required to be more watched than my noble Friend. I beg the noble Duke will watch me in the quotation I am about to make, and I beg he will compare what I read with the report he will find of his own expressions to-night in the usual organs of information. Mr. Gladstone thus expressed himself on the 30th of March, in introducing the Resolutions to the Committee of the House of Commons—

"I think the tithe is not paid by the landlord; and as for the assurance of the Catholic party, I cannot consent that any such assurance" [that was the assurance in 1829] "should bind me to uphold what I conceive to be unfair to the Catholics and injurious to the Empire. In this matter I say we should exercise our own freedom, and judge what is for the common good; and it is on the ground of the common good, I ask you to consent to the disendowment of the Established Church in Ireland."—[3 *Hansard*, cxci. 478.]

My Lords, I only regret the course which has been taken because I think it has led to a confusion of which we have seen some fruits to-night. The noble Earl who generally sits above the gangway on this side of the House (the Earl of Shaftesbury), induced, I suppose, by the blandishments of the noble Duke, and the way in which he described this measure, has come to the conclusion that the Bill now before your Lordships is a "meagre and insignificant Bill," and one which involves none of those important principles which the noble Earl who moved its second reading candidly admitted to be involved. My Lords, that the actual provisions of this Bill fall far short of the principles which are involved in it I freely admit; but in what way the noble Earl has satisfied himself that a support of the Bill would not imply a support of those principles I am unable to understand.

My Lords, I am very much disposed to agree with was said by one of your Lordships, that, although it will be proper to consider the provisions and the working of the Bill, the provisions of the Bill are trifling compared with the greater and larger question, which was the subject of the first of the Resolutions passed by the other House of Parliament. But, at the same time, I think we ought not to conceal from ourselves what the effect of the working of this measure would be, supposing it were to receive your Lordships' assent. The mode in which the provisions of the Bill have been dealt with upon the Opposition side of the House has been somewhat singular. The most rev. Prelate who presides over the northern Province (the Archbishop of York), pointed out on a former night various consequences that would ensue from the passing of this Bill. He was replied to by my noble and learned Friend the Master of the Rolls Lord Romilly), from whom, if from anyone, I should have expected an answer to the objections which had been made. What answer, however, did my noble and learned Friend make? He said he had listened to the objections which had been made, and was of opinion that they could all be removed in Committee. But if my noble and learned Friend fully appreciated the character of these objections, and had my noble and learned Friend borne in mind the provisions of this Bill, he must have seen that the only manner in which these objections could have been removed in Committee would have been by striking out every clause in the Bill. But my noble and learned Friend was followed by a noble Duke formerly First Lord of the Admiralty (the Duke of Somerset). The noble Duke spoke late in the evening, and with a frankness and freedom which left nothing to be desired. He said the Bill was one of those things which nobody could understand. He said he had listened to the objections of the most rev. Prelate, and he concurred in most of them. He said that, for his part, he was not responsible for the Bill, and he could not for the life of him see how it would work. He said further, that on the whole, he was disposed to look upon it as almost impossible. But, although it was unintelligible, although it was impracticable, and although it was almost impossible, yet, notwithstanding, the noble Duke was prepared to vote for the second reading of the Bill, in order that, through the medium of an unintelligible, impracticable, and impossible Bill, we might convey to the people of Ireland the conviction that we meant to deal with them in a spirit of conciliation. Well, now, perhaps your Lordships will forgive me, if as briefly as possible, and as simply as possible, I point out exactly what I believe will follow from this Bill.

I must, at the outset, refer to a matter which, though small in itself, I should be sorry to suppose had not been noticed by your Lordships. The title of the Bill, as it comes before your Lordships, is, "To prevent for a limited time new appointments in the Church of Ireland." Now, my Lords, I am not acquainted with any Church that bears that name. I know of one Church in Ireland, which is described in an Act of Parliament which has not been repealed in a very different manner. The Act of Union says—

> "The Churches of England and Ireland, as now by law established, shall be united into one Protestant Episcopal Church, to be called The United Church of England and Ireland."

That is the Parliamentary name of the Church now sought to be dealt with. And, my Lords, I take the misnomer, which the Church has received in the title of this Bill, only as an indication that the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll), and the other compositors of the measure, were afraid to state boldly and broadly that the Church they were about to destroy by their legislation was the United Church of England and Ireland.

Well now, my Lords, this Bill proposes to suspend for one year—though, as was well said by the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey), we knew from past experience that that suspension will last considerably longer—the appointment of Bishops and incumbents of this Church. There are objections to this which lie upon the very face of this measure. In the first place, I object to it because you have at present a Church which is entitled by law to the service of Bishops and clergy appointed in a continual succession, and you interrupt that succession and deprive the Church of those services, not because anything has been determined by Parliament, but because, at some future period, something may perchance be determined by Parliament with regard to that Church. My Lords, what does the Resolution which is said to be embodied in this Bill itself say upon this point?—

> "That, subject to the foregoing considerations, it is expedient to prevent the creation of new personal interests, pending the final decision of Parliament."

Now, my Lords, the final decision of Parliament is the decision of Parliament. The decision of Parliament is not the decision of the House of Commons. It is the decision of the Three Estates of Parliament, resulting in a legislative measure; and therefore, what is proposed by the Bill is this—that the functions and the working of the Church should be suspended and placed in abeyance, in order to see whether an attack to be hereafter made upon the Church should prove successful. But that is not all. I object to it also because, at the same time that it paralyzes the Church, it renders it impossible for voluntary action to step in and supply the vacuum, even if voluntary action was at hand. The episcopal and parochial action of the Church is regulated by law, and can proceed only through legal channels. So that, during this intermediate period, the Church would be placed in a position worse than that of any voluntary society in the kingdom. I object to it, in the next place, by reason of its unequal working. This is a measure which proposes to suspend the appointment of incumbents where the patrons are Bishops, but to leave the appointments free where the patrons are laymen. So you will have two parishes side-by-side, the same in area, the same in population, the same in spiritual exigency. They will both become vacant in the course of the year. In the one of them the Bishop is the patron; in the other a layman. The layman can appoint an incumbent. The parish which is in the gift of the Bishop will be deprived of its incumbent. On what possible principle, on what rational or plausible ground, can you state to the laity of Ireland, that of the two parishes I have supposed, one is to be deprived of its incumbent, and the other is to continue to have its incumbent? But at the same time that the measure works in this way, I object to it because it works blindly. It strikes at one and the same time at the parish which has the smallest population, and the smallest need for endowment, and it strikes equally and at the same time at the large and populous parish, where the Church population is already overgrown, and where the Church with all its present appliances is unable to keep pace with the wants of the people. Observe, my Lords, the difference between this measure and that which it professes to follow—the measure of 1833. The measure of 1833 dealt with those parishes — and with those parishes only—in which there had been no service performed for three years. It suspended, as well it might do, those parishes until arrangements were made for incorporating them with other parishes. Under this Bill the populous parishes of Ulster, where there is the greatest difficulty in providing the ministrations of the Church to meet the demands upon them, may some of them become vacant during the year to which the Bill will apply, and it will be impossible to supply the vacaciesn when they occur.

My Lords, these being the general objections which lie on the surface of the measure, let me ask your Lordships to observe some other consequences that would follow from its working, which have not received the attention they deserve. I take the first stage of the Bill, which suspends the appointment of successors to Bishops and incumbents. Have your Lordships considered the effect of the measure on the families of a deceased Bishop or incumbent? There is hardly any see in Ireland, and there are still fewer parishes, where the incumbent has not, upon entering on the incumbency, paid a heavy charge to his predecessor; and the security given him for this payment by Parliament is, that he may in turn recover this charge against his successor. I have got before me a statement with regard to the position of seven Episcopal sees in Ireland, where the sums recoverable from successors amount to nearly £30,000. But when I turn to the position of the incumbents, I find, in one diocese alone, that of Armagh and Clogher—taken not because it is more favourable to the argument, but because circumstances led to the return being easily obtained, the charges amount to £45,000. Your Lordships may, therefore, imagine to how considerable a sum these charges amount over the whole of Ireland. You have authorized and secured these building charges: you have them registered by Act of Parliament: they have become a Parliamentary security. In almost every instance in Ireland the incoming incumbent has paid the charges out of his little savings, and that charge has become the provision for his family in case of his death. I have before me an instance, taken out of many, in which an incumbent had to pay this charge on taking possession of the benefice. He had not the money of his own, but the trustees of his marriage settlement had £1,000 belonging to his wife, which was laid out on this building charge, and that has now become the only means of providing for his widow and children in case of his death. At present that is not only a charge on the benefice, but it is a personal debt due from the successor. A clergyman in Ireland, when he is appointed to a living, inquires into the charge upon it, and considers whether he has the means to pay it off, and if he is prepared to pay it off, he accepts the living. The course I have described will, I am sure, be attested by the right rev. Bench. The incoming incumbent pays it off by four instalments to the family of his predecessor. Now I am quite aware that the incumbency will be handed over to the Ecclesiastical Commission, as the Bill provides, "subject to the charge." I quite admit the charge will remain a charge on the benefice; but how will the family of the deceased incumbent, to whom it is a matter of life or death, be paid their little pittance? How will they be paid? The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have no funds wherewith to pay it. There is no successor personally liable to pay it. The Bill remains in operation for a year, and is renewed for one year or two years; the charge continues unpaid, and there will be the greatest difficulty in recovering the charge, that which ought to be paid without difficulty and to the day.

So much, my Lords, with regard to the action of the Bill in relation to incumbents; but let me now ask your attention to a few facts, as to the effect it will have on a class well worthy your Lordships' consideration — the class of curates. The author of this Bill (Mr. Gladstone) professed at the outset a tender and solicitous regard for the case of the curates. Let us see how that regard is manifested by this Bill. The average vacancies of preferments in the year throughout Ireland are about ninety. Take it that the measure remains in force only one year, ninety vacancies will occur. Of the preferments in Ireland one-fifth are in lay hands and four-fifths in the hands of the Bishops. Therefore, seventy-two of these vacancies will be in Episcopal patronage. The difference between the incumbencies in the hands of laymen and those in the hands of Bishops is very important. The layman is perfectly free to appoint whom he likes; he has no ties on him but the claims of friendship, or personal preference. But with respect to the Bishop it is altogether a different matter. The Bishops are the patrons in Ireland, to whom the curates may fairly look for the reward of their labours, and if they do not receive that reward from the Bishops they are not likely to receive it from anybody. I am happy to say, from my knowledge of the right rev. Prelates of Ireland, that this claim of the curates has on all occasions been fully acknowledged. I hold in my hands a very sorrowful list of names—a a list which is at the service of any of your Lordships who may desire to see it—of seventy-five curates in Ireland, who have, for upwards of twenty years, on their little pittance of £75 or £100 a year, been serving the Church in their curacies in the various dioceses in that country, where it is proposed during the next year to suspend the appointments to the incumbencies. Therefore, virtually and practically, the whole effect of the present Bill would be—because it is the incumbencies to which the Bishops have the right of presentation that the Bill will suspend—that some seventy out of these seventy-five curates will fail to receive their preferment in the course of the year which otherwise they might certainly expect. That, my Lords, is the glorious result of the first portion of this Bill, suspending the appointment to the vacant benefices.

Now let me go a step further. The next portion of the Bill is the provision providing for vacancies in sees. I confess that I hardly know the exact meaning of this portion of the Bill, and I expected to hear some explanation of it from the noble Earl (Earl Granville), but as he did not think fit to enter into the point, I must take the explanation of it which was given by the author of the Bill in "another place." Mr. Gladstone says—

> "The measures taken with respect to the suspended bishoprics are the same as those proposed by Lord Derby in 1833. Those measures will serve the purpose now."

That is the statement of the author of the Bill, who must be supposed to know something about it. My Lords, no bishoprics were suspended for an hour by the legislation of 1833. The bishoprics which were then abolished were abolished upon the death of the Bishops who held them, and were immediately, without the delay of a second, transferred to the other bishoprics to which they were joined. It is therefore a pure mistake to suppose that there is any provision in the Act of 1833 that will serve as a precedent for what the Bill proposes to do. But that is not all. The Act of 1833 did nothing whatever with respect to the spiritualities of the Church; it was a Bill dealing with the temporalities of the Church only. Here is a Bill which appoints certain persons—we shall see presently who they are—the "Guardians of the Spiritualities," and an Act of Parliament passed in 1833, which did not mention spiritualities from beginning to end, is invoked as a precedent for the arrangement. But, in the next place, this Bill provides that—

> "The persons designated by the Act of 1833 to execute the powers of that Act shall be the guardians of the spiritualities under this Bill."

But no persons were designated by the Act of 1833 to guard the spiritualities, and no persons were by that Act "designated" for any purpose. This is a strange mistake to have been made, but it ought to be pointed out. What that Act did was this—it allowed the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to select out of certain persons (the archdeacons of the diocese, the dean, and vicars general) some one, not to act as guardian of the spiritualities, but to make certain official Returns, which had to be made from time to time, not with reference to bishoprics then suspended, but with reference to any bishopric which might at any time, even down to the present day, be vacant. The duties of these persons so selected were merely mechanical duties connected with the making up these Returns. But that is not all. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners are by the present Bill to appoint the guardians of the spiritualities in every vacant diocese. At the present time the Archbishop is the guardian of the spiritualities of a vacant diocese, and why is he to be displaced for some person said to be designated in the Act of 1833, but who is not designated in that Act? But the climax of all this remains. The framers of this Bill were unacquainted with the ecclesiastical law of Ireland. They were not aware that the guardians of spiritualities, even if appointed, could not exercise those peculiar and statutory powers which are required for the government of a diocese in Ireland —powers as regards residence or non-residence of incumbents — as regards the licencing and regulating of curates, and other matters of the same kind, which are conferred, not by the general ecclesiastical law, but by the Act of Parliament passed in 1825, which makes the Bishop of the diocese personally, and not through his Consistory Court, the judge in all the ordinary questions arising between the Bishop and his clergy. Therefore, the appointment of guardians of spiritualities would simply leave the Church where a bishopric fell vacant in a state of anarchy and confusion, because none of those powers to which I have referred as belonging to the Bishops personally could be exercised by the guardians of the spiritualities.

My Lords, these are objections to the Bill which I challenge the noble Earl to answer. But I will go a step further, and ask, What is the provision made for filling vacant incumbencies? It is proposed by the Bill that vacant incumbencies shall be filled by stipendiary curates. I take leave, in the first place, altogether to deny that it would be possible in Ireland to obtain, in the course of a year, ninety stipendiary curates who, for an engagement which might terminate within a year, would undertake to move house and home, and take possession of one of these incumbencies, for the purpose of performing a duty during a certain number of months. But I say further, that, even if this were possible, it would ruin an incumbency to appoint a stipendiary curate under these conditions. It is impossible that he could have any sympathy with, or interest in, the institutions or in the laity of the parish. To fill up a vacant incumbency in this way would be most fatal to its permanent interest. Take, for instance, the case of a vacancy occuring in an incumbency in a populous town, where a stipendiary curate is appointed under the conditions I have named. It would be impossible to supply the place of the former incumbent under these conditions with a man equal in power to himself, and the result would be that the congregation would be broken up. But, here, again, your Lordships will hardly believe it when I tell you, that in many cases the stipendiary curate under the provisions of this Bill could never come into existence. The proposal in this Bill which relates to the subject is, that the provisions of the Act of 1833 for supplying the spiritual wants of suspended benefices shall apply to the benefices becoming vacant under this Act. But what are the provisions of the Act of 1833 as to supplying the spiritual wants of suspended benefices? They are to this effect — It is to be lawful for the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and for the Bishop of the diocese associated with them to make the necessary provision. But there may be no Bishop of the diocese, and thus you leave no means of appointing the miserable substitute in the shape of a stipendiary curate that may be required.

And now, my Lords, passing on from this, I come to the mode in which this Bill proposes to deal with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. When the subject was first mooted in the other House of Parliament, a very frightful story was told about the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Mr. Gladstone said it was absolutely necessary something should be done, because these Ecclesiastical Commissioners were in the habit of manufacturing—of "erecting"—benefices; and that within a very short period two benefices had been manufactured, in each of which there were to be found only four specimens of a class which he denominated "Anglicans." That produced a great effect in the other House of Parliament, and thereupon it was said, We must have a Resolution, not merely against Bishops and incumbents, but also against these Ecclesiastical Commissioners. A few weeks passed away, and it turned out that the whole story was an entire delusion. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have no more power to create benefices in Ireland than any of your Lordships. Some person, no doubt, had told Mr. Gladstone this story. The truth, I believe, was, that two old benefices had been joined together under the Act of 1833, or some Act of that kind, by order of the Privy Council. The incumbent happened to die; the union could not be continued; the Bishop, I have no doubt for very good reasons, refusing to continue it: and thus Mr. Gladstone was given to understand that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had created two new benefices. Accordingly, the idea of restraining the Ecclesiastical Commissioners from creating benefices has not appeared in the Bill. But what are the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to be restrained from doing, and what will be the effect? They are now to be restrained from making "grants" and "augmentations." Now I want your Lordships to observe what the consequences of that will be. Your Lordships are probably not aware of the manner in which grants are made by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. They are made in pursuance of the Act of 1833, and the way of making them is this—If there is a church wanted in a neighbourhood, and the inhabitants are willing to contribute, the Commissioners are known to be ready to make a grant correlative to the sum raised in the neighbourhood. The usual course, therefore, is, in the first instance, to collect money in the neighbourhood, to purchase a site, and, perhaps, begin to build. When the money is subscribed, the subscribers go to the Commissioners and have a grant made them. Now, so largely is this course followed, that I find that in the last thirty years subscriptions were paid into the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to the amount of £196,000, to set against corresponding grants, and during the last eight years this "slumbering Church of Ireland," which the noble Earl below the gangway (the Earl of Carnarvon) contrasted so unfavourably with the Church of England, has paid to the Commissioners—altogether apart from sums expended without reference to the Commissioners—no less than £103,706. Now observe, my Lords, you suspend by this Bill the power of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to make grants during the next year. And what will be the effect? It will be, that in those cases where money has already been given—where, perhaps, sites have been obtained, but the grants have not been actually made, you stop the power of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to fulfil the expectations which have been held out to those who have contributed on the faith of Parliament, and you compel the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to break faith with them. But that is not all. What about the augmentations? The case with regard to them is still more singular. The work of augmentation has also been pursued by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners since 1833. I think it was Mr. O'Connell who said that this system of augmentation was the best feature in the Act of 1833. That Act provides that all livings in Ireland over £300 a year shall be taxed in order to collect funds to augment all livings below £200, and bring them up to that amount. Now that process of augmentation has been going on slowly indeed, as the funds have not been available to any large amount, but every year a certain number of these small livings have been augmented and brought up to £200. Now I have got a list of those whose turn would come next year, and I will just mention four of them, in order to show the sort of cases they are. There is Christ's Church, Lisburn, the net income of which is £125, the Church population estimated at 5,000; there is St. Paul's, Belfast, the net income of which is £125, and the Church population 6,000; there is Newtonards, the net income of which is £135, and the Church population 2,500; and there is Miltown, Armagh, the net income of which is £128, and the Church population, 2,340. These are samples of the cases which would come next for augmentation. But remember that the faith of Parliament is pledged to these augmentations, because the Act of Parliament, which you have not repealed, holds out this promise to the incumbents under £200 a year. Remember, also, that here you have got two vested interests to consider, not merely the interest of the smaller incumbents, but also that of those larger incumbents, who have been taxed and whom you are going to tax for the next year. But you have no right under the sun to tax the larger livings unless you augment the smaller ones; yet here you are asked to continue taking the money from the larger incumbents without applying it to the benefit of the smaller livings. My Lords, looking at the clauses of this Bill, which some of your Lordships appear disposed to see passed into a law, this would be its operation and effect. And I cannot avoid congratulating the noble Earl (Earl Granville), perhaps I should say the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll), and his coadjutors, upon the spirited form which their first effort at legislation upon this subject has assumed. They have been ingenious to inflict pain at the points at which it would be most keenly felt. The conscientious convictions which the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) admitted had for thirty years of Office been so discreetly smothered by the Leaders of the Liberal party, have at last burst forth, and a noble crusade has been formed—a crusade not to rescue or protect, but to overthrow all that is sacred; and the first victims selected by the gallant band of warriors are the expectations—based on the faith of Parliamentary promises—of miserable and underpaid incumbencies waiting for their long-delayed augmentations,—the preferments, anxiously looked for and now almost within his grasp, of the hard-working and ill-requited curate, and the little patrimony of the widow and the orphan, whose pittance is abstracted if its payment is endangered or delayed.

My Lords, before passing from this Bill, there is one other subject to which I would ask the earnest attention of your Lordships. I am not going now to argue the bearing of the Act of Union upon the great question of the disestablishment of the Church. That is a subject which is much too long to be considered to-night, and which may well be considered at some future period; but I do ask you to consider the effect of the Act of Union with reference to the present Bill. Upon the construction and bearing of the Act of Union, I will enter into no points of dispute, but will take the construction put upon it in words, for which the promoters of the present Bill are in the fullest degree responsible. It was only in 1856—which, I suppose, is within the Parliamentary Statute of Limitations—that a Motion was made in the House of Commons by Mr. Dillwyn, for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. Lord Palmerston was then Prime Minister. The noble Earl who moved the second reading of this Bill (Earl Granville) was a Member of the Government; so was the noble Earl near him (Earl Russell); so was the noble Duke who spoke to-night (the Duke of Argyll); so were the noble Earls beyond him who were formerly Lords Lieutenant of Ireland; so was Mr. Gladstone himself. We have, therefore, the collected opinion and determination of the Government of that day. Now, the only ground upon which Lord Palmerston opposed the Motion of Mr. Dillwyn, was the Act of Union. I do not say that he had no other objections, but that was the ground he selected as the answer to Mr. Dillwyn. Speaking for all the distinguished statesmen who composed his Cabinet, Lord Palmerston said—

> "If that 5th Article has any meaning at all—and it is preposterous to suppose that it is a vain delusion, and that it has no real and substantive intention—it must mean, in the common sense of mankind, that the Church of Ireland in harmony with the Church of England is to be maintained. . . . . . Parliament is competent to deal either with the Church of England or the Church of Ireland according to varying circumstances; but it must deal with those Churches not in order to destroy them, but for the purpose of rendering them more effective in their operation."—[3 *Hansard*, cxlii. 766-7.]

I observe that Mr. Gladstone voted with Lord Palmerston upon this ground. Well, that is a fair construction to put upon the Act of Union, and it is quite sufficient for my purpose. I do not enter into the question whether it is competent to Parliament to vary or repeal the Act or Treaty of Union. That has not yet been done, and I ask you this question,—Do you suppose it would be tolerated—would it be attempted—that the Church of England should be the subject of a Suspensory Bill of this kind for a year, or any other period, because it was intended at a future period to alter its constitution or stop its existence? If you will not so deal with the Church of England, I ask how is it possible, consistently with any adherence to the Act of Union, that you can deal in a different spirit with the Church of Ireland? My Lords, I asked would this be attempted with the Church of England. But I am bound to mention one occasion on which the attempt was made. The ancestor of the noble Earl, formerly Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (the Earl of Clarendon), in his History of the Great Rebellion, has given us an interesting account of the negotiations with the King at Newport, in 1648, and of the Convention which was extorted from the King at that time by the Commissioners who represented the opinions and policy of the Leaders of the Parliamentary party. It is a curious thing, and one would almost suppose that the proposers of this Bill had resorted to that precedent, that I find that the 2nd Article of that ill-omened Convention is in its wording almost the same as that of a Suspensory Bill. The consent of the King, says Clarendon, was extorted *magna inter suspiria,* to a measure for suspending for three years the functions of the Established Church in England, and for alienating and selling for the benefit of the State the lands of the Church, reserving only the ancient rents. That is the only precedent I can find for this measure, and as such I place it unreservedly at the disposal of the noble Earl.

I have detained your Lordships too long

upon this Bill. Allow me now, to make some observations upon those great principles to which, under the guise of this Bill, your Lordships are asked to assent. My Lords, in dealing with the question of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in Ireland, it will be convenient, I think, at this period of the debate, to get rid of some points that have been referred to, which seem to me to have no real bearing on the argument, and which rather tend to introduce perplexity and irrelevancy as soon as they are mentioned. I think we may assume that we are not going to hear anything more of the "intelligent foreigner" and his opinions. I think we may also entirely put aside any observations—of which only a few have been made—on what are called the inequalities of the Irish Church, as regards the amount of emolument received compared with the extent of the duty performed. My Lords, upon that head I have taken the opportunity of asserting, and I think the warmest friends of the Church have always asserted, an anxious desire to see every subject of inequality of this kind carefully examined and completely redressed. I believe the Irish Church has suffered much from this not having been done before; and for my part, I shall be better pleased the sooner that work is done. I think we may likewise put aside the reference which has been made once or twice to the case of Scotland, and the course taken with respect to the establishment of Episcopacy in that country. That case has no analogy whatever to the present. In Scotland there was an Established Church. That Church had endowments. No person proposed to disestablish that Church; no person proposed to take away its endowments; but the question, the only question agitated between England and Scotland in the reign of William III. was this—whether the Parliament and the Government of England should coerce that Established Church of Scotland to receive a form of Church government to which it conscientiously objected? I think we may also put aside this question—What would it be judicious, just, or expedient to do, supposing we were now dealing with Ireland as a new country, and were considering for the first time the question of religious establishments? That, my Lords, unfortunately, is not the question with which we have to deal. That was the question with which the colony of Australia, which has also been referred to, had to deal. It was also the question, though not perhaps in so pure a form, with which the colony of Canada had to deal, when we left the disposal of the clergy reserves to the Legislature of Canada.

One other reference, and one only, has been made to a case supposed to be an analogy. I mean the case of Jamaica. That was alluded to by the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) who sits below the gangway, and who was lately Secretary of State for the Colonies. That noble Earl made a speech which was addressed partly to the subject of the Irish Church, and partly to the subject of Her Majesty's Government. With regard to the Irish Church the noble Earl appeared to me to say about as much evil and as little good as he possibly could do. But with regard to Her Majesty's Government, I am bound to say he said nothing except what was evil. The noble Earl appears to think that, since the occurrences which happened in the spring of last year, virtue and honour have retreated from the public service and have retired into private life. The noble Earl even proceeded to make a suggestion that the Government, under the guise of defending the Irish Church, were really only seeking to prolong her existence for a short time, in order that they might have the satisfaction of destroying her themselves hereafter. Now, my Lords, if that is an hypothesis which presents itself to the understanding of the noble Earl as rational and intelligent, I do not know that there are any means of preventing him from entertaining it. But I venture to think that the Irish Church will hardly thank the noble Earl, entertaining as he does this theory, for the advice, which in consequence of his opinion he tenders to her, and for the course he is about to pursue in respect to this Bill; because, as I understood his advice to the Church, it was this, that in order to save herself from this apprehended annihilation hereafter at the hands of her friends, she ought immediately to surrender herself to be destroyed by her enemies. And the noble Earl, as I understood him, is perfectly willing to assist her in this operation by his vote on the present Bill. The noble Earl, however, said that nothing could be so grossly inconsistent as the conduct of the Government in defending the Irish Church at the time when they were disestablishing the Church in Jamaica. He said that the case of Jamaica was exactly parallel; that the case of the English Church was not the same as that of the Irish Church, but that the case of Jamaica was the same, and there the Government was disendowing and disestablishing the Church. Now, my Lords, what are the facts? I am sorry to have to state them to a noble Earl who was Secretary for the Colonies. In Jamaica and other West Indian islands there are Bishops appointed by the Crown; there are parishes in those islands with archdeacons and parochial ministers. Now, nothing whatever has been done, nothing whatever is proposed to be done altering in any manner the establishment of Bishops, archdeacons, and clergy in the way in which it has subsisted ever since it had any existence. From a very early period the dignitaries of the Church were supported by the colonies. The distress in the islands arising from emancipation was so great for the time, that the Parliament of England, as a matter of charity and as an eleemosynary gift, was content to pay out of the funds of the mother country a sum of £20,000 a year in order to eke out and complete the salaries of some, not all, but of a certain number of the Bishops and archdeacons in those islands. That payment has gone on for some time. It has attracted from time to time the attention of Parliament, and as the temporary pressure of the islands was passing over, and as the subject moreover of the application of the resources of the Imperial Exchequer for colonial purposes was better understood, a strong feeling was expressed by Parliament that this contribution ought to cease, but to cease only so far as the Imperial Exchequer is concerned; that is to say, that the colonies which have the Bishops, the archdeacons, and the parochial incumbents should be left to take this payment on themselves. This grant of £20,000 had been placed on the Consolidated Fund instead of on the Estimates, and therefore an Act of Parliament was necessary. The colonists are, I believe, perfectly ready to make provision for the payment of the Bishops and parochial clergy; and the whole of this great question of the disendowment of the Church in Jamaica turns out to be simply this—the transfer of the burden of £20,000 from the Imperial Exchequer to the Colonial Exchequer. Now I must express my regret that the noble Earl, in his anxiety to make a thrust at Her Majesty's Government, should have allowed his judgment to be so blinded with regard to a simple, commonplace transaction of that kind as to magnify it in his own mind into a case parallel with that of the present Bill, and with the disendowment and disestablishment of the Irish Church.

The Earl of CARNARVON: May I be allowed to ask the noble and learned Lord this question, whether the colonists have undertaken, either directly or indirectly, to substitute any payment for the endowment for this country?

The LORD CHANCELLOR: My answer to the question is this — I believe the colonists are ready to make provision for the payment of the clergy of the Church; and as soon as the Act receives the Royal Assent, communications will be made to them by the Colonial Office, inviting them to put themselves in motion for this purpose. Whether, however, they do this or not does not signify a pin's point in the argument. There was no endowment to which we ever pledged ourselves. There was no contract whatever upon the subject. There was simply an eleemosynary donation of £20,000 originating in the distressed state of the island; and out of tenderness for the circumstances under which that donation was made, the measure, to which I have referred, contains a clause, providing that none of those persons who have gone out to Jamaica, upon the faith of this donation from the Imperial Exchequer, are to suffer during their incumbencies; and the Imperial Exchequer, during their incumbencies, will make good the sums they have been receiving. The noble Earl, however, who moved the second reading (Earl Granville) referred to Jamaica for another purpose. He said he understood the Government had consented, in the case of Jamaica, to a suspensory measure analogous to this Bill. The noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) told the noble Earl he did not know how strong the case really was, for that it was perfectly parallel. Now, what is the fact with regard to this suspensory measure, which is a different matter from the Parliamentary grant of £20,000 a year. There is in Jamaica a very singular colonial law, which is this—that all the parochial arrangements of the island are made for a term of years only. They all come to an end next year (1869); the incumbents and curates of the whole island hold their preferments for a term, which will then expire; and the whole of the salaries and of the work to be done will then be subject to a revision. In this state of things, Governor Grant sent a despatch to the Colonial Office, in which he thus expresses himself—

> "The second measure is mainly of preparatory character, though it will also have the effect of producing an immediate saving to the revenue, of considerable importance in the present state of the finances of the colony. Under a colonial statute, the tenure of the cures of all the clergy of Jamaica expires with the close of the year 1869. At that time it will be legitimate to make any changes of system, and any reductions in number and pay, which may be thought proper on general principles. Great reductions in pay were made by the late Colonial Legislature at the expiry of the last temporary statute, by which the ecclesiastical establishment was regulated; and it has been perfectly understood by all parties here, that the re-arrangement of the ecclesiastical establishment after 1869 would be treated practically as an open question. For this reason I have proposed to the Bishop that no vacancy, occurring in the ecclesiastical establishment, shall be filled until a new scheme for supplying the religious wants of the island shall have been determined upon by Her Majesty's Government; and in this proposal his Lordship has acquiesced. I now submit this recommendation for your Lordship's decision. Already by the provisional introduction of this principle, an immediate saving, which I estimate roughly at about £2,000 a year, has become feasible, without public inconvenience or personal loss to any one: the details of which arrangement I hope to be able to send to your Lordship by next mail. I cannot too strongly express to your Lordship the obligation I am under to the Bishop of Kingston for the kind and liberal support I have received from him in my endeavour to improve the embarrassed financial condition of this colony, by economy in this department of affairs."

The facts are thus very simple. All appointments must come to an end in 1869; and it would be very foolish to appoint, merely for a year or two, when an entire change in the ecclesiastical arrangements of the island is already appointed by statute to be made. The Colonial Secretary sent a despatch in reply, in these words—

> "I have to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch, No. 57 of the 24th of November, reporting the reduction effected by you in the ecclesiastical expenditure in Jamaica, and the steps taken by you with a view to a further reduction of it. I concur in your views on this subject, and approve your proceedings for giving effect to them. I have observed with satisfaction the cordial co-operation which you have met with from the Bishop.

Now I think all this was a very ordinary and very natural transaction. Both the Governor's letter and the Secretary of State's despatch appear to me to be exceedingly proper. I believe the arrangement has nothing on earth parallel with the suspension of appointments proposed by the present Bill. If, however, my Lords, I am mistaken in this view, if it is the case that Her Majesty's Government do not, as was said by the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon), come into Court with clean hands upon this subject, if they are guilty of the flagrant and glaring inconsistency to which he referred, if that is the case, then, at least, it may not be unfitting, that in the presence of the accuser of the Government, I should remind your Lordships that the hand which is appended to that despatch is the hand of the Earl of Carnarvon.

Now, my Lords, as regards the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church, which is the real principle of this Bill, there are two questions which have to be considered—justice and policy. It has been repeatedly said that the endowment and establishment of the Irish Church are an injustice. If, however, anything is unjust, there can never be much difficulty in putting your finger upon that which constitutes the injustice, and I listened to this debate with some interest to know whether we should be informed by any of the speakers what the injustice, as regards the position of the Irish Church and its endowments, was said to be. Well, my Lords, what is the injustice? If these endowments belonged to any other Church or body, I should admit at once that it was a great injustice, and that the Church ought not to have them. But is it contended that these endowments belong to any other Church? Is it contended that they belong to the Roman Catholic Church? Do you intend to give them to the Roman Catholic Church? Why, the Roman Catholic Church say that they do not claim them, that they do not want them, and that they would not have them. There is no case, therefore, of a rival claimant demanding these endowments, and asserting that they properly belong to them. Then is the injustice this, that wherever you have an Established Church, with endowments, that is of itself an injustice and an inequality as regards every person who is not a member of it? My Lords, depend upon it, we must face this question and must make up our minds how to answer it if that is said to be the injustice. Is the existence of the Irish Church, with its endowments, an injustice to everyone who does not belong to it? If this is the theory we are to adopt, then I maintain that it does not matter whether those who do not belong to it are 5,000 or 5,000,000. The injustice, if injustice there be as regards individuals, is the same. There can be no greater injustice as regards each individual of the 5,000,000 than there would be towards each individual of the 5,000. Therefore, if that principle is to be laid down in support of this measure, it is one which applies to this country as well as to Ireland. A petition was presented the other night by a noble Lord (Lord Lyttelton), which I am desirous of treating with every respect. The petitioners stated that the Irish Church was an injustice, and that they could not support an injustice. I said to myself "Here are philosophers, literary men, men of reputation; I shall now hear what the injustice is." I read the petition and found the usual dogmatic statement, that the Irish Church, with its endowments, was an injustice, but I found nothing more. The question was thus left just where it had been. But the noble Lord who presented the petition took the trouble of giving your Lordships an explanation on the subject. If I am wrong he will correct me. He said that he did not understand that all those who had signed the petition, or the greater number of them, approved the scheme brought forward in connection with the present Bill. Many, or some of them, were in favour of a plan for dividing the endowments of the Irish Church among the various denominations in Ireland. Now, if these petitioners have adopted the view that these endowments belong to all the different religious denominations in Ireland, I agree with them that the present appropriation of these endowments is an injustice. I do not agree with them in their first proposition, that these endowments do belong to all the religious persuasions, but if they have arrived at that view, I can see what they mean by an injustice, and the conclusion at which they arrive is what might be expected from logical men. But, then, my Lords, that petition is not one in favour of this Bill, and the petitioners, on the contrary, are contending for a principle disowned by the promoters of this Bill. Well, but then it is said that the majority in Ireland do not accept the services of the Established Church, but profess a different religion, and that in this lies the injustice of the Establishment. Now, my Lords, if that is the principle we are to adopt—if what is just when those who have the endowments are in the majority is unjust when those who have them are in the minority, then the logical consequence must be that the majority are entitled to the endowments. I ask the noble Earl, who moves the second reading (Earl Granville), is it his proposal that the endowments of the Irish Church should be transferred to the Roman Catholics; or is it that they should be divided among all denominations; or is it that the majority, whoever they may be, should have these endowments? If he repudiates each of these three proposals, then I am unable to see what is the injustice which he is going to remedy.

Now, my Lords, one word about numbers — a difficult and delicate subject to enter on. The point to be considered seems to me to be this. Is the connection between Church and State an Imperial question, or a local question? If it is an Imperial question, I apprehend that the numbers you have to look to are the numbers of the Empire. If it be a local question, I want to know how far are you going to localize it? Are you going to stop at localizing it in Ireland? Why should not a proposition be made to localize it in Wales? You may depend that if you treat this as a local question, you must be prepared to carry out that principle far beyond the case of the Irish Church. If the question of Church and State is to be dealt with according to the exigencies of different localities, you cannot stop short at Ireland. Let me take a question which is analogous. You have now a Protestant Sovereign, a Protestant Head of the State, laws to secure that the Head of the State shall always be a Protestant. Is that an Imperial principle? I apprehend it is. That law is enacted and maintained because the great majority of the people of the Empire hold it to be a good law. But I want to know, if the question of the connection between Church and State is a local question, why the principle that the Head of the State should be a Protestant should not also be a local question; and, if so, why should not the people of Ireland express an opinion upon it? Why should not an agitation be got up in Ireland to treat this principle as an Irish and not an Imperial question? My Lords, this is not so chimerical a supposition as some of your Lordships might be inclined to suppose. At a meeting of the Defence Association, of which Cardinal Cullen is the President, it has been made a subject of complaint that a law of this country inflicts the grievous hardship on Roman Catholics of entailing a forfeiture of the Crown on any Sovereign of the United Kingdom who should be converted to what is termed in the Resolution "genuine Christianity." More than that. My Lords, a supporter of this Bill in the House of Commons, more advanced or more candid than his fellows, has made a proposition, which, I believe, has not yet been considered, that the declaration which secures that the Sovereign should make a profession of the Protestant religion, should be wiped out of the Coronation ceremony.

My Lords, I have thus tried, and tried in vain, to find out what is the injustice complained of by the advocates of this Bill; and now let me ask you—for this question of injustice has two aspects—to consider what is the injustice on the other side? The subject is too broad to take in all its details; but let me refer, in order to show the working of a measure of disendowment, to two important elements of the property of the Irish Church. I will take first the glebe lands. I do not mean the glebes themselves, for they are comparatively small matters, nor do I speak of the small patches round the residences of the clergy; I speak of the glebe lands constituting a large item in the property of the Church in Ireland. The glebe lands in Ireland amount in round numbers to 133,000 acres. In the province of Armagh alone they amount to about 112,000 acres. I do not suppose I over-state the value of those lands—they are said to be about the best in Ireland—when I say that they are worth considerably more than £100,000 a year. Now, what is the title to that property, and how were these glebe lands given? Let me read to your Lordships a very short extract from Mr. Hallam's account of the settlement of Ulster by James I. He says—

> "From a sense of the error committed in the Queen's time, by granting vast tracts to single persons, the lands were distributed in three classes, of 2,000, 1,500, and 1,000 English acres; and in every county one-half of the assignments was to the smallest, the rest to the other two classes. Those who received 2,000 acres were bound within four years to build a castle and bawn, or strong court-yard; the second class within two years to build a stone or brick house with a bawn; the third class, a bawn only. The first were to plant on their lands within three years forty-eight able men, eighteen years old or upwards, born in England or the inland parts of Scotland; the others to do the same, in proportion to their estates. All the grantees were to reside within five years, in person or by approved agents, and to keep sufficient store of arms. They were not to alienate their lands without the King's licence, nor to let them for less than twenty-one years. Their tenants were to live in houses built in the English manner, and not dispersed, but in villages."

That was the scheme of settlement generally; but the instructions with regard to assigning glebes were in these words—

> "The Commissioners are to assign to the incumbent of each parish a glebe, after the rate of threescore acres for every thousand acres within the parishes, in the most convenient places, or nearest to the churches; and, for the more certainty, to give such glebe a certain name, whereby it may be known."

My Lords, the Commissioners proceeded under that Order to allot the glebe lands; and if your Lordships have the curiosity to look into the matter you will find in your Library, through the recent publication of the Patent Rolls, the terms of the grant of every one of those glebes. I will take the limitations of two of these, by way of example—

> "To hold for ever to the incumbent and his successors in free, pure, and perpetual alms for all services"—a title in frankalmoign, as good a title as a fee-simple—"with a covenant for the building of glebe houses; and in default His Majesty reserves permission to enter, and by the hands of the dean, archdeacon, and two justices of the peace, to collect the issues and profits of the lands until the buildings shall be finished; and no person shall let or set any of the glebes contrary to His late Majesty's instructions, upon pain of forfeiture of five shillings an acre."

In another grant, the only other example that I shall give—

> "All the preceding lands are to be held by the incumbents and their successors for ever, in free, pure, and perpetual alms, on condition that they shall build substantial residences."

Now, my Lords, observe what the consequences were. This was the Plantation and Settlement of Ulster. Not only did the incumbents settle and comply with the conditions imposed, not only did they reclaim the lands allotted to them, but the settlers who took the 1,000 acres, less the sixty, induced by this grant for the maintenance of their religion, imported or immigrated with other Scotch and English settlers. They reclaimed the lands of Ulster, and that province, which, according to Sir John Davis, was immediately before one waste and desolate wilderness, became the garden of Ireland. Money was laid out upon it, men came into the country and settled there with their families, and if you now touch these glebe lands, which were so granted, you unsettle the settlement of Ulster. You take away that which was the most important element of the settlement; you interfere, not merely with the interests of the incumbent and his successors, but those rights and interests of the laity who staked their fortunes in Ulster and made Ulster what it is, you entirely confiscate. I need not remind your Lordships that the greatest amount of wealth, prosperity, and energy that was ever brought into Ireland was introduced by means of that very settlement. So much for the glebe lands, and for the £100,000 or £200,000 a year of the income of the Irish Church which the glebe lands represent. Now, my Lords, turn for a moment to the tithe rent-charge. I cannot at this hour go into the history of that portion of the possessions of the Church, and after the speech of my right rev. Friend this evening, what I can say must fall far short of what you have already heard. But I ask you to take one short and simple view of the results of confiscating the tithe rent-charge. Eight-ninths of the land in Ireland belongs to Protestants. The purchasers in the Incumbered Estates Court were, it is well known, as to the great majority, Protestants also. Now, let me ask your Lordships to take the case of a single one of these purchasers, for we shall never understand the bearing of the question till we look at individual cases. Let me suppose the case of a purchaser of land who buys a whole parish. He is a Protestant; he naturally looks for the enjoyment and instruction of his religion, and to the advantage of having a parochial clergyman upon his estate. He knows that in some way or other this parochial clergyman must be provided for, and he knows, when he buys or inherits the land, that there will be payable out of it a sum (say) of £500 a year tithe rent-charge, which will be applicable to the support of that minister whose ministrations he values. Now, if you confiscate the rent-charge and apply it to secular purposes, what is the practical effect on the layman? Never mind the clergyman; let him take care of himself for the present. You thereby require this Protestant owner, the purchaser of a whole parish, to provide another £500 a year, in order therewith to provide for the minister whose former means of support you have confiscated. That brings us face to face with the character of this measure. It is not a measure in which the vested interests of the clergy are really so much at stake. And I can conceive nothing more nearly approaching to mockery than a Resolution which says that the Irish Church is to cease, due regard being had to all personal interests and individual rights of property—that being afterwards interpreted as meaning the individual interests and rights of property of the clergy. I am very anxious for the clergy and their well-being; but they appear to me to be of all persons the least interested in this question, because their interests for life are to be secured. The persons whose interests are overlooked are the laity. I have given your Lordships an instance—a proprietor buys a parish knowing that there are certain outgoings intended to provide for a clergyman; having bought the parish, he finds these outgoings confiscated by your legislation to some wholly foreign purpose, and is by that means compelled to supply the deficiency by another payment of equal amount which he never reckoned upon at all. Let me put a homely illustration—here is a parish hospital with ample endowments for its support; let us suppose that an enlightened legislator resolves to apply its endowments to some other purpose, providing at the same time that all vested interests shall be respected. The hospital is full of patients, and it has a good staff of medical and other officers. An actuary is brought in to value the amount of interest which each patient may be supposed to have for his sojourn in the hospital, and to value the life-interests of the staff. The amount of this valuation is secured, and then it is said that all vested interests are respected. No doubt all interests are respected, except the not unimportant interest of the parish for which the hospital was originally intended. And then, my Lords, if this enlightened legislator were to find that the compensation took up two-fifths of the endowment, he would, according to the views of the promoter of this Bill, tell us that he preserved for the hospital two-fifths of its property! Now, this is exactly what you propose to do with the Church; the clergy are all to be compensated with money, the parishes are to be simply robbed of their endowments.

Now, my Lords, let us turn to the policy of the question—the pacification of Ireland. That was a question dealt with somewhat summarily by the noble Earl (the Earl of Clarendon). The noble Earl who has had some experience of Ireland, said, "I never supposed that this measure would do anything for the pacification of Ireland. I don't think it will, but at all events," he said, "if we pass this measure we shall have satisfied our own consciences." That was the view of the noble Earl. Now, my Lords, I am quite sure that your Lordships would be quite willing to do anything in reason to bring ease to the conscience of the noble Earl; but at the same time I am bound to say that when one considers the number of years during which the noble Earl has been in Office, and during which he never, that I am aware, opened his mouth upon this subject, I cannot help thinking that this chronic state of uneasiness of conscience has not, upon the whole, caused him much discomfort. But, my Lords, I think your Lordships would do well to consider whether this Bill, which you are asked so suddenly to pass to the great injury of one class of the population, will have any good effect in producing that harmony we all so much desire to see? Now what is the foundation for the idea that this measure will lead to the pacification of Ireland? In the first place, is it the case that the Established Church in Ireland has been the cause of the antagonism of races which has so undoubtedly and so long prevailed? I should like to answer that question in the words of a Roman Catholic historian, also a great poet, who gives us a statement from the Roman Catholic point of view, as to the history of the Church of Ireland. Mr. Moore says—

> "At the period when all were of one faith, the Church of the Government and the Church of the people of Ireland were almost as much separated from each other by difference in race, language, political feeling, and even ecclesiastical discipline, as they have been at any period since by difference of creed. Disheartening as may be some of the conclusions deducible from this fact, it clearly shows that the establishment of the Reformed Church in that kingdom was not the first or sole cause of the bitter hostility between the two races."

Now take the present time, and I ask, what reason is there for supposing that any of these Fenian movements, which we all look on with abhorrence, are in any shape or form connected with the Established Church? Has any member of that body ever suggested anything of the kind? On the contrary, have not the whole of the attempts of Fenianism been designed to obtain possession of the land in Ireland, to effect a separation of the two kingdoms, and to establish what has been called the nationality of Ireland? Well, my Lords, what as to the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland? It is impossible not to observe that the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland have discovered that the measure which has been so temptingly held out to them, and which they have been asked to support, does in reality give them nothing, and may deprive them of much which they now have. Every day I read in Roman Catholic organs appeals to the laity, upbraiding them for being utterly indifferent to the great work being conducted in England by their great apostle, Mr. Gladstone. Then, is there any foundation for imagining that the Roman Catholic priesthood, with their great influence over the laity, would, upon receiving a measure of this kind, induce the laity of Ireland to be satisfied, and influence them to ask for nothing further? If your Lordships believe that, you will act in entire opposition to the declared position and opinion of the Roman Catholic priesthood. Your Lordships have heard of the circular issued from a meeting of the Tenant-right Society in the county of Meath, the meeting being attended by the Roman Catholic Bishop and Vicar General, and the circular being signed by two Roman Catholic priests. In that circular they say—

> "The one, the great, the sole question for Ireland, is the land question; other agitations, such as that against the Established Church, are got up for party purposes, would infuse an element of bigotry into the already sufficiently disturbed relations between landlord and tenant, would effect the ruin of thousands of tenants, and precipitate that social catastrophe we are anxious to avert."

My Lords, I could not help being struck the other day by a pamphlet which was sent to me, purporting to be written by the Rev. Mr. Malone, a parish priest of Belmullet in Ireland, and who writes to my noble Friend lately at the head of the Government (the Earl of Derby). He sums up the case of Ireland against England in these words, and your Lordships will see that he does not even mention the Established Church. His propositions are—

> "First, that Ireland, by Divine right, belongs to the Irish race; second, that England never had a right to dispossess the people of Ireland third, that England does, nevertheless, dispossess, extirpate, and indirectly put to death the people of Ireland; and, fourth, it will be a question for consideration whether the people of Ireland have a right to resist and overthrow any Government that thus violates the fundamental principles of right and justice in her regard."

My Lords, if, as I am convinced is the case, this agitation against the Church is not an Irish but an English question, and an English anti-Church agitation, let me ask you to consider what will be the probable effect upon the Protestant population of Ireland? I do not claim for the Protestant population of Ireland any indulgence, I do not claim for them any privilege, I do not claim for them ascendancy of any kind; but I do claim for them this —I claim that it shall be recollected that they represent by far the greatest amount of the education, of the energy, and of the prosperity of Ireland; and that so far as they have been introduced into and settled in Ireland, they have been introduced and settled to civilize, and to cement the union between the two countries, and to plant in Ireland the seed of that freedom of thought, and speech, and action, which are among the most glorious fruits of the Reformation. What, then, I ask, do you suppose will be the feeling of the Protestant population of Ireland, if dealt with in the manner that this Bill proposes to deal with the endowments of their Church? I do not mean to say, as has been said by others, that the effect will be to produce anything like resistance by physical opposition. But, my Lords, I do say this—that legislation of this kind, viewed by them, as it must be viewed, with resentment and a sense of injustice, cannot fail to induce in their minds feelings which must in the highest degree be detrimental to the realization of that close connection which we all wish to see prevail between this and the sister country. Upon this point I am anxious to refer to testimony which the promoters of this measure will regard with greater favour than my own. Sir George Grey, when a Colleague of all the noble Lords who sit on the front Opposition Bench, and speaking in the House of Commons on behalf of the Government of which they were Members, said, no later than 1863—

> "Whatever I may think of the wisdom and policy of establishing an exclusive Church of the religion of a minority in a country, without making any provision for the religion of the majority of the inhabitants, it is impossible to get rid of the fact that this Church has existed for centuries, has become interwoven with the institutions of the country, and could not be subverted without a revolution. That revolution I, for one, am not prepared to recommend."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxi. 1714.]

My Lords, in the same debate a right hon. Gentleman, who represents perhaps more than any other Member of Parliament the Roman Catholic opinion of Ireland—I mean Mr. Monsell—said—

> "He disclaimed all idea of supporting the Motion from a desire to overthrow the Established Church of Ireland. That, he admitted, could not be accomplished without a revolution, and he was not prepared to face a revolution for such an object."—[*Ibid.* 1716.]

The noble Earl (Earl Russell) seems surprised at that opinion; the noble Earl will therefore allow me to quote his own words. I should not venture to go so far back as 1846 if the noble Lord had not referred to his opinions at that time, and endorsed them in the pamphlet he published only last year. He said—

> "I believe that with respect to what some have proposed—namely, the destruction of the Protestant Church in Ireland, there could be no worse or more fatal measure sanctioned by Parliament. I believe that it would be politically injurious, because I believe that many of the most loyal in Ireland, many of those the most attached to the connection with this country, would be alienated by the destruction of that Church to which they are fondly attached. I believe that, in a religious point of view, it would be the commencement of a religious war; that there would be that which does not at present prevail, the most violent and vehement attack upon the Roman Catholic Church, and that the Roman Catholics themselves would be the first to complain of the destruction of the Protestant Church."

My Lords, I believe these opinions are not overstrained, and that the effect of this policy on the population of Ireland will be either to perpetuate the war of races, which was rapidly dying out, or else—and this is a result to which some agitators look forward with avowed pleasure—to unite them in a common hostility to England.

Now, my Lords, for its effect on the social well-being of Ireland. That is disposed of in a word. There is no evil in Ireland, by the admission of everyone, so great as the evil of absenteeism. Disestablish the Irish Church, and you produce two classes of absentees, which have hitherto not existed—one class, the Bishops and clergy, who have been the most numerous and most useful of the resident gentry of the country. The other will be that class of those laymen, who, having no longer the services of the Church to which they belong, will have every temptation held out to them to cease to reside in the country. And here again I am happy to be able to quote the words of the noble Earl in his pamphlet this year. He says, speaking of the destruction of the Protestant Church—

> "It would manifestly check civilization, and arrest the progress of society, in the rural parts of Ireland. In connection with education it would deprive Ireland of the Parliamentary grants which now flow from the Imperial Exchequer."

My Lords, I turn next to the effect on the welfare of the Church itself. I admit that, as a member of the United Church of England and Ireland, I look with great anxiety to this part of the subject. My Lords, I do not wish to enter into any theological argument. I certainly should be very sorry to reciprocate the announcement in the recent Encyclical from Rome, that one of the dogmas of the present day, which are to be reprobated, is the idea that Protestantism is a form of Christianity. I am willing to extend the most perfect respect to the sincere opinions and convictions of the Roman Catholic Church, though I do not agree with them; but I may, at the same time, be excused for preferring the doctrines maintained by my own Church, and for feeling alarm and jealousy at any policy which would be injurious to the spread of those doctrines. Now, the noble Earl, in moving the second reading, assured us that he was perfectly satisfied that if this Bill passed the Church would be amply supported; that she might safely rely on her own exertions, and would even rise to higher prosperity and greater vigour than she has ever yet enjoyed. My Lords, even if this view of the results of disendowment were true, still if the endowments are the property of the Church, the observations of the noble Earl would be but little to the purpose. It is very much the same thing as if some person, surveying the ample rent-roll and possessions of the noble Earl, and, being led by circumstances, to take what the noble Earl terms a "calm and dispassionate view" of the great inequalities in the division of property, should go to the noble Earl and say to him, "You are committing a great mistake; with your commanding eloquence, your unrivalled tact and great abilities, if you would only be content to give up any reliance on these adventitious sources of wealth which you possess, and launch forth upon the strength and support of your own powers, you would not feel in the slightest degree the want of what you surrender; and in a few years you would come back to me and tell me how much happier, how much richer, how much more influential you are, and how much you find your general welfare improved by having taken my advice." I doubt very much whether the noble Earl would think that a persuasive or consolatory mode of argument in his own case. But, my Lords, I deny that the assumption is true. I fully admit—I am thankful to believe—that the spread of the great truths of revealed religion has taken place, and will take place, notwithstanding the want of endowments. But I apprehend it is an entirely different thing where you have the case on the one hand of a Church that never has possessed endowments; which has taken root, and extended its branches, and pushed itself forward, from time to time, just as its strength and numbers enabled it, and as means were supplied to allow its efforts to be made; and where you are dealing, on the other hand, with a Church which has grown up and grown old in the possession of endowments, and where, by a sudden and hostile wrench, you propose to tear away its supports. I know that it is the fashion to say, "Look at the case of the Free Church of Scotland, how it has repudiated endowments, and has provided for the sustenance of its own ministry." There is no kind of analogy between the two cases. In Scotland you had a Church, which, under the stress and pressure of conscientious conviction, was, by its own action, rent asunder into two parts—one of which retained, and the other of which for conscience' sake, surrendered those endowments which had belonged to the body as a whole. That same conscientious conviction—that same pressure which brought about this severance, became, as it always will become, a source and motive of liberal action, amply sufficient to supply the place of those endowments, which, for conscientious reasons, were given up. It is a very different matter with regard to a Church in which there is no desire to give up, no conscientious scruple which demands the surrender of, its endowments; but whose endowments the State forcibly carries away. My Lords, it is said that the Church of Ireland ought to rest upon the support of the members of the Church of Ireland. I have not the least doubt that in the large towns in that country the Church would continue to be supported. It would be supported at a sacrifice, but the sacrifice would be made, and the Church maintained. But what would happen in the country parts of Ireland, inhabited by a sparse and scattered population, amid the wilds and amid the agricultural districts of the country? I apprehend that this would happen—that thinly sprinkled Protestant population of those parts would either emigrate, or in time—and that no distant time—be absorbed into the religion of those by whom they are surrounded—the religion of the Church of Rome, and become subject to all the political influences connected with that Church.

And now, my Lords, I turn to the connection between the Church in Ireland and the Church in England. I do not wish to over-state this part of the argument. I admit that there are large, very large, differences between the Church in Ireland and the Church in England, as regards the circumstances of the two countries and the circumstances of the two Churches. But your Lordships must bear in mind what you are asked to do. You are asked to deal with this question, not in reference to circumstances, but upon principles—upon the principles of justice and equality; and if you lay down the principle that the existence in Ireland of an Established Church having endowments is an injustice and inequality as regards anyone who does not belong to it—and that is the principle upon which you are now asked to act—then I want to know why the principle is not to be applied to England? Supposing this was to happen, supposing the Church in Ireland were to be disestablished, and, several years hence, some statesman were to get up and say, "Let us look back at the debates that occurred upon the Bill for the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1868, and we shall find it laid down that the Irish Church was an inequality and a hardship upon those who did not agree with it, and are we now to have this inequality maintained in England?" What answer could we give? I do not see how the principle of equality can be applied to one country and not to the other. Is there to be equality and justice for Ireland and inequality and injustice to England? Bear in mind, my Lords, that we have had ample warnings upon this point. These opinions are not mine; we have had warnings on the subject from every body of men, who, as far as I am aware, are anxious for the passing of this Bill. As regards the Roman Catholic body, do they say that they are anxious only for the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland, and that they do not suppose that anything that is done in Ireland will become a precedent for dealing with the Church in this country? I was much struck by reading, only the other day, in the *Westminster Gazette*, a prominent organ of the Roman Catholics of England, an article headed "The Catholics of England and the coming Election"—

> "The independency of the Nonconformists is a less unclean thing in our eyes than the Royal Supremacy. We have suffered less—England has suffered less, by it than by the fatal principle introduced by the Tudor religion. In the work of disestablishing, first the Irish, then the Anglican Church, we can, though without sharing their principles, join hands with the earnest and religious Dissenters of England."

That is what the Roman Catholics of this country say of the matter. Now let us see what the Dissenters say. Do they say, "We want to abolish this anomaly in Ireland, but to leave it untouched in this country?" I take the words of Mr. Miall on this point—

> "The Irish Church question will not be finally disposed of before the public mind will be prepared to entertain proposals in reference to the Scotch Kirk and the Church of England. As it has been with one Establishment, so probably will it be with the others. Their time is fixed. An impulse will come unexpectedly and from an unanticipated quarter. The ordinary barriers will be broken down. What is taking place now is full of encouragement to such as are content to labour and to wait. They need not ask, 'Who will roll us away the stone from the sepulchre?' In the appointed hour they will be relieved of their perplexity by the intervention of some unlooked-for messenger from heaven. Mr. Gladstone is but now treading on the verge of a wide region of change. He knows not whither his convictions will ultimately impel him. He may be regarded as raised up and qualified by Divine Providence for great and beneficent purposes."

But the noble Earl (Earl Granville) said that those who foreboded any danger on this score to the English Church were "prophets of evil." Well, one of these prophets of evil is now sitting beside the noble Earl and has just addressed your Lordships in support of this Bill. The noble Earl (Earl Russell) said no later than last Session (1867), in moving for the Commission on the Irish Church which is now sitting—

> "A third course would be to 'secularize' the Church funds; that is, to adopt the voluntary principle in regard to the Church in Ireland; to establish no new Church and to abolish the Establishment which at present exists, giving to education, or to any other object of general utility, the revenues which are now absorbed by the Established Church in Ireland. Of course this proposal contemplates securing a life-interest to the present holders of benefices in the Church. This is a plan which I have often thought might be realized, but it has very great defects in it. In the first place, you immediately destroy, as far as Ireland is concerned, the principle of Establishment. Such an example would hardly be lost on the Dissenters of this country. Although the cases might be very dissimilar, those who strove for the destruction of the Church Establishment in England in favour of the voluntary principle, would avail themselves of the precedent to overthrow the Established Church here. I therefore think it would be unwise in us to assent to a Bill embodying that view, even if it came from the House of Commons."

My Lords, I am sorry to say that there was much of the speech of the noble Earl to-night which I was unable to catch, but I suppose I ought not to doubt that he means to act by voting against this Bill, as he said he would not quite twelve months ago for he then held the opinion that it would be unwise to assent to a Bill embodying the policy he then condemned, that is, the policy of disestablishing the Church in Ireland, even if that Bill came up to us from the House of Commons. Well, my Lords, but then the noble Earl the late Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Carnarvon), says that for a Government to assert that danger may accrue to the English Church from the destruction of the Irish Church is a wanton—nay more, is a reckless — nay most, is a criminal thing; and Her Majesty's Government are wanton and reckless and criminal for attempting to bind up the fate of the English with that of the Irish Church. Now I want to know, if my house adjoins my neighbour's and both stand under the same roof, am I guilty of a wanton, of a reckless, of a criminal act when, even although my foundations are deeper and my walls thicker, and my beams broader and my joists more fireproof than my neighbour's, I venture to suggest that if a fire breaks out in his house it may possibly extend to and injure mine? But then we are told that the Church of England need not have any fear because she is firm in the affections of the people. My Lords, I believe she is firm in the affections of the majority of the people of England, and I should be very hopeful of her safety if those who had to decide it were the people of England. But those who say so, assuredly forget how any question affecting the Church of England will come to be decided. Will it be decided by the people of England? My Lords, it will not. It will be decided by Parliament, by the House of Commons. And whom will the House of Commons represent? My Lords, do not imagine you will have all at once a gross and open measure proposed in the House of Commons to disestablish and disendow the Church of England. There will be nothing of this kind, but you will have, year after year, measure after measure proposed, bit-by-bit legislation, all having the same tendency, and all going to impair in some way or other the standing and coherence of the English Church. And who will vote upon these questions? The people of England? No. There will be the representatives of Ireland; rather more than one-half of them representing constituencies flushed with the recent triumph over the Church in their own land, and eager to add to that triumph. We know how they will vote. Then there will be the remainder of the Irish representatives, returned by constituencies stung with resentment and grief and pain at the way in which they have been treated and betrayed. We can imagine how they too will vote. Then you will have the Scotch Members, at present almost all returned by constituencies holding voluntary opinions, and who, if as Mr. Miall says, the Scotch Kirk is to be the next victim, will have no establishment of their own left to defend. You will have them added to the Irish Members. Then there will be the representatives of English constituencies, no small number, who are influenced by voluntary opinions; and in that state of things, will the affections of the people of England be able to preserve, inviolate, the safety of the English Church?

I must now, with your Lordships' permission, add a few words on the effect which these proposals will have on the security of property. I think it is very important that we should understand upon what principle we are invited to act as regards ecclesiastical property. The proposition now is to secularize, for the first time, property which, from time immemorial, has been devoted to ecclesiastical purposes. Remember, in the course of our Parliamentary history, this has never yet been done. What is the true view of the position and nature of ecclesiastical property? The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) says it is perhaps a technical view to take, but that there is no corporation of the Church; that there are individual corporations, such as Bishops and incumbents, but that the Church itself is no corporation. My Lords, this is indeed a technical view, because it is one which wholly fails to comprehend and to appreciate the broad and substantial view of the question. No doubt, a lawyer will tell you that you have in the Church individual corporations, such as Bishops, and rectors, and incumbents. But for whom do they hold the property they possess? Is it for their own enjoyment and benefit? Can they do what they please with it? Certainly not. They hold it as trustees for the whole Church, for the laity and the clergy alike; and in that sense, in that larger and wider view, in that comprehensive and corporate capacity, the Church, and not the individual corporations are the persons entitled to the benefit of the property. Now, it is said that there is a great distinction between ecclesiastical and private property. I never said there was not. The distinction is this—with regard to private property, every owner of it has a right to do with it what he likes, With regard to ecclesiastical property, because it is held in trust for others, that trust has to be protected, and therefore, as to property of this description, the State has a duty to perform. But the only duty which the State has to perform, and the only power which the State, morally speaking, possesses, is the duty and the power to see that the trusts are executed, and that a proper object of the trust remains. And, my Lords, provided the trust is executed, and the object of the trust remains, I maintain that Parliament is no more competent, morally, to deal with property of that kind than it is to deal with private property. That is the whole principle applicable to the case, and the only question is, as to an abuse of the trust or a failure of the object. Now, as to any abuse of the trust, we have had every speaker admitting that, whatever may have been the case in times past, the clergy of the Church in Ireland are now performing their duty in a manner worthy of all praise. Well, then, has there been a failure in the object of the trust? The noble Earl (Earl Granville) contended there was, and he made it out in this way — He said that when Queen Elizabeth confirmed these possessions to the Irish Church, she had a full expectation that the whole country would become Protestant, and that the endowments would, therefore, be for the benefit of the whole country. Now, I do not in the least know, nor I think does the noble Earl know, what Queen Elizabeth may have thought with regard to Ireland; but it is certain that when Queen Elizabeth confirmed the English Church in its possessions, she intended—for she made her intent extremely clear—that there should be no nonconformity, and that the whole of England should conform to the English Church. Therefore, you might as well say that because the expectation and intention of Queen Elizabeth were defeated in England, there was a failure of the objects in their entirety which she had in view. But it has been said that there are no converts made in Ireland. I should be prepared to controvert that statement, but it is not possible in this House to examine into the case of individual converts. But let us take a broader view than the view of individual instances. We are told now that the great statistical authority as to the Irish Church in the days subsequent to Queen Elizabeth is Sir William Petty. I will accept his authority, although it is, I think, Mr. Hallam who says that Sir William Petty's conjectures are "prodigiously vague." Well, Sir William Petty says that at the time he writes, at the close of the 17th century, there were 100,000 Churchmen in Ireland out of a whole population of 1,100,000. That is, one in every eleven. There are 700,000 now. If you multiply 700,000 by 11, you get a population of something like 7,500,000, whereas the population of Ireland is only 5,500,000. Therefore you have a Church in Ireland, according to Sir William Petty's calculation, increasing in a very much greater ratio than any other denomination since the time of which he wrote. If that be so, then there is no failure of the object of the trust. You have, therefore, neither of the grounds which would justify the interference of the Legislature with ecclesiastical property. Then, my Lords, are we right or are we not, in saying that the security of property must be affected by legislation of this kind? My Lords, what must happen? The next time there is a Government to be attacked, the next time that some device has to be discovered for organizing a "calm and dispassionate" attack on something that excites the envy of those who do not possess it, what more easy than to say,—taking a case which attracts considerable attention—"Let us deal with private endowments?" I understood the noble Duke, who began the debate to-night, (the Duke of Argyll) to lay down broadly as his opinion, that "any money given to Churches the State might deal with as it thought fit." Well, between the case of private endowments and the case of corporate property the transition is quite easy. And how will private property be dealt with? Not, probably, by some proposition to confiscate it, but by measures to interfere with entails and with settlements, and with descents and successions and wills, and thus to establish the principle that the State has a right to change the disposition of private property; and for such a proceeding, legislation like the present will become a precedent. In the pamphlet of the noble Earl (Earl Russell) he refers to the estates of the Bedford family. The noble Earl says the case of those estates is different from those of the Church, inasmuch as the heir of the Duke of Bedford succeeds to the Bedford estates as a matter of course; whereas with regard to a bishopric, the new Bishop does not succeed as a matter of course. My answer to that is, that the heir of the Duke of Bedford succeeds as a matter of course as long as you maintain the present law; the successor of the Bishop succeeds as a matter of course as long as you maintain the present law; but if you alter the present law as regards the one, I want to know what security you have that the law may not be altered also as regards the other? I will not enter into the anecdote the noble Earl (Earl Russell) has told us to-night, when he said an Earl of Derby of an earlier date had shut up the then Earl of Bedford in a castle. But the noble Lord did not tell us what that Earl of Bedford had done.

EARL RUSSELL: The then Earl of Derby wished to shut him up.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Oh, he only wished to shut him up! The noble Earl, I think, suggested that the Earl of Derby did this because the Earl of Bedford would not join the conspiracy to dethrone Queen Elizabeth. I only referred to the subject in order to remind the noble Earl that there is another version of that story, which states that the Earl of Derby of that day was supposed to have been poisoned by the Jesuits because he would not enter into the conspiracy himself.

But, my Lords, how will this measure bear upon the supremacy of the Crown? You have now a Protestant head of the State. You have in each country of the United Kingdom, in close connection with the State, a form of the religion of the Sovereign. You have this secured by a tripartite contract between the three kingdoms. For, my Lords, it is an error to suppose that the contract on this subject is in the Act of Union with Ireland alone. In the Act of Union with Scotland, in 1706, it is made a "fundamental term" of the Union with Scotland, that the Sovereign of Great Britain shall undertake to maintain, and preserve inviolately, the settlement of the Church, as by law established, "within the kingdoms of England and Ireland." The same stipulation is again made a "fundamental" term of the Union with Ireland a century later. You have thus in Ireland the Sovereign of the United Kingdom the legal and recognized head in matters ecclesiastical as well as civil. But you have in Ireland, side by side with the Royal Supremacy, an ecclesiastical supremacy asserted, which ignores and sets aside the supremacy of the Sovereign. And if you withdraw and terminate that part of the Royal Supremacy which the connection of the Church with the State asserts and recognizes, you leave the rival and antagonistic supremacy in undisputed possession of the field.

My, Lords, I wish to say a few words about the origin of this measure. I never wish to inquire into the motives for the course of action of public men. But we have had the consideration of that question thrust upon us. We have been told by the noble Earl (Earl Granville), repeating what has often been said before, that what led to the proposal of this Bill was a statement which is alleged to have been made—but which never was made in the sense or meaning which is alleged—by the Government in the other House of Parliament with reference to their policy towards Ireland. My Lords, I think the noble Earl has himself shown that this measure was determined on by its author long before. He told us that in a conversation he had with Mr. Gladstone at the commencement of last year, Mr. Gladstone stated to him that one of the first duties of the Liberal party would be to undertake the question, in the sense in which it has now been undertaken, of the Established Church in Ireland. And, my Lords, in the pamphlet to which I have already referred of the noble Earl (Earl Russell) who sits beside him, which I cannot suppose was given to the world without some consultation with the party with which he always acts, the noble Earl (Earl Russell) announced that it was not for one moment to be endured that this Session should pass without a proposition being made in Parliament by the Liberal party through Mr. Gladstone, with regard to the Irish Church. If that be so—when it was Mr. Gladstone's conviction expressed to his Colleague last year—and when it was the conviction of the noble Earl (Earl Russell) at the commencement of the present Session, I want to know how it can be pretended that this attack upon the Irish Church was occasioned by, or was the consequence of, the statement erroneously attributed to the Government in the House of Commons? But that is not all. That conversation with Mr. Gladstone, we are told, occurred at the beginning of last year. Now, in the summer of 1865, Mr. Gladstone, then a candidate for the University of Oxford, wrote to one of his constituents who was seeking for some explanation of his views on the Irish Church; and at that time he said—

> "The question of the Irish Church is remote, and apparently out of all bearing on the practical politics of the day. I think I have marked

strongly my sense of the responsibility attaching to the opening of such a question. One thing I may add, because I think it is a clear landmark, in any measure dealing with the Irish Church, I think—I scarcely expect ever to be called upon to share in such a measure—the Act of Union must be recognized."

Now, this was in the summer of 1865, and there having been in the interval no Parliamentary discussion on the subject whatever, it is perhaps a pardonable curiosity which leads me to ask how it came to pass that within eighteen months Mr. Gladstone, in consultation, we are told, with the noble Earl (Earl Granville), announced to him that, in his opinion, it was the first step in the policy of the Liberal party to proceed to destroy the Irish Church? The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll), with that happy view which he ever takes of the failings and imperfections of every creature in the horizon, except the one who himself pronounces the criticism and the condemnation, referred to my right hon. Friend the First Minister of the Crown, and spoke of the cunning of animals who could not protect themselves by strength. Now I should be sorry to use, with reference to this letter of Mr. Gladstone, the term "cunning," I believe it was written in perfect sincerity, according to what Mr. Gladstone at the time believed. But what I do say is this, that the most cunning of all the cunning animals to which the noble Duke referred, if he had desired to baffle and mislead the innocent and unsuspecting person who made the inquiry, could not have been more happy or adroit in the expressions he used than was the author of this letter.

My Lords, the noble Duke says the great office of party discipline and party warfare in this country is to identify the fortunes of a party with great public measures. I agree generally in that view. But I ask, is this measure a great public measure in the proper sense of that term? That it will have a great effect upon the Church which is to be the subject of it I entirely admit, but by a great measure I mean a measure well-considered in all its parts, and as to no part of which there is any reticence or desire to conceal the whole scope of its effect and operation from the party who makes it their political programme. Now, can that be said of this measure? You propose to disestablish and disendow the Irish Church; what do you propose to do with the funds of the Church? You are going to apply them to Irish purposes; I ask to what Irish purposes? Are you going to apply them to the relief of the poor? I apprehend not; that would be simply taking the burden off property which now bears it. Are you going to apply them to the primary education of the people? If you do, it will be a strange benefit to Ireland that simply deprives Ireland of some £300,000 or £400,000 a year, which at present flows there from the Imperial Exchequer. Are you going to apply them to the higher or middle class education of the country? Do you not know that the Roman Catholic Church distinctly and uniformly refuses to have any participation in donations of that kind, unless they have them on their own terms, and upon a system of education which you have always refused to admit? You object to those who would alter the arrangements of the Church by taking the endowments of one parish and carrying some part of them to another. Are you going to apply these funds to Irish purposes in the particular parish from which the endowments emanate? I want to know how that is to be done? What is the reason why there is this concealment as to what the intention is with regard to these funds? My Lords, there is one explanation, and one only, that I can give, and that, I am sorry to say, whatever in other respects I might think of the measure, deprives it, to my mind, of the character of a great measure—I say the object of the concealment which has been practised as to the appropriation of these funds is to render possible the temporary concurrence of the votes of those whom you know perfectly well it would be impossible, if you were at once to reveal the appropriation you are about to make of these funds, to combine for any united course of action.

My Lords, I feel I owe your Lordships a very sincere apology for having so long delayed you in my comments on this Bill, and on the policy of its promoters. Let me, however, say one word with reference to the advice you have received from various noble Lords who sit on the front Opposition Bench as to the principle on which you should perform your duty with regard to this Bill. Several noble Lords sitting on the Opposition Benches have referred, I thought with some bitterness, to the effect which the Bill of last year will have on the constituencies of the country. My Lords, it appears to me a strange thing that these noble Lords who have always professed to be such very ardent reformers, should, whenever they come to speak of the legislation of last year, never fail to communicate to your Lordships the impression that they look on that legislation with apprehension and regret. The noble Earl (the Earl of Clarendon) spoke of the leap in the dark which you had taken. I know the noble Earl is not the author of that saying, but he made it part of his argument. He said you did not know what the new constituencies would be, and he recommended you to pass this Bill, because the future was so much in uncertainty. I must confess, my Lords, that the noble Earl's reasons would have led me to a different conclusion. This Bill has passed the present House of Commons which is about to come to an end. That House itself said that the ultimate decision as to the fate of the Irish Church was not matter for them—that it ought to be remitted to a future Parliament. The noble Earl does not know what that future Parliament will be—he does not know whether it will approve or disapprove the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. Now, these to my mind are reasons why the whole question should be allowed to go to the new Parliament unaffected by this Bill, in order that it might deal with that question with full freedom. But the noble Earl (Earl Granville) who moved the second reading, not, I agree, in any words of menace, but in more of blandishment and entreaty, asked your Lordships to take no course which would bring you into collision with the other House of Parliament. My Lords, I value the honour of your Lordships' House, and the harmonious action of the two Branches of the Legislature, as much as any of your Lordships; but I maintain that the way to promote this harmony is for each House frankly, fairly, and respectfully, to discuss on its own merits every question which comes before them, and, if necessary, on every question to pronounce their opinion by their votes. My Lords, if the day should ever come when a measure carried in haste through the other House of Parliament, and brought up and presented to your Lordships for the first time, shall be accepted by your Lordships, not because you approve of it—nay, while you disapprove of it—but merely because it has been carried by a majority in the House of Commons, the influence, the independence of your Lordships' House, the respect of the country for your Lordships—nay, more—the respect of yourselves for yourselves, will be at an end. My Lords, differing therefore from the noble Earl as to the duty now devolving upon you, I ask you to reject this Bill. I might well be content to do this on the score of the vices and defects of the Bill itself, and of the perverse and blundering ingenuity with which it endeavours to accomplish the worst possible thing in the worst possible way. But I ask you to reject this Bill on higher grounds. I ask you to reject it because it is the commencement of a policy upon which your Lordships have not even yet been consulted, but which policy you will be taken to have accepted if you approve this Bill. That policy is nothing short of the devotion to secular purposes of the funds hitherto held sacred, the severance of the Union of Church with the State, and the curtailment of the supremacy of the Crown. The fruits and consequences of that policy, in our opinion, will be, not the pacification of Ireland, but the perpetuation of the conflict of races—the undermining of the security of property—the arrestment of the progress of social improvement and toleration—and the quenching—so far as it is in the power of legislation to quench it—of the light of the Reformation in that country. My Lords, these are the vast issues involved in this Bill. These are the issues involved in your Lordships' decision now, and they are the issues yet to be presented to the country in the great appeal to its enlarged constituencies. My Lords, in that appeal—for I agree with the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) that it is fitting that a Government should uphold a standard of political faith—in that great appeal the Government will stand as the defenders of all that this Bill and the policy of its promoters would seek to overthrow. By the result of that appeal we are prepared to abide; and, my Lords, be that result what it may—and I, for one, have confidence in the true heart and faith of the country—a nobler cause for which to fight—a fairer field in which to stand or fall—no Minister and no statesman need desire.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON, who spoke amid cries of "Spoke," "Order," was understood to say: After the charge of inconsistency which the noble and learned Lord has brought against me, I trust the House will not refuse me one moment for personal explanation. There are two cases to which the noble and learned Lord has referred—the suspension of certain ecclesiastical offices in Jamaica, and the disendowment wholly of the Church in the West Indies, as far as this country is concerned. I admit that upon the recommendation of the Government and the Bishop of Jamaica I sanctioned the Bill for the suspension of certain ecclesiastical offices in Jamaica. But where is the inconsistency? I sanctioned a Suspension Bill and I am prepared to vote for a Suspensory Bill this evening. Her Majesty's Government have sanctioned a disendowment scheme to the extent of £20,000. [*Cries of* "Order" *and* "Spoke" *continuing, the noble Earl sat down.*]

Earl GRANVILLE, rising to reply, said: My Lords, I like to believe that it was partly out of personal kindness, though chiefly from the obligation to give the utmost latitude to an advocate of a prejudiced cause, that made your Lordships so indulgent to me on the first night of this debate. I wish I could make a return for that indulgence by complete silence tonight. But there are a few observations I feel bound to make, and I am afraid that the feeling of your Lordships will be somewhat similar to that of the Earl of Derby so often referred to in the course of this debate upon the score of "shutting up." The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack was, I am sorry to say, unintentionally, inaccurate in his reference to the noble and learned Lord the Master of the Rolls. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack said that my noble and learned Friend had admitted that there were several objections to the measure. I asked my noble and learned Friend what objections he had admitted, and he replied, "None whatever."

The LORD CHANCELLOR: I beg the noble Earl's pardon. What I said was that the noble and learned Lord, after listening to a good many objections, in reply said that they could be removed in Committee.

Earl GRANVILLE: Well, the noble and learned Lord then said that a noble Duke sitting by my side (the Duke of Somerset) had stated that the provisions of the Bill were impracticable. I asked my noble Friend if he had said that the Bill was impracticable, and he replied that he had not.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: The noble Duke's words—I have them by me—were "I cannot conceive myself how it is to work."

The Duke of SOMERSET, amid considerable laughter, rose to explain, but his remarks were inaudible.

Earl GRANVILLE: Now, my Lords, I quite agree with that noble and learned Lord who argued that the great question was that of the disestablishment, or, as he put it, that of the disendowment of the Irish Church. That question is one which it is very difficult to deal with at all, and yet we find one of our most distinguished Parliamentary and forensic advocates, in speaking for two hours and three-quarters on this great question, throwing away just one hour by London clock in discussing the minutest and the most trifling details, and then throwing away another quarter of an hour in an attack upon a late Colleague of his Colleagues, exhibiting an evident reluctance in approaching the core of the subject. Now, with regard to this Bill and its provisions, I have in my pocket two briefs—one for an English and the other for an Irish lawyer of considerable eminence—which would explain any one point on which I could not give an offhand answer. If this Bill had gone into Committee I could have shown your Lordships that there was no real ground for all those difficulties which have been conjured up. But, as the noble and learned Lord occupied, I believe, an entire hour in elaborating that technical argument, I suppose I should take about three in going over the same point, and, therefore, I presume your Lordships will give me the benefit of the doubt, and prefer that I should go on to some other point. The noble and learned Lord's argument reminded me of what was said to me by a noble and learned Lord, a political opponent, who always treated me with the greatest personal respect. I remember asking Lord Lyndhurst whether the singular manner in which he condemns what he had to say was a work of nature, or whether he took much trouble about it. In his cheerful manner he said, "We must take a little trouble, eh?" and then he added, "The great difficulty lawyers have is that at the Bar we are always obliged to use all our arguments, and in Parliament we can only use our good ones." I think it would have been better if my noble and learned Friend had omitted that long disquisition on property, and for my part I shall decline to occupy your Lordships' time in discussing the case the noble and learned Lord put to me which was in every part of it so purely hypothetical. I wish, however, to say one word regarding what fell from the noble Earl on the cross-Benches. The noble Earl, who, disliking a motley crew, is the Leader of this opposition to the attack upon the Irish Church, finds fault with us for two reasons. We ought to have adopted his proposal made a few months after the first suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. But if we had done so we should have utterly failed, and any change in the Irish Church might have been delayed for twenty years. He also complains that now, when we do so with almost certain prospects of success, we do not adopt his plan; but we believe his plan is not acceptable to the Catholics, and is against the conviction and feelings of the English and the Scotch. I have hopes, however, of again fighting in the same ranks with the noble Lord, since he has declared that he prefers disestablishment to the present state of the Church. Now, perhaps, the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees will allow me to say one word about his speech. The noble Lord repeated the arguments I attempted to answer, he has appealed to us to believe in his sincerity, and has urged us to use plain words in expressing what we think. I desire to express in the plainest words of the English language my belief that my noble Friend is one of the most honourable, most sincere men and politicians I know, the least likely to say one thing and to do another to-morrow; but if I am asked to say in plain words what I think of certain portions of his speech, I must, with all respect to your Lordships and to my noble Friend, acknowledge that I had rather do no such thing. I prefer quoting from a modern poet to describe that speech—

"In holy horror, in pious grief,
He solemnly cursed the rascally thief;
Never was heard such a terrible curse;
But what gave rise
To no little surprise,
Nobody seemed one penny the worse."

Any of your Lordships who know how serious a matter it is to have an intellectual encounter with one right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Oxford) must sympathize with me in having to meet the whole Bench. But it is in their numbers that I look for safety. I must first thank the Bishop of this diocese for having given me such complete reparation as to the motives of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone) and his Friends. The most rev. Prelate the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, and the Bishop of Oxford, feeling how strongly the colonial cases bear upon the Church of Ireland, have brought forward arguments to prove that these Churches were still in connection with the State. The Archbishop gave as reasons the participation of the Bishops in the acts of the Legislature and the Church Assemblies under local Acts. I believe that if the facts were as stated they would not support this argument. The noble Earl the late Secretary for the Colonies (the Earl of Carnarvon) showed that he was wrong, and I can vouch for the accuracy of the answer which he gave in manner and in substance. The Irish Prelates have approached the subject with a dignified melancholy, as men who fear an injury to themselves, their clergy, and their flocks, but my right rev. Friend who spoke to-night (the Bishop of Oxford) spoke with a merriment, a lightheartedness, and cheerfulness which, while it jarred on his Irish Brethren, must have acted as balm on those of his English Friends who had persuaded themselves there was danger for the English Church. But there is as great discrepancy between the right rev. Prelates themselves; and the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of London says that if the Church is disestablished the Catholic clergy, decked out with foreign honours, will have such a social superiority that the Anglican clergy will be crushed. Another right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Killaloe) says that the measure will give no satisfaction, because circumstances make it impossible that the Catholic clergy would ever be raised to the social position of the Anglicans. Which are we to believe? I must say, at this point, that I feel some little hesitation to proceed. I do not know whether your Lordships perceived that if there was perhaps a slight amount of theological hatred which tainted some of the speeches with regard to the Roman Catholic clergy, they all treated the Roman Catholic laity with great delicacy and consideration. While the other right rev. Prelates have contradicted each other the right rev. Prelate appears to have contradicted himself, and wishing to prove the sacredness of Church property and the necessity of the connection between Church and State, he proved conclusively by figures that the Church has continuously had taken from her portions of her revenue till only about one-eighth remained of them, and by a long historical statement that the State thwarting and impeding the Church in every direction had been her bane and the cause of her miserable failure. I hope the most rev. Primate will not think it personal or disrespectful of me if I say that it is impossible to approach him without seeing, through his dignified deportment as a great Prelate, Nature has given him a warm and kind heart. Yet such is the pernicious influence, not of the Church, but of its invidious position in Ireland, that the Head of that Church was the only lay or spiritual Peer that reproduced the famous allusion to blood, language, and religion as distinguishing the Catholics from the Protestants. I remember as if it was yesterday, though it is thirty-six years ago, hearing the passionate protest almost screamed by a great Irish orator against this insult to his countrymen. He asked an enthusiastic British House of Commons whether, from Assaye to Waterloo, those aliens in blood, language, and religion had shown less heroic valour than our own glorious England, and alluding to the last decisive day, he asked, amid the peals of approving indignation, whether the blood of England, Scotland, and Ireland had not flowed in the same stream and drenched the same field, and turning suddenly to the brave and generous father of a noble Lord here present, and forgetful of Parliamentary forms, he exclaimed, "Tell me, for you were there?" I own I then thought the phrase had ceased to exist. The right rev. Prelate and the President of the Council seemed to think it unpatriotic and un-English of Lord Clarendon and myself to quote the opinion of foreigners, although it was on my part an answer to a foreign argument of the Prime Minister. So the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury), who objects to catchwords, does not like what he has christened the "Foreign friends' arguments"—arguments brought by us from foreign drawing-rooms. If he means by such only the places were the most frivolous of fashionable society meet, I deny the fact. If he means places where my noble Friend and I have met statesmen, great lawyers, literary men, and eminent persons belonging to the aristocracy and middle classes of some of the great capitals in Europe, we admit and rejoice in the fact. Now, my Lords, I cannot think that a little intercourse with foreigners would deteriorate the beneficial character of the great influence which the noble Marquess is sure to exercise in this country. The noble Marquess has lately made acquaintance with the railway world, which must have at first appeared almost like a foreign country to him. I trust it was not there that he learnt to take so black a view of human nature as he described himself to entertain. But one great lesson he has certainly learnt—that powers are given to railway companies properly, and for the public good, to take land for which money is no compensation to some owners, to destroy churchyards consecrated to God, and in which have been placed the ashes of dead, to destroy homes where the poor live and factories where they work, with compensations to those who are proprietors, but with none to those who have to seek other homes and other workshops. And the result of the lesson has been shown in this debate. The noble Marquess entirely abandons the high property argument of the noble Earl below him. He recommends compromise, and with the word compromise all the high-flown arguments that have been used of sacred property, sacrilege, &c., go out by the window. I admit that the bulk of foreigners know as little of us as in many instances we know of them; but I will say that there are Frenchmen, Germans, and Italians by whom I should shrink from being examined on some nice points of our constitutional history and law. Of course, when the Lord Privy Seal tells us that the Irish Church is the most sacred portion of the British Constitution, and that it is one of the legs of the Church of England; and when the President of the Council says that the House of Lords represents the innermost mind and the will of the nation, while the House of Commons—I do not know whether any Members of that House now hear me—only represents the impulses and declamatory power of the nation, of course that makes an end of the matter. Again, if M. Guizot or Professor Rancke and others — not fashionable dandies, as the noble Marquess may think, but sincere Protestants—were to tell you they object historically to the Irish Church, because while the English Church has every claim to call itself self-reformed, the Irish Church was forced upon Ireland in opposition to the wishes of the people; if they said that, out of deference to the laws of language, they objected to a Church being called national which only ministered to the wants of a small fraction of the population, and lastly, for political reasons, that they believed there must be some cause why Poland and Ireland were the only countries where the Roman Catholic clergy were not ultra-Conservatives; if they objected morally to the Irish Church because the foreign Protestants believed it was a duty to do to others as they would wish to be done by, and that we should certainly not submit in

England for a month or a week to such a state of things—of course we should recognize the wisdom of our Government and the ignorance of the foolish foreigners; but still the noble Marquess might admit, with Charles Fox, that you might get some information in conversing even with the stupidest man; and he might even learn that when he describes what has been proposed as the most complete form of spoliation—that more masterly completeness of spoliation has been shown elsewhere. I will now say a few words on what fell from the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby); but any objections I may have felt to the tone of "No surrender" in the greater part of the noble Earl's speech vanished when I heard two sentences towards the close. He said—I quote from the report in *The Times*, which I cannot doubt is accurate, for it is so like language which I have heard before—

> "Your Lordships are always disposed to yield as far as you can to deliberately expressed and well-ascertained opinions of the House of Commons."

And he added—

> "And it must be a very decided expression of opinion to alter my judgment on such a question."

I do not know whether the noble Earl will contradict me.

THE EARL OF DERBY: Yes; I am sorry to correct my noble Friend. What I referred to was the ascertained opinion of the country, not of the House of Commons.

EARL GRANVILLE: The fault is not mine, it is that of the very accurate reporter of *The Times;* but the correction suits my purpose as well. But there are other points which have given me pain. In my first speech I protested, and I think rightly, as to the introduction of the name of the Sovereign and the Coronation Oath into this question. I stated what was the construction put upon the Coronation Oath by great lawyers and great statesmen. I stated—what nobody can attempt to deny—that whatever the construction of that Oath may be, it applies equally to the colonies and to the mother-country. I also reminded your Lordships that the present Sovereign has on several occasions, by the advice of different Ministers, and on one occasion by the advice of a Committee of Privy Council, specially summoned for the purpose, given her assent to Bills disestablishing various Churches in the colonies. I might have added that it was done with the full consent and approbation of one who well knew the rights and duties of the British Crown—the most sagacious and most beloved councillor and guide that any Sovereign or woman ever had. Well, the noble Earl after this, referring to my having deprecated any discussion on this point, made a declaration which if he had been a novice, instead of the greatest debater, perhaps, in the world, would have convinced me he was unable to deal with facts, and had preferred making his speech as he had originally prepared it. He said—

> "You cannot relieve the Sovereign from the obligations of the Oath. She is bound to protest when, in acting on Her Minister's advice, she takes a step in direct violation of her solemn declaration and Oath that she will maintain inviolate the United Church of England and Ireland."

The noble Earl goes on to add that—

> "The Oath would be violated if Her Majesty endorsed a proposal to disendow or disestablish that which she has sworn to maintain implicitly."

My Lords, I do not understand this argument. Either one thing or another. Does the noble Earl deny the statement I have quoted?

THE EARL OF DERBY: I certainly do not recognize my speech in that statement.

EARL GRANVILLE: It is a very singular thing that the noble Earl should not recognize his speech, of which I believe every noble Lord on this side remembers, if not the words, at least the substance; and it has been reported by accurate reporters in the morning papers. I say I do not understand his argument. Either there must be that which I have described—namely, an obligation on the part of the Sovereign to adhere to the law as it is now, or as it may be, or it is an Oath to God from which no earthly power can absolve her. The noble Earl repeated twice that there were some persons who seemed to think the Queen could have no opinion, and had no personal obligations. I do not know to whom he could allude—not, I think, to any Peer on this side of the House, for we are as zealous as himself of the Queen's Prerogative, and as devotedly loyal to Her Majesty's person. The Queen has exercised during a long and successful reign a beneficial influence on the course of public affairs. It has been great and beneficial in consequence of Her Majesty's intimate knowledge both of the principles and details of our Constitution, and because her people believe and know that she never has moved, and never will move, even under injudicious advice, one inch from the path which she believes the Constitution prescribes. The noble Earl, on a former occasion, pledged the majority of this House—greatly increased by the chivalrous, though, I think, mistaken, feelings which have animated the Episcopal Bench, and not inconsiderably increased by the numerous creations of the last two years—to reject this measure before it had seen the light, and before it was known by what majorities in the other House it would come recommended to your Lordships. I believe the effect of that threat was to give strength and spirit, if it did not, as some positively assert, increase the numbers of the majority in the other House; and I have always felt that the mention of that threat might have the same effect upon the country. If there was no qualification, I feared an exciting and dangerous effect; but the words which I have already quoted from the noble Earl's speech will, I hope, induce the people to see that all that is required is for the constituencies to enable the next Parliament to give a very decided opinion in order to destroy opposition in this House, and that it will offer no stolid obstacle to their wishes. With this feeling I trust they will calmly and dispassionately—for I like the words, though they grate upon the noble Marquess's ears — that they will calmly and dispassionately examine the arguments to which I believe the debate in your Lordships' House has made such valuable additions. I have little doubt of the result. There will be great difficulty in settling some of the details for the disestablishment of the Irish Church; much time will be taken to make the preliminary arrangements; but in a very few months the battle of justice and religious equality against an ascendancy which is politically wrong, and is injurious to the Protestant religion will be fought and will be won.

The Archbishop of ARMAGH: In explanation, I beg to say that there is a wide difference between the application of the words which fell from me the other evening, and of those which the noble Earl has referred to. The words "The Irish are aliens in blood, language, and religion," were taken up as an offence to the Irish nation. The words I used were used in a sense very different. They were not intended to be offensive. What I said was that the 700,000 Irish Churchmen were not aliens, but were of the same blood as yourselves, and I said so because I wanted to show our claim to your consideration and to justice.

On Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion?—Contents 97; Not-Contents 192: Majority 95.

CONTENTS.

Cleveland, D.
Devonshire, D.
Leeds, D.
Saint Albans, D.
Somerset, D.
Sutherland, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Normanby, M.
Townshend, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cottenham, E.
Cowper, E.
Craven, E.
De Grey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Ducie, E.
Essex, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Russell, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Sommers, E.
Spencer, E.
Suffolk and Berkshire, E.
Zetland, E.

Falmouth, V.
Halifax, V.
Sydney, V.

Abercromby, L.
Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Camoys, L.
Carrington, L.
Chesham, L.
Churchill, L.
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dacre, L.
De Mauley, L.
De Tabley, L.
Ebury, L.
Fitzhardinge, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Granard, L (*E. Granard.*)
Harris, L.
Hastings, L.
Hatherton, L.
Houghton, L.
Kenry, L.(*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Leigh, L.
Lismore, L. (*V. Lismore.*)
Londesborough, L.
Lovat, L.
Lurgan, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Meredyth, L. (*L. Athlumney.*)
Methuen, L.
Minster, L. (*M. Conyngham.*)
Monson, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Penhurst, L. (*V. Strangford.*)
Petre, L.
Poltimore, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*) [*Teller.*]
Rollo, L.
Romilly, L.
Seaton, L.
Sefton, L. (*E. Sefton*)
Seymour, L. (*E. St. Maur.*)
Somerhill L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stafford, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Sudeley, L.
Sundridge, L (*D. Argyll*)
Taunton, L.
Truro, L.
Vaux of Harrowden, L.
Vivian, L.
Westbury, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, Archp.
Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
York, Archbp.
Armagh, Archbp.

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Northumberland, D.
Richmond, D.
Rutland, D.

Abercorn, M.
Ailsa, M.
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.
Winchester, M.

Abergavenny, E.
Amherst, E.
Annesley, E.
Aylesford, E.
Bandon, E.
Bantry, E.
Bathurst, E.
Bradford, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Coventry, E.
Dartrey, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Dudley, E.
Effingham, E.
Eldon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Ellesmere, E.
Erne, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrington, E.
Harrowby, E.
Hillsborough, E. (*M. Downshire.*)
Home, E.
Jersey, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Macclesfield, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Morton, E.
Nelson, E.
Portarlington, E.
Poulett, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Sandwich, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Strange, E. (*D. Athol.*)
Tankerville, E.
Vane, E.
Verulam, E.
Westmoreland, E.
Wilton, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

Bangor, V.
Bolingbroke and St. John, V.
Canterbury, V.
Clancarty, V. (*E. Clancarty.*)
De Vesci, V.
Doneraile, V.
Exmouth, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V.
Hereford, V.
Hill, V.
Hood, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Bangor, Bp.
Carlisle, Bp.
Durham, Bp.
Ely, Bp.
Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Killaloe, &c., Bp.
Kilmore, &c., Bp.
Lincoln, Bp.
Litchfield, Bp.
Llandaff, Bp.
London, Bp.
Manchester, Bp.
Meath, Bp.
Oxford, Bp.
Ripon, Bp.
Rochester, Bp.
Salisbury, Bp.
Worcester, Bp.

Abinger, L.
Aveland, L.
Bagot, L.
Berwick, L.
Blayney, L.
Bolton, L.
Boston, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Braybrooke, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Castlemaine, L.
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath*)
Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colchester, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Congleton, L.
Conyers, L.
Crewe, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Denman, L.
De Ross, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Digby, L.
Dunboyne, L.
Dunmore, L. (*E. Dunmore.*)
Egerton, L.
Elphinstone, L.
Farnham, L.
Feversham, L.
Fitzwalter, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Grinstead, L. (*E. Enniskillen.*)
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Hylton, L.
Inchiquin, L.
Kesteven, L.
Kilmaine, L.
Kingston, L. (*E. Kingston.*)
Lilford, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Lytton, L.
Moore, L. (*M. Drogheda.*)
Northwick, L.
O'Neill, L.
Oriel, L. (*V. Massereene*)
Ormathwaite, L.
Ormonde, L. (*M. Ormonde.*)
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Rayleigh, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Saltoun, L.
Scarsdale, L.
Sheffield, L. (*E. Sheffield.*)
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
St. John of Bletso, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Templemore, L.
Thurlow, L.
Tredegar, L.
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford.*)
Vernon, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wharncliffe, L.

Resolved in the *Negative,* and Bill to be read 2ª on *this Day Six Months.*

ADMIRALTY SUITS BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Law relating to Proceedings instituted by the Admiralty, and for other Purposes connected therewith — Was *presented* by The Lord SILCHESTER; read 1ª. (No. 182.)

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT (1866) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.] (NO. 185) — A Bill to amend the Contagious Diseases Act, 1866: Also,

LODGERS PROPERTY PROTECTION BILL [H.L.] (NO. 186) —A Bill to protect the Property of Lodgers: And also,

CHILDREN, &C. PROTECTION BILL [H.L.] (NO. 187)—A Bill for the better Protection of Children, Servants, and Apprentices:

Were severally *presented* by The Marquess TOWNSHEND; read 1ª.

House adjourned at Three o'clock, A.M., to half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, June 29, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee* —Committee R.P.

Public Bills—*Ordered* — Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies *; Libel (Ireland) *; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements *

First Reading — Libel (Ireland) * [199]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * [200]; Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies * [201]; Colonial Governors' Pensions Act Amendment * [202].

Second Reading — Metropolitan Police Funds [132]; Poor Relief * [186]; Municipal Elections (Scotland) * [189]; Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment * [193]; Medway Regulation Act Continuance * [196]; Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment * [181].

Committee—Ecclesiastical Commissioners * [69]; Land Writs Registration (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [111]; Regulation of Railways * [142] — R.P.; Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) (*re-comm.*) * [191]; Curragh of Kildare (*re-comm.*) * [192]; University Elections (Voting Papers) * [187]; Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-comm.*)* [139], debate *further adjourned;* Bank of Bombay * [178]; New Zealand (Legislative Council) * [185]; Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts Amendment (*re-comm.*) * [197] — R.P.; Bankruptcy Act (1861) Amendment * [145]—R.P.

Report — Ecclesiastical Commissioners * [69]; Land Writs Registration (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [111]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) (*re-comm.*) * [191]; Curragh of Kildare (*re-comm*) * [192]; University Elections (Voting Papers) * [187]; Bank of Bombay * [178]; New Zealand (Legislative Council) * [185].

Considered as amended — Consular Marriages * [188]; Bank Holidays and Bills of Exchange * [180].

Third Reading — Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) (*re-comm.*) * [191]; Courts of Law Fees &c. (Scotland) * [158]; County General Assessment (Scotland) * [172].

ARMY—SHORNCLIFFE CAMP.

QUESTION.

Mr. VANDERBYL said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether a Notice which was given by his Department to terminate, as on the 1st of April last, the monopoly which has for many years existed, and still prevails, in the supply of Malt Liquors to the Troops at Shorncliffe Camp has been withdrawn; and whether it is intended to continue such monopoly?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that the Notice given to terminate the monopoly in the supply of Malt Liquors to the Troops at Shorncliffe had not been withdrawn, and it was not intended that the monopoly should be continued. Negotiations were in progress for purchasing the rights of the person having the monopoly, but some little time would probably elapse before the question would be settled.

ARMY—THE 86th REGIMENT.

QUESTION.

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, The number of Lieutenant Colonels who have commanded the 86th Regiment since January, 1862; the number of different Stations at which the 86th Regiment has been quartered during the last three years, including removals at the Cape of Good Hope and Mauritius; whether it be true that the sum of five shillings a-day, allowed for sixteen days to the Officers of the 86th Regiment on arrival at Algoa Bay, to compensate for unavoidable expenses and loss of mess, has been since stopped out of the pay of the Officers by Orders from home; whether the Colonial allowance of 1*s.* 6*d.* per diem allowed at the Cape of Good Hope has been since stopped, and Officers compelled to re-fund that sum; whether it is not the fact that the admissions into the Hospital in 1868, of Men, Women, and Children of the 86th Regiment were in January 370 men, 45 women, 68 children; February, 320 men, 39 women, 61 children; March, 257 men, 35 women, 47 children; April, 175 men, 27 women, 38 children: whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House Copy of the Correspondence of Medical Officers at the Cape of Good Hope and Port Elizabeth, shadowing forth what would happen if the Regiment was sent to the Mauritius; and all Correspondence between the Medical Officers and the authorities at the Mauritius regarding the landing of the Regiment during the epidemic; and, whether it be true that it is contemplated sending the 86th Regiment to India in its present reduced and sickly state?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, he would give the best Answer to the seven Questions that he could. The number of Lieutenant Colonels who had commanded the 86th Regiment in the term specified was five; and the Stations at which it had been quartered in the last three years were Gibraltar, the Cape, and the Mauritius. It was not the case that the allowance of 5*s.* per day had been stopped from the Officers' pay, but a smaller allowance, known as the Field allowance, had been stopped, and that was probably the origin of the hon. Member's Question. The Colonial allowance of 1*s.* 6*d.* per day at the Cape was stopped under a misapprehension, but it was now to be re-commenced. With respect to the admissions into hospital, he regretted to say that he believed the numbers given in the Question to be substantially correct. He should be very unwilling to produce the Correspondence referred to in the latter part of the Question, and he hoped the hon. Member would not press for it. In answer to various Questions that had been put, he had always stated the exact position of affairs with respect to this Regiment at the Mauritius, and, amongst other things, that in consequence of the circumstances under which the Regiment landed, the Commander-in-Chief had sent out an Order for a Report of the circumstances to be forwarded. That Report had been received and submitted to him (Sir John Pakington), but he was reluctantly obliged to concur in the opinion of his Royal Highness, that that Report was not satisfactory. In consequence of that decision, the Commander-in-Chief had communicated to the General commanding at Mauritius, his opinion on the subject. Justice had been done, and he thought no good effect would be produced by reviving the subject. There was no intention of sending the Regiment to India, nor did he believe that such an intention had ever existed.

CLERKS IN THE CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Commission appointed to inquire into the grievances complained of by the Clerks in the various Departments of the Customs have concluded their labours ; and, whether the result of the comparison which they have instituted between the duties performed by the Clerks in the Departments of Account in the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments respectively has been such as to prove that the duties performed by the Clerks in the former are as arduous and important as those performed by the Clerks in the latter Department ; and, if so, whether it is proposed to place the Clerks in the several Offices of Account in the Customs on the same footing as to salary as the Clerks in the Inland Revenue ?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, stated that the Commission appointed to inquire into the alleged grievances of the Clerks in the Customs had concluded a portion of their inquiry, and he hoped that the Report would be in the hands of the Treasury before the close of the Session.

IRELAND—RECORDS.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, he also wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Government intend taking, during the present Session, any and what steps for rendering available to the Irish public the numerous and very important Public Records relating to Ireland, which are preserved at the Record Office, London, and to which the attention of the Government was directed four years since by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant ?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, in reply, that he was not aware what were the important Public Records to which the Question of the hon. Member referred. He was informed that there were no Records relating to Ireland in the Record Office, but there were entries in the Rolls of Chancery and other Courts, which it had been proposed to transcribe, in order to their being deposited in the Dublin Office. This was merely a question of expense, and might be postponed until the other questions relative to the Irish Records, were decided by the Master of the Rolls.

THE LEOMINSTER MAGISTRATES.

QUESTION.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to a report stating that the Leominster Magistrates have recently fined some boys 1*s.* and costs, or in default seven days' imprisonment, for playing cricket on Sunday ; and, whether he considers such conviction in accordance with the Law ?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, that the clerk to the justices at Leominster had written to him to explain that there had been no conviction before them of boys for playing at cricket on Sundays. A great number of boys had been in the habit of playing at cricket in a field of growing grass, and some were brought before the magistrates and fined 1*s.* and costs, which fines were immediately paid. The offence had nothing to do with its being Sunday, for they would have been equally summoned for playing in this field on any other day. With regard to such a conviction being contrary to law, the hon. Member would find in the 71st volume of *Hansard,* third series, an opinion given by Sir Frederick Pollock on this subject.

INDIA—THE MUTINY MEDAL.

QUESTION.

MR. ADAM said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, When the Correspondence, moved for on the 22nd March 1867, relative to the grant of the Medal to Troops and Police engaged in suppressing the Mutiny and Rebellion in the Bombay Presidency during the years 1857, 1858, 1859, &c. will be laid upon the Table; and, whether, taking into consideration the services performed by the Troops and Police so engaged, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to order the Grant of the Medal to them?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, in reply, said, the Papers alluded to by the hon. Gentleman had been received from Bombay. They formed three very large volumes, which it would be impossible to produce to the House in full; but Mr. Lushington, the late Commissioner of Police at Bombay, had now the volumes in his possession, and had undertaken to mark the despatches which it would be desirable to produce. He might inform the hon. Gentleman that he had written a despatch by the last mail to India, with respect to the question of extending the grant of the Indian Mutiny Medal. He had resolved that it should be given to all persons who had performed service against the mutineers or rebels, including amongst the latter all who had made common cause with them. The word persons would include Police, and he hoped the settlement of the question would be satisfactory.

REFINING OF SUGAR AT COLOGNE.

QUESTION.

MR. CRAWFORD said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, Whether he will lay upon the Table a statement of the particulars and results of the experiments in the Refining of Sugar conducted at Cologne previous to the Convention of November 1864, the same having been already published by authority in Holland?

MR. STEPHEN CAVE said, in reply, that no publication of the details of these experiments had been sanctioned by the Commission; nor was anyone authorized by them to make experiments. He heard that a Mr. Lottman, who was employed by the Dutch to watch the proceedings, did make private experiments and had published the results; but he understood that these were performed and published entirely on his own responsibility and not on that of the Government of Holland. A blue book would shortly be issued by the Foreign Office, which would afford all the information that could be given in regard to the experiments at Cologne.

ARMY—QUEEN'S REGULATIONS, 1868.

QUESTION.

MR. O'REILLY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether paragraph 165, of the Queen's Regulations, 1868, "the Commander-in-Chief will in all cases select the senior officer who may have qualified for promotion to the higher grade," will in all cases be complied with?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that if the hon. and gallant Member would refer to the paragraph in question, he would find it applied only to the cases of the promotion of officers who had neglected to pass the necessary examination. He had no reason to doubt that the Commander-in-Chief would carry out the regulation.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES IN THE INDIAN ARMY.—QUESTION.

MR. O'REILLY said, he would beg also to ask the Secretary of State for India, in reference to his statement that a room had been provided in quarters in India to be used by the Protestant soldiers for reading and prayer, but that the Order in question did not apply to Catholic soldiers as they had not asked for anything of the kind and were not likely to do so, Whether he can state what applications had been made on the subject by Protestant soldiers; and, whether there will be any objection on the part of the Military authorities on the ground of discipline or the regulations of the service to Catholic soldiers in Her Majesty's service signing petitions or making other written application asking for similar privileges?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, in reply, that he thought the most satisfactory way of dealing with the Question of the hon. Gentleman would be to forward a copy of it to the Governor General, and call his attention to the matter.

PATENTS OF QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND OF PRECEDENCE.—QUESTION.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he would object to lay upon the Table of the House, a Return from the time when the late Lord Chancellor Brougham became Lord Chancellor of the number of Barristers who have received Patents of Precedency and Patents constituting them of Council to the Crown, commonly called Queen's Counsel or King's Counsel, distinguishing in such Return the number of Barristers receiving such Patents respectively during the holding of the Great Seal by each Lord Chancellor respectively, and stating the date of the call to the Bar of each such Barrister?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he would request the hon. Member to move for a Return on the subject.

METROPOLIS—ORNAMENTAL WATER IN REGENT'S PARK.—QUESTION.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether his attention has been called to the way in which the work connected with the Ornamental Water in the Regent's Park is being carried out, and whether the gradients have not been made at an angle extremely dangerous in the event of any persons, especially children, slipping into the water?

Lord JOHN MANNERS in reply, said, his attention had been called to the way in which the works connected with the Ornamental Water in the Regent's Park was being carried out. There was a difference of opinion as to whether it was likely to be dangerous to children who might slip into the water; but the question was under his consideration, and if it should appear that any serious danger was likely to occur, he should consider whether some protection could not be afforded.

DISINTEGRATION OF SEWAGE.
QUESTION.

Mr. LIDDELL said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to certain experiments recently conducted on a large scale at Tottenham, for disintegrating the impurities of Sewage Water by an admixture of alum; whether the Government have called the attention of the Metropolitan Board of Works to the successful results of these experiments, with a view to the remedy of the evils complained of at Barking as arising from the system of Metropolitan Drainage; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House any Report of these experiments, and Copy of any Correspondence which has taken place upon the subject?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that the experiments at Tottenham had been carried on by the local authorities who had sent him a letter, from which he gathered that the experiments had not been so satisfactory as his hon. Friend seemed to suppose. He thought he should be going out of his way if he were to express an opinion on the subject. Two experiments had been made by different persons, and, as far as he could gather, they had not been so successful as experiments made with lime. At present the fertilizing properties of the residuum had not been ascertained. No Report on the subject had come before the Government.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN RIBBONS.
QUESTION.

Mr. EATON said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, If his attention has been drawn to a statement lately published calling in question the accuracy of the Board of Trade Returns of Foreign Ribbons imported into this country; what is the system pursued by the Customs House authorities in order to ascertain the net weight of silk and satin ribbons imported; and, whether the Returns of those articles, as published by the Statistical Department of the Board of Trade are to be looked upon as substantially correct or not?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE in reply, said, his attention had been called to this statement by the hon. Member for Coventry, and he had, in consequence, caused inquiries to be made at the Customs. He found that the Customs authorities obtained their information with regard to silks, as in the case of other articles free of duty, from the person who cleared the goods for the merchant and passed the entry. The net weight was taken from the gross weight, allowance being made for tare. When duty was charged this computation was, of course, accurate, and in the case of velvets, where the same method of packing continued, the Returns were still very correct. They were so, too, when made by some one acquainted with the custom of the trade, but when made by mere carriers they were, no doubt, less accurate. It did not, however, follow that, because two parcels of the same gross weight were returned at different net weights, there was necessarily inaccuracy, because some were packed in wood, others in paper. The Customs did their best to obtain precision, and sometimes opened parcels and insisted on amended entries. When the unit of entry system prevailed Returns were more accurate, on account of the penny stamp, but this had been given up, as an impediment to trade. The invoice was of no assistance, as silks and ribbons were not sold by weight, but by the piece or length. These Returns were so far useful that they enabled a pretty accurate comparison to be made between the imports of different years. The Statistical Department of the Board of Trade could, of course, only be responsible for compiling correctly the Returns in the Customs registry, the accuracy of which they had no means of testing.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT FOR IRELAND.—QUESTION.

Mr. PIM said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is his intention to lay upon the Table, before the end of the present Session, the Bill for extending to Ireland the principle of the Local Government (England) Act, 1858, and the General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862?

The Earl of MAYO in reply, said, he hoped within the present week to lay on the table a Bill for extending to Ireland the principle of the two Acts alluded to by the hon. Member.

CEYLON—LIGHTHOUSE ON THE GREAT BASSES.—QUESTION.

Mr. HANBURY - TRACY said, he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, Whether it is the intention of the Government to erect a Lighthouse on the Great Basses, for which the shipping of the commerce of the East have for years been subject to a charge without any return or advantage whatever; and, whether the Ceylon Government have not offered to construct and maintain this Lighthouse; and, if so, what objection exists to the proposal?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE: It is not the fact, Sir, that the shipping of the commerce of the East has been subject to a charge for a Lighthouse on the Great Basses without any return or advantage. No charge has been made in respect of any Lighthouse there. In 1863 a Light Ship was placed at the Little Basses, and since then a toll of 1*d.* per ton has been imposed on all ships passing the Light which enter or leave British ports. The net receipts from this toll are about £7,500 a year. Out of this has to be paid interest on the construction of the Light Ship, and of a spare Light Ship, and the expenses of maintenance, including the crew and tender. As regards the erection of a Lighthouse on the Great Basses, the Ceylon Government have sent home certain proposals which are totally inadequate. Careful plans and estimates have, however, been prepared by Colonel Frazer, who erected a Lighthouse on the Alguada Reef, Bay of Bengal, and by Mr. Douglas, engineer of the Trinity House, and these are now under the consideration of the Colonial Office, Board of Trade, and Trinity House. There are considerable difficulties both as to the work itself and the mode of providing funds. A Correspondence on this subject will be found in a Return laid on the table in 1863.

ARMY—VOLUNTEER REVIEW AT WINDSOR.—QUESTION.

Lord ELCHO said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in justice to the whole Volunteer Force, any inquiry has been made, or will be made, to ascertain what Volunteer regiments or Volunteers showed a want of discipline at Windsor on Saturday week last; and who are the officers that left their regiments on that occasion? He wished to put this further question, it being stated that one or two companies of some administrative battalions showed great want of subordination, and conducted themselves with impropriety towards the General in command. If that were proved was it intended to wipe these companies out of the Volunteer *Army List*? There was a strong feeling that such a course should be pursued, and that no other would be satisfactory.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: Sir, on the Monday after the review I had a conversation with General Lindsay with regard to the occurrences to which the Question of the noble Lord relates. Since that time General Lindsay has been absent from

London engaged in inspecting some regiments of Militia in Scotland; but I am daily expecting a Report from General Lindsay of what occurred on the day of the review, and I shall probably receive it to-morrow. I have also taken steps to ensure General Lindsay's early return to London. Until I have had an opportunity of personal conference with General Lindsay I do not think I shall be justified in announcing the measures I intend to adopt. I intend to confer very fully with him on the subject, and whatever may be the course which I ultimately think it right to adopt, I hope I shall be able to take measures that will tend to prevent for the future any repetition of such conduct.

SURGEON IN CHIEF OF THE POLICE FORCE.—QUESTION.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is true that upon the retirement of the late Surgeon in Chief to the Metropolitan Police Force the candidates for that office were informed that the restrictions, debarring the holder of that appointment from pursuing any private or hospital practice, would continue in force; that within a few months of the present Surgeon, Mr. Holmes, being nominated such restrictions were suddenly removed; and whether he is aware that such a rule, though afterwards relaxed, prevented many distinguished men in the medical profession from offering themselves as candidates for that appointment?

SIR GEORGE GREY: Sir, as this Question refers to an arrangement made by me three years ago, I had, perhaps, better answer it. On the resignation of Sir John Fisher, the Chief Surgeon to the Metropolitan Police, a question was raised as to the necessity or expediency of continuing the prohibition of private practice. I consulted Sir John Fisher upon it, and his opinion was that it would be advantageous to the police that the Chief Surgeon should have hospital practice; but he thought extensive private practice would interfere with the duties of the office. I acted on this opinion. The office was first offered to Mr. Pollok, an eminent surgeon, of St. George's Hospital, who had, besides, extensive private practice. He was unwilling to relinquish this, and therefore declined the appointment. It was then offered to and accepted by Mr. Holmes, an assistant-surgeon at St. George's Hospital, a gentleman also of the highest reputation in his profession, and of whose qualifications for the office no doubt could be entertained. After some months' experience he found that the duties of the office did not nearly occupy the whole of his time, and it was represented with great force that no man in the prime of life and devoted to his profession would permanently retain an office which did not fully occupy him. On a re-consideration of all the facts of the case I decided that the restriction might be relaxed by allowing the Chief Surgeon to practise, subject to the condition that there should be no such absence from London as to interfere with his primary duty in connection with the Police, and that the salary was to be reduced from £500 to £300, the amount at which it had been fixed before the restriction was originally imposed. I have no reason to suppose that any inconvenience has arisen from the relaxation of the rule; but if the experience of the last two years, with respect to which I have no information, has shown that private practice has in any degree interfered with the efficient discharge of Mr. Holmes's duties, I am sure that he would himself feel that he should either give up his practice or resign the office.

IRELAND — ERECTION OF MILITARY STORES AND BARRACKS.

QUESTION.

COLONEL GREVILLE-NUGENT said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, If the Treasury have the power to authorize the granting of Loans to Grand Juries on the security of the County Cess for the erection of Militia Stores and Barracks; and, if not, whether it is the intention of the Government to apply to Parliament for such powers?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, in reply, that it appeared, by a recent Report from the Board of Works in Ireland, that there was no power to advance money for the erection of Militia Stores and Barracks by presentments from the Grand Juries in Ireland, as there was for the erection of Court Houses. He was not aware that any inconvenience had arisen from this disability; but as he found it was a matter of considerable interest and importance, he should inquire whether it would not be possible to amend the law in that respect.

EXEMPTION OF SCHOOLS AND CHARITIES FROM POOR RATES.

QUESTION.

MR. BAINES said he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government have come to a decision as to the exemption of schools and charities from the recently declared liability to the payment of poor rates, on which subject the present and the late Government have received important representations, and to which they have promised attention?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that this matter had been under the consideration of the Government, and they had come to the conclusion that they could not treat it as an isolated question. The whole subject must be dealt with if any question were raised respecting the exemption of charitable property. The subject would give rise to a great deal of discussion, and it would be impossible to deal with it in the present Session.

ARMY—OFFICERS OF DEPOT BATTALIONS.—QUESTION.

COLONEL FRENCH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been drawn to the fact that Circular 900, December 15, 1866, has practically withdrawn from the Officers of Depot Battalions the privileges of exchange and promotion by purchase which up to that date they enjoyed; and, if so, whether it is proposed to make any compensation for the loss they have thus sustained?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, he could only repeat the Answer which he had given to a similar Question on a former occasion. The greatest care and tenderness had been exercised towards existing interests, but there was no intention to make such compensation as the right hon. and gallant Gentleman indicated.

IRELAND—PROPOSED CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.—QUESTION.

SIR JOHN GRAY said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If he will lay upon the Table of the House, a Copy of the Letter of Archbishop Leahy and Bishop Dorey, addressed to him during the present month in relation to the negotiations opened by the Government with the Irish Catholic prelates for the granting of a charter for a Catholic University in Ireland; and, of his reply thereto?

THE EARL OF MAYO said, it was his intention to-morrow to lay on the table of the House, a copy of the letter of Archbishop Leahy and Bishop Dorey, and of his reply thereto.

STRAY DOGS.—QUESTION.

MR. BENTINCK said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is aware that the Commissioner of the City Police has, under the 18th section of the Metropolis Streets Act, fixed the 1st of July next as the date for detaining dogs unprovided with muzzles, instead of the 22nd of June last, the date adopted by the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police under the same section; whether such want of unity of action between the Police authorities is not a serious evil, and, whether he will address a remonstrance to the City authorities as to the folly and impolicy of their proceedings in this respect?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, he was not aware until his attention had been called to the matter a short time ago, of the existence of the state of things to which his hon. Friend referred. He had no control over the City Police; but the Metropolitan Police had seized a very large number of dogs, and great difficulty had been experienced in disposing of them.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

EMPLOYMENT OF DISCHARGED SOLDIERS.—RESOLUTION.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL in rising to move, That it is expedient to employ in Government situations non-commissioned officers and privates discharged from the Army with good character, said, he laid claim to no originality in making such a proposal. He found that a Royal Commission which had sat in 1861, and had been presided over by the noble Lord the the Member for the East Riding (Lord Hotham) had reported as follows:—

> "It might also be a great encouragement to recruiting and to good conduct while serving, if a preference were given to pensioners discharged with good characters, in filling up such situations

as porters and messengers in public offices, and any of the subordinate appointments in the Excise, Customs, Post Office, and other civil Departments, for which they might be qualified."

Again, a circular had been issued from the War Department in 1858, which set forth the opinion of the Secretary of State for War as to the advantages of employing such men in the War Department, and laid down rules and regulations under which they might be so employed. He wished the present Secretary of State for War would furnish the House with the results of his experience as to the working of that system, which he believed had been very successful, both in point of efficiency and economy. It was only fair, he might add, that he should refer to two societies of an independent character which had conferred great benefits on persons discharged from the army. The one was the Army and Navy Pensioners' Employment Society, who gave the following account of their operations:—

"In the year 1855, in consequence of the war with Russia, men of all ages, in large numbers, were daily discharged from the service, disabled by wounds, or from broken health and other causes unfitted for military duty. Those men experienced the greatest difficulty, almost amounting to impossibility, in obtaining any employment to enable them to support themselves and families. The arrangements of the public service did not permit them to receive pensions in any degree adequate to their support, nor was it desirable on sound social principles that they should be placed beyond the general necessity of industrial occupation. In cases of limited service the pensions awarded were generally from 6*d.* to 8*d.* per diem, and seldom rose to 1*s.* The discharged soldier became, in consequence, idle and half destitute, and rapidly lost his military instincts and habits of discipline and order. The Council considered that in peace, as in war, such a society would be a means of raising the character of the services, by showing to the soldier and sailor that in the decadence of his powers, whether from wounds, climate, accident, or long service, he was still cared for, and could come with his good character in his hand and claim the aid of the institution. From the re-constitution of the society in 1859, to the present date, nearly 4,766 pensioners of good character have been registered, and 2,981 provided with employment. The situations vary in value from £30 to £100 or more per annum; the men are recommended only for such places as their antecedents qualify them for, and it is gratifying to the Council to be able to state that, from the favourable reports received both from employers and the pensioners themselves, the operations of the society continue to give general satisfaction. The Council is now most anxious to extend to pensioners in other large cities the same advantages afforded by the three offices now established in London, Dublin, and Edinburgh. Though a large amount of good is at present being done, great disappointment is caused to many pensioners, who, aware of the existence of the society, or recommended by officers to apply to it, still come in large numbers to London, seeking its aid, which, under the circumstances stated, all cannot obtain. The Council feel sure that officers in Her Majesty's service cannot be aware of the difficulties which 'pensioners' meet with on re-entering into civil life; and in how many instances some of the best men are, with their families, in a short period after their discharge, reduced to a state bordering on destitution."

In 1859 the Corps of Commissionaires was formed by Captain Walter, who deserved the cordial thanks of every person feeling an interest in the army for the pains he had bestowed in the formation of that corps, upon which object he had expended much money and time. Captain Walter, imagining that it would be well to hand over the corps to those who from their peculiar position might be better qualified to carry out the objects for which it was organized transferred its administration to an executive committee, composed of Colonel C. R. Egerton, Colonel J. N. Sargent, Rear Admiral J. W. Tarleton, Colonel Sir E. Wetherall, and Major General H. D. White. This was done with the view of representing the War Department, the Horse Guards, and the Admiralty. It appeared that 1,448 men had passed through the corps. The total strength at present was 360, and the amount deposited by the men in the savings bank of the corps was £2,349. The number of the men belonging to the corps employed in Government Departments was 35, and the average wages of first-class men were 22*s.* 6*d.* a week. The wages paid by Government to Commissionaires were from 18*s.* to 20*s.* per week. The wages in the country were about 14*s.* a week. Every Commissionaire employed by Government was required by the corps to put 1*s.* per week into the savings' bank, and was thus able to provide for his family or against old age, and, as he had his pension besides, Government was not called upon to make him any further provision or retain him when really beyond work. The yearly average number of men discharged from the army for three years ending on the 31st of December, 1867, was 13,735. Of these 6,381 were discharged with pensions, and 7,354 without pension; and these men laboured under great difficulty in obtaining situations. A letter written by an old soldier, a corporal in the Engineers, who had been discharged after twenty-one years' service, expressed the disappointment he had experienced from inability to obtain employment. There were a vast number of situations in the Post Office, Customs, Excise, and other Government Departments which might be well filled by discharged soldiers. The Postmaster General had 30,000 persons employed under him, and some of the other Departments were equally extensive. Ample opportunity was thus afforded for carrying out the plan he proposed, and the adoption of such a system would be a great blessing to men discharged from the army. They had provided first-rate schools and reading rooms for soldiers; but the troops did not fully avail themselves of these advantages, because they did not see of what use it would be to them to do so. If, however, they knew that they would have a chance at the end of their service of obtaining a Government appointment they would fit themselves for such a position. He sincerely trusted that some effort would be made to hold out an inducement to soldiers to fit themselves to hold such situations. At present one of the greatest checks to any such employment was the age which the Civil Service Commissioners had fixed as the limit for applicants entering the service, and when men applied they were told that they were just beyond the age at which they could enter the service. If this rule was modified, and a portion of the minor appointments, as messengers, porters, and third class clerks, given to discharged soldiers, a great boon would be conferred upon that class, and he believed that great benefit would also accrue to the State.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is expedient to employ in Government situations non-commissioned officers and privates discharged from the Army with good character,"—(*Sir Charles Russell,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

CAPTAIN VIVIAN cordially endorsed all that the hon. and gallant Baronet had said on this matter. Encouragement to the soldiers in this way was the principal mode in which they could hope to induce a better class of men to enlist in the army. Men in the army were now offered only the inducement of promotion to the non-commissioned ranks, with the addition, after a great many years' good service, of a pension which barely kept body and soul together, and a good conduct medal. In some few cases a commission was also offered. But in the present constitution of the army a commission given to a non-commissioned officer was a very questionable advantage, and he should be very sorry to see the constitution of the army materially altered. That being the case, he looked to the employment of discharged soldiers in the various grades of the public service for which they were qualified as one of the greatest inducements that could be held out. In some of the public Departments he was aware there was a great objection to the employment of soldiers as clerks. He had received several letters from persons employed in those Departments urging objections; but he could not concur in them, because he knew that many of the discharged soldiers were excellent penmen and accountants, very methodical, and, he believed, quite as capable of discharging the duties in civil Departments as the ordinary third class clerks. He hoped that the system of employing them which had been commenced in the War Office would be elaborated in other Departments; for there was no doubt that if it became known that such posts would be filled up by military men, it would be a great inducement not only to good behaviour in the army, but to a superior class of men entering the service.

LORD ELCHO said, he would beg to remind the House that when the subject of the purchase of commissions in the army was before the House, he had read a letter from a sergeant in his own regiment, pointing out that the greatest boon to the soldier would be to offer him employment in the Civil Service after his term of military service had expired. He was far from implying that the duties performed by civil clerks were not admirably performed, but he was perfectly certain, from the training which men received in the army, and from what he had seen of military clerks at Wimbledon and Hythe, that they would perform the duties equally well, and their employment in that capacity would not only be most economical to the State, but would add to the efficiency of the army by attracting to it the best men in the country. He saw no reason why the superior clerkships should not be open to retired officers. As regarded the men, giving commissions was no inducement; but it would be a great inducement to offer situations in the public service from £50 to £150 a year. In France and Prussia the duties of the War Department were performed entirely by military men, and he did not see why the example of those countries could not be followed in this. He hoped, therefore, that with either party in power, the Government would turn their attention to this question, as he believed that not only efficiency in the army but economy in the public service would result from elaborating the scheme of the hon. and gallant Baronet.

COLONEL BARTTELOT said, the thanks of the army were due to the hon. and gallant Member for Berkshire (Sir Charles Russell) for bringing this subject forward, because there was an acknowledged difficulty on the part of soldiers, even when discharged with the best character, in obtaining employment of any kind. In the course of last week a soldier formerly in his own regiment, who possessed admirable business qualifications, and had been discharged with a first class character, had come to him in a state of absolute starvation and had implored him to procure him some employment. If the proposition of the hon. and gallant Member were assented to, it would prove one of the greatest boons that could be conferred upon the non-commissioned officers and the privates of the army, who at the present time formed a very superior class of men.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he presumed it was not the intention of the hon. and gallant Baronet to press his Motion upon the House for present acceptance, as it would be a great mistake to endeavour to bind the judgment of the House or of the Government with regard to the contents of such a Motion. If that was the intention, he could not concur in the Motion now being put; but, subject to that reservation, he could not help saying how much justice he thought there was in the general desire that had been expressed by the hon. and gallant Baronet. It was, however, a very large subject. He confessed he thought it desirable that a larger scope should be given to the consideration of this subject. which was by no means free from difficulty, The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the barrier of age. Now, that barrier was one which had not been fixed precipitately but really did represent in a great degree the result of the experience of the authorities in the Civil Service Departments themselves. Now, he was by no means disposed to say that no modifications should take place with reference to this barrier.

Lord Elcho

With respect to the civilians generally we might suppose that it had been judiciously arranged, and how far it could be modified in the case of persons who had served in the army was a very nice question. It was not only a question as to the discharged soldiers, but also a question as to what would be fair to civilian candidates. So far as prepossession was concerned, there was no proposal he should look upon with greater favour than that of the hon. and gallant Baronet. He thought it would be well worth the while of the Government to take measures for a careful review of most of the lower branches of the Civil Service to see how far it would be possible to make them the means of affording an honourable and useful career for discharged soldiers and non-commissioned officers. As regarded the effect of such appointments on the composition of the army, and the inducements they would offer to enlist, that was a very large question, which went even to the extent of the term of service in the army. It was possible, if the House should see fit to carry out the view supported by men of great weight, of introducing a shorter term of service in the army, that it might greatly facilitate the views of the hon. and gallant Baronet. He only touched the surface of a question which he thought well worthy of examination to its very root and foundation. It would not be difficult to suggest the means at any rate of a preliminary examination. A commission would not be desirable, but if the Government were disposed to appoint a mixed official committee of practical men, including military men and an intelligent officer of the Treasury, to make an investigation, the result though not necessarily final would be useful; because it was not to be expected or desired that rapid progress should be made. He suggested this as a means of breaking ground in a direction that was of great importance, and he joined in acknowledging the services of those hon. Gentlemen who had brought the matter before the House.

GENERAL PERCY HERBERT said, he was not sanguine about such a scheme inducing a different class of men to enlist; but he believed it would be valuable in inducing men in the army to behave themselves, and to educate themselves so as to be qualified for appointments in the Civil Service on their discharge. Where soldiers were employed in some of the Departments at the Horse Guards he believed that the duties were performed most satisfactorily, and with a great saving of expense to the country. Within his own knowledge, there were two clerks in a public office receiving salaries between them of £500 a year to do the duties which any ordinary clerk could discharge efficiently for £120, and which he knew a discharged soldier, of excellent character and abilities, would be delighted to perform equally well at *5s.* a day.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, he should support the Motion. He considered that the Government did not look after discharged soldiers as they ought to do. He deemed it desirable that Government should endeavour to employ to the end of their lives men who had served out their time in the army.

GENERAL DUNNE said, that about ten years ago he brought the question under the attention of the House, and the difficulty with which he had been met was the age before which men were required to enter the Civil Service. But he thought they ought not for a moment to contemplate reducing the term of service in the army for the purpose of carrying out the scheme. In the War Department discharged soldiers were specially qualified for employment in consequence of the peculiar training they had undergone.

COLONEL SYKES said, the scheme was necessary to make service in the army popular. With regard to the question of age, he would point out that as men generally entered the army at eighteen for twenty years' service, when they were discharged they were, as a rule, in good health and quite able to discharge their duties in any Government situation to which they might be appointed. His experience of soldiers taken from the ranks for civil employments in India had given him the very highest opinion of the qualifications of the men who would be eligible for the public service. He trusted, therefore, that, as a matter of economy, policy, and justice, the scheme would be carried out.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he thought that the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for Berkshire (Sir Charles Russell) had taken a very judicious course in the interest of the soldier in pressing the question on the consideration of the House. He could not doubt that the more extensive adoption of the principle of employing discharged soldiers of good character in the Civil Service, would be a great encouragement to good conduct in the ranks of the army and a legitimate reward to those who left the service with good characters. He had been referred to as a witness, because it was in his Department that the experiment had been most extensively tried. The object of the hon. and gallant Baronet was to elicit from the Government some declaration in favour of a more extensive adaptation of that principle. It was impossible, however, for him to say how far the Government might be disposed to adopt the principle, or how far the heads of the different Departments might be inclined to apply it. The hon. and gallant Baronet had under-rated the number of soldiers employed in the Civil Service in saying there were only thirty-five.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL explained that he had said, or, at any rate, meant to say, that only thirty-five of the Corps of Commissionaires had been employed in Government situations. He did not refer to the employment of soldiers in the War Department, beyond appealing to the right hon. Baronet to make a statement on the subject.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he was glad to have elicited that explanation, because it would be undesirable that an impression should go forth that only thirty-five soldiers were employed. He held in his hand a statement of the ages at which soldiers were taken into the public service as messengers in the several Departments, employment which he was happy to say was not limited to the army, but had also been extended to the naval service. In the War Department no less than thirty-three old soldiers were employed, and he was glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) express a general concurrence in the propriety of such appointments, for they not only conferred a boon upon the well-conducted soldier, but also tended very much to the economy of the public service. There were no doubt many duties discharged by clerks in the public offices for which soldiers upon leaving the army would be unfit, but on the other hand, there were many functions for which they were well suited, and they had performed such functions with entire satisfaction in the Department where he was best able to form a judgment. He therefore saw no reason why the same system should not be introduced in the other Departments.

LORD HOTHAM said, that as the system proposed was one which had been recommended by a Royal Commission over which he presided some nine or ten years ago, it was natural he should take an interest in it. His hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Charles Russell) had every reason to be satisfied with the discussion. Several Members had given an opinion favourable to the object he had in view, and although the right hon. Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) took, as was natural and proper for him to do, a Treasury view of the subject, yet, at the same time, the right hon. Gentleman looked at it with the greatest possible fairness, and gave an opinion favourable to the general principle of the proposal. The Secretary of State for War had also stated that the thing worked well in the War Office, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would endeavour to enlist the sympathy of his Colleagues in favour of doing something in the same way in the Departments over which they presided. He was not one of those who expected that they could very materially change the condition of the men who entered the army ; but he thought that by holding out inducements of this kind they might make soldiers better conducted, and thus improve the discipline of the army and increase its efficiency.

MR. H. BAILLIE said, he was glad the question had been brought before the House. It was the abominable practice which prevailed on both sides of the House of placing all the small situations in the gift of the Secretary of the Treasury at the disposal of Members of the House, for distribution among their constituents that prevented the employment of deserving men of the class referred to. He believed that among the many thousands of persons in the employment of the Post Office not one discharged soldier was to be found, although there were many quite capable of discharging the duties. He trusted the Government would take the matter into their serious consideration.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

IRISH CHURCH COMMISSION.

QUESTION.

SIR JOHN GRAY said, he would beg to ask the hon. Member for Hereford, What progress has been made with the inquiry entrusted to the Irish Church Commissioners; has the inquiry been concluded, and, if not, what subjects have been investigated, and what yet remain to be investigated ; if the inquiry has been concluded, why the Report, which the House was led to expect would be presented in the early part of the Session, has not been presented before this ; is it intended to present the Report in such time as to admit of its being printed and circulated amongst the Members of the present House of Commons ?

MR. CLIVE: The delay, where there has been delay in London, has been entirely caused by the necessity for several of the Commissioners sitting in Dublin, there to get up the statistics. The Report has been completed, and it is not necessary for me to go into the subjects that have been investigated and the subjects that have not been investigated ; for none remain to be investigated. The Schedules of this Report—the draft of which I hold in my hand—are very voluminous and complicated, and require extensive examination and close revision. That examination and revision have been going on within the last few weeks in Dublin. That accounts for the Report not being issued, and there is reason to hope that in less than a fortnight the Report will be in the hands of Members. Two more sittings are all that will be necessary ; the Commissioners will be in London to-morrow, and in a fortnight from that time I have reason to expect the Report and Schedules will be presented to hon. Members.

In reply to Sir JOHN GRAY,

MR. CLIVE added : The Report has not been conclusively adopted, and there must be one or two more sittings of the Commissioners, but there is hardly anything to be done.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE : Has any fresh inquiry been taken up by the Commissioners within the last two months that has tended to prolong their labours ?

MR. CLIVE : I am not aware that anything new has taken place since that time. The delay, as I have already stated, is almost entirely due to the voluminous nature of the Schedules.

THE NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE.

MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE.

MR. GOLDSMID : Mr. Speaker—Sir, in rising to call attention to the recent appointment of Architects for the New Public Buildings in the Metropolis I make no apology, as the question has been already considered in " another place," and as the buildings, when completed, will either be amongst the greatest eyesores or the greatest ornaments of the metropolis. It is well therefore that the House of Commons should know what is going on; it is well it should consider the application of the public money, and should see that faith has been kept with the competing architects. An announcement was made in *The Times* a few days ago that Mr. Street had been appointed architect to the New Law Courts, Mr. Barry to the National Gallery, Mr. Scott to the continuation and completion of the Public Offices in Downing Street, and Mr. Waterhouse to the new erections at South Kensington. Last year I brought the result of the competition for the National Gallery to the notice of the House; now I desire to direct attention to that for the Law Courts. The history of the proceedings with regard to them is shortly this — By the Courts of Justice Building Act 1865, the duty of superintending the building was assigned to the Treasury with the advice and assistance of certain Commissioners who were appointed in the same year, and who were a mixed body some fifty in number. The next step was that in February 1866, the Treasury, with the consent of the Commission appointed five Judges of Design, Sir Alexander Cockburn, Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. Gladstone, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, and Mr. Cowper. But at the same time the Commission laid down this condition—that "the plans ultimately adopted should receive the final confirmation of the Commission by the signature of the Chairman being attached to them when the contracts should be entered into." And this condition was confirmed by a Treasury Minute, dated December 23rd, 1865. Further, Messrs. Shaw and Pownall, surveyors, were appointed by the Commission to report upon the designs, and to see whether they complied with the Instructions as to internal arrangement, ventilation, access, &c., &c. At a much later period those two gentlemen were added to the number of Judges; in fact, it was after they had prepared their Report. Another surveyor (Mr. Gardiner) was named to test the estimates of cost given by the competing architects. Such, then, shortly were the arrangements made to judge of the designs. The next question to consider is—what were the conditions of the competition? The Judges of Design decided that it should be limited to six architects whom they named; but by a Resolution of the House of Commons the number was increased to twelve. Of the twelve requested to compete one subsequently retired; so that eleven actually entered the lists. This matter settled, the Treasury issued Instructions, which had been most carefully prepared by the Commission, and which entered minutely into all important details. Therein it is laid down that—

> "The arrangement of the Courts and Offices is of vital moment; on it mainly depends the success or failure of their concentration, and its importance cannot be over-estimated."—[Sec. 21, p. 7.]

Further, they state at Sec. 41, p. 12, that—

> "The chief points to be kept constantly in view, and to be treated as superseding, so far as they may conflict, all considerations of architectural effect, are the accommodation to be provided, and the arrangements to be adopted, so as in the greatest degree to facilitate the despatch and the accurate transaction of the law business of the country."

And Sec. 54 that—

> "The comparative cost of carrying out each design will be an important element in determining the competition."

And finally it is declared that each unsuccessful competitor is to receive £800, and that the successful one is to be employed to erect the building. Everything in these Instructions appears so careful and accurate that one might hope that there could be no difficulty in deciding clearly the relative positions of the contending architects. But the result did not prove this to be the case; for on the 30th July, 1867, Mr. Cowper, on behalf of the Judges, informed the First Commissioner of Works that—

> "The design of Mr. Barry was the best in regard to plan and distribution of the interior, and that the design of Mr. Street was the best in regard to merit as an architectural composition."

Thereupon Lord John Manners consulted the Commission, who recommended him to refer the matter back to the Judges of Design as they had decided without considering the question of cost, and before receiving Mr. Gardiner's Report. This advice was followed; but the Judges replied that Mr. Gardiner's Report contained nothing to affect their previous decision. In accordance with a recommendation of the Commission, the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown was then taken upon the points arising under the original Instructions in consequence of the double award, to which several of the architects had objected on the ground that they had been invited to compete against each other singly, but not against any two conjointly. The Attorney General held that, as no competitor had gained pre-eminence and been named singly, the competition had failed, and the Government were at liberty to appoint any architect they chose. And, accordingly, by a Treasury Minute, dated the 30th May, 1868, they appointed Mr. Street—an appointment to which, for various reasons, some of the competitors objected. One would have thought that this was complication enough, but there was more, for other tribunals had been appealed to. The Commission had appointed two sub-Committees, one of barristers and the other of solicitors, to consider the designs. They soon amalgamated and presented a joint Report which was substantially in favour of Mr. Waterhouse, and which gave the next place to Mr. Scott. This Report was subsequently confirmed by the Commission. Moreover, the Commission passed a Resolution in favour of a central hall, such as Mr. Waterhouse and Mr. Street had provided; whereas Messrs. Shaw and Pownall, who first drew up a Report as mere ordinary assistants, and were subsequently appointed professional Judges, disagreed with this Resolution, and especially found fault with Messrs. Waterhouse's and Street's central hall. Nor was this all. There was yet a further complication; for the Judges and Officers of the different Courts and Departments to be lodged in the new building had been requested by the Commission to report on the accommodation provided for them, and out of sixty-four such Departments, forty-three reported. They gave in twenty-eight cases the first or second place to Mr. Scott, and in twenty-nine the first or second to Mr. Waterhouse; whereas to Mr. Lockwood they gave sixteen, to Mr. Street nine, and to Mr. Barry also nine. Now twenty-one offices did not report; and Messrs. Shaw and Pownall gave, in seventeen out of these twenty-one, the palm to Mr. Barry, which is most extraordinary, considering the relative numbers he obtained in the other offices. And it must be added that subsequently the Commission refer to the decision of Messrs. Shaw and Pownall only to disagree with it. Moreover, in two remarkable instances the opinion of the Judges and their officers was decidedly against all the competitors except Mr. Waterhouse. The cases were those of the Probate and Divorce Courts and the Courts of Appeal. With regard to the former Sir J. Wilde says that the only admissible plan is Mr. Waterhouse's. Now, Sir, I think I have shown by this statement that the task the Government had to perform was one of no ordinary difficulty, and that though dictated by the most conscientious desire to do justice their decision could not fail to cause much heartburning. There was an embarrassing number of different awards—namely, that of the Judges and Officers of the Courts, in favour of Messrs. Waterhouse and Scott; that of the Commission and its sub-Committees, in favour of Mr. Waterhouse; and that of the Judges, in favour of Messrs. Barry and Street. And, finally, there was a Report of Messrs. Shaw and Pownall, drawn up before they were appointed professional Judges, which was strongly in favour of Mr. Barry. Doubtless the Government, on looking into the cases of the four gentlemen—Messrs. Barry, Street, Waterhouse, and Scott—observed—1. That Mr. Barry's designs exceeded the given area, had no system of ventilation, and, according to Mr. Gardiner's Report, immensely exceeded his own estimate of cost—namely, by some £400,000; and that his claims rested on the award of the Judges, which was well-known not to have been unanimous, and on Messrs. Shaw and Pownall's Report, of which the Lord Chancellor had said—

> "That it was disagreed with by all the various bodies of the profession, who after all were those best qualified to decide with respect to internal accommodation."

2. That Mr. Street's design was not wanting on the points just referred to; that his internal arrangements were defective; and that his claims also rested on the award of the Judges. 3. That Mr. Waterhouse's designs were approved by the Commission and its Committees, and by the Judges and Officers of the various Courts; that his estimate of cost was exceedingly accurate; and that he had shown his powers by building the Manchester Assize Courts. 4. And lastly, that Mr. Scott's plans were commended by the Officers of the Courts; and that he had been successful in much former public work. Now, as I have stated, the Government must have been greatly perplexed, actuated as I am sure they were by an earnest desire to act fairly towards all the competitors. As a way out of their difficulties, they adopted what would appear to the public to be a system of compensation, by making the four appointments I mentioned at the commencement of my statement. But the announcement of these appointments was not correct; for that of Mr.

Waterhouse was made by the late Government in 1866. Consequently, as far as he was concerned, it was no compensation. Mr. Barry says, through the right hon. Member for Calne, that he has an equitable claim to build the new Law Courts; and others will doubtless through other friends in this House put forward their rights. Now, Sir, I do not quarrel with the appointment of Mr. Street; but as it has been stated that the public faith has not been kept, I think it is a question the House of Commons ought to investigate; and if, as I believe, the Government have endeavoured to act fairly between the competitors, they can only court such an inquiry. In whose favour soever may be the result, I hope that a building worthy to be called our great Palace of Justice and one of the greatest ornaments added in modern times to the metropolis may be erected; and at the same time, that there may be no well-grounded reason for complaining that the public faith has not been kept with the competing architects. For these reasons I beg to move—

"That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the recent appointment of Architects for the New Public Buildings in the Metropolis."

Mr. GREGORY seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the recent appointment of Architects for the New Public Buildings in the Metropolis,"—(*Mr. Goldsmid,*)

—instead thereof.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, that having been one of the Judges of Design, he was not disposed to give a vote on the Motion, but he could not absolve himself from the duty of expressing an opinion on the subject. His hon. Friend had stated the case very luminously and impartially, but he was inclined to demur to the proposition of his hon. Friend that there was sufficient reason why a Select Committee should inquire into the matter. His hon. Friend had pointed out the great difficulty the Government were placed in with respect to the decision they arrived at, and every one must admit that it was impossible for the Government to arrive at any decision which would not be open to plausible, and even more than plausible, objections. In his opinion the Government were perfectly free from blame in the course they had taken with reference to the difficult question with which they had to deal, and he could only express his regret that he and those who acted with him had so entirely failed in rendering effective aid to the Government in this matter. He was persuaded that, upon the whole, the Government had come to a recommendation which the House would do no good in endeavouring to disturb. The House in this matter was, if he might so speak, a rude instrument for a delicate process. To appoint a Committee upon this subject would be to re-open from the beginning an operation which had been found to be extremely laborious and complicated, and to re-commence the labour with even less chance of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion than they had when the matter was first started. The only prudent course was to leave the matter in the hands of the Government, for them to act upon their own responsibility.

Mr. LOWE said, he wished, in the first place, to state that he had not the honour of the acquaintance of Mr. Barry, except with respect to this matter, and he had no intention of expressing himself or of asking the House to express any opinion upon the respective merits of the different Gentlemen whose names had been connected with this subject. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken (Mr. Gladstone) that it would be most improper to re-open this question from its commencement by appointing a Committee to inquire into it. The only charge that he intended to make against the Government was that under very difficult circumstances they had missed their way, and had not adopted the best course which was open to them. They had put too violent a construction upon the failure of the Judges to make an award, and they seemed to think that the whole proceedings were rendered void *ab initio,* and they therefore set at nought the contract which they had entered into with the architects. In making this statement he had no desire to cast reproach or blame upon the Government, his object being simply to point out to the House that there was a course now before the Government which they might adopt without re-opening the question from the beginning. It had been stated by the Lord Chancellor in "another place" that Messrs. Shaw and Pownall were not appointed Judges, but in making that statement the noble and learned Lord was inaccurate. There was no dispute about the facts of the case. There was, most undoubtedly, a contract of some kind or another entered into between the Government and the competing architects, and when it was found that the Government, in consequence of the course taken by their agents, could not carry into effect the terms of that contract, the Government should do all in their power to carry into effect the spirit of that contract. The Treasury determined to appoint certain eminent persons as Judges, and caused Instructions to be prepared for the competing architects, the number of whom was limited to twelve. Out of these twelve one was to be selected on account of the design, and not upon any other consideration. The Government, however, were not pledged to adopt the design, but the successful architect was to prepare another for actual use. A copy of the Instructions, signed by Lord Cranworth, the then Lord Chancellor, was sent to each of the competing architects. One of the provisoes in the rough draft of these Instructions was that, in the event of none of the designs being adopted by the Judges, the Government would be quite unfettered in the selection of an architect, and though this was subsequently withdrawn, in consequence of an objection raised by Mr. Barry, the fact of its being originally inserted was a proof that the Instructions constituted a contract of some nature or other between the Government and the architects. He maintained that the Judges were not arbitrators, but rather agents and delegates of the Government, exercising a duty which the Government could, if it had chosen, have exercised itself. The Judges could not agree upon an award, and they therefore certified to the Government that Mr. Barry's design was the best as regarded the interior, and Mr. Street's the best as regarded the elevation. The Attorney General was thereupon consulted, and advised the Government that the Judges were not authorized to appoint two architects, and that consequently no architect had been appointed at all. This opinion being communicated in due course to the Judges, they replied that, unhappily, they could come to no other conclusion, and so the matter terminated. Now, as far as the Government were concerned, he had no fault whatever to find with their conduct up to this point, and he believed the Attorney General had given them good advice; but it seemed to him that they were wrong in arriving at the conclusion that they were set perfectly at liberty by the failure of the Judges to make an award, and that the whole proceedings had been rendered void *ab initio*, What he contended was that, although the Judges had not given such a decision as was expected of them, that fact did not relieve the Government from all the obligations they had entered into with the architects, who, it should be borne in mind, had incurred great expense, and who had been guilty of no fault. Under the circumstances it was the duty of the Government to fulfil the contract as far as possible, or, as a lawyer would say, *cy près*, because they were bound by what they had done themselves as well as by what the Judges had done within their legitimate authority. It was true that the failure of the Judges did not give Mr. Barry a right to bring an action at law against the Government, but, at the same time, the Government were bound in good faith, and in some degree also by law, to stand by their contract. Of course the view he took of the matter excluded all the competitors except Messrs. Street and Barry. The professional Judges (Messrs. Shaw and Pownall) made out a table containing the number of marks they gave to the competitors on the different matters of arrangement. The total number of marks was eighty-eight, and of these Mr. Barry gained forty-one, or nearly half; Mr. Gilbert Scott, who came next, obtained twenty-five; while Mr. Street obtained only three, and these were upon tramways and upon comparatively unimportant matters. In all the principal things which the Instructors contemplated—namely, ample and uninterrupted communication; light, air, and quiet—Mr. Barry was thought by these professional Judges to have succeeded. But, although the Judges did not give effect to this Report by recommending Mr. Barry's plan, the Government would have done rightly and wisely if they had selected it, because the points upon which the selection was to turn had been best accomplished by Mr. Barry. The Lord Chancellor, in "another place," said that the competition having failed or miscarried, it became the duty of the Government to undertake the responsibility of saying who should be the architect. But how did the competition miscarry? Not through the fault of those who were prejudiced by the selection of the Government. The effect of what had occurred would be not only to throw discredit upon the Government, but to put an end to the system of architectural competition. The object of competition was to get the best man, but the effect of what had occurred was to prevent the best man from coming forward. The very highest authority on this subject, Lord Cranworth, who, as Lord Chancellor, signed the Instructions to the architects, stated in "another place" that the Instructions were to attend almost exclusively to matters of internal accommodation, convenience, and arrangement. Lord Cranworth, like himself, was personally unacquainted with Mr. Barry, but, like him, argued this subject not on the question of merits but of Government faith.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, he had the misfortune to be one of the Judges of these designs who were appointed to render what assistance they could to the Government; and he should feel it unbecoming in him to express any opinion as to the architects except this, that many of them manifested very great merits. His right hon. Friend who had just addressed the House, had taken an entirely different view of the duties of the Judges, and of the meaning of their award, from that which the Judges themselves took. No doubt it was a main and leading point in the Instructions to the architects that they were to attend to the important uses of the building, and that so far as these might conflict with architectural beauty the internal accommodation was to be preferred. But it was never considered that the competition was to be decided by reference to internal matters only. On such a principle, there would have been no elevations wanted at all. The contract of the Government with the architects was to submit their plans for a consideration of their relative merits to the appointed Judges, who were in no sense agents of the Government except in the event of their reporting in favour of one particular competitor; and if they failed to report one competitor as better than all the rest they had no power to bind the Government by any opinion which they might have expressed, and in common sense, as well as in law, the matter was wholly at large. To argue that the void award which had been made took out of the hands of the Government the responsibility of making the appointment seemed to him perfectly wild and extravagant, and it might involve the greatest possible injustice to other architects whose names the Judges had not mentioned. You could not for a particular purpose detach a particular opinion from its context, and adduce it for a purpose for which the Judges never brought it forward; you could not base anything upon the unauthoritative expressions of opinion of those who had failed in their character of Judges. If all the Judges had been of the same opinion as Messrs. Shaw and Pownall it might then no doubt have had great effect; but it was not so; and the barristers and solicitors, who were the best judges of what was wanted, preferred to the plans of Mr. Barry those of nother gentleman who was not named by the Judges. The Officers of the Courts, he believed, either concurred in this opinion, or preferred the plans of Mr. Scott. These gentlemen were as well qualified as Messrs. Shaw and Pownall to form an opinion as to the nature and character of the accommodation to be provided in the building, and of the arrangements by which the transaction of business might best be facilitated; and other architects might just as well say that the Government was bound to accept the opinion of the lawyers and Officers. It was not the opinion of the Judges that Mr. Barry had by his internal arrangement placed himself upon such a pinnacle, that they, without taking into consideration other things, could recommend him; and it was a fallacy to say that, because of the Report of Messrs. Shaw and Pownall, Mr. Barry ought to be appointed the architect.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE begged to take part in the discussion as representing a class which not yet been heard—namely, the entire art-loving public. He had devoted many hours to the study of the designs when they were exhibited at Lincoln's Inn, and he felt justified in begging the hon. Member not to press his Motion to a division. He was satisfied that the appointment of a Committee would only lead to further complication. It would unsettle the little progress that had already been made, and come to no result, working out, as it would have to do, against the grain, within the few hours still left of the active life of the last old Parliament, a most perplexed problem. Those who had preceded him in the debate had spoken as if the question would only lie between four given architects; but, in fact, if it were re-opened at all, it must be re-opened completely, and the claims, not of those four only, but of all the eleven would have to be considered. His hon. Friend had dropped the name of Mr. Brandon. Well, the grandiose design of that architect would have to be considered, so would the striking one contributed by Mr. Seddon; so also would the design which all who were not lawyers, but experts in architecture, with a singular unanimity pronounced to be a model both of learned labour and of vigorous genius—that of Mr. Burgess. Mr. Street's design was no doubt a very good one, by a most competent and distinguished architect, and it would, of course, in its re-modelling be materially improved. Against his friend, Mr. Barry, he was very unwilling to say a word, but he feared that if that gentleman succeeded in obtaining the inquiry which he was seeking, other reports, as authentic as those of Messrs. Shaw and Pownall, and not so favourable, might come out; one, for instance, from the Probate Department, which as he had heard rumoured, would virtually put Mr. Barry's entire plan out of court. On the whole, then, he said "Let well alone." That "well" no doubt might be better, but it might also be worse, and as he was convinced that the only result of a Committee would be completely to throw back the whole scheme of re-building the Law Courts for an indefinite period, he hoped the Government would not consent to it.

Mr. TITE said, that the Government having selected eleven of the best architects in England—he might say in Europe—to enter into a competition for designs for the new Courts, it was a great misfortune that they did not find themselves in a position to adhere faithfully to the bargain which was made. He had the highest possible opinion of the four gentlemen whose names had been introduced into this discussion. They were an honour to the country. It was much to be regretted that some architects had not been placed upon the Commission, which was composed almost entirely of lawyers. After a long discussion, the names of two of the competing architects — Messrs. Street and Barry—had been bracketed together. It was very unfortunate that when the Judges had bracketed two gentlemen together, as of equal merit, one excelling in interior arrangement and the other in the exterior design, and when a course had been agreed upon acceptable to those two gentlemen, that course had not been carried out. The right hon. Gentleman opposite, as a man of honour and desiring to act fairly between them—the system of joint architects having been objected to—gave the erection of the National Gallery to Mr. Barry; but he adjudged the enormous prize of the erection of the new Palace of Justice to Mr. Street. On account of this great inequality, it was most desirable, he thought, that some compromise in the matter should be arrived at, and what he would suggest was that, as the present site was declared by competent authorities to be too small for the erection upon it of all the Courts of Chancery and Common Law, the land reclaimed from the Thames should be turned to account. If that were done, the new Chancery Courts might be built on the present site, and Mr. Street might be appointed as the architect. There would not be the least difficulty in making a communication by a gallery between those Courts and the new Common Law Courts which might be erected on the Thames Embankment, and the erection of which might be committed to the hands of Mr. Barry. The enormous expenditure requisite to extend the existing site would thus be avoided, and a tolerably satisfactory arrangement arrived at; for two architects had been more than once known to work conjointly at the same building with perfect success.

Mr. POWELL said, he hoped the House would abide by the decision to which it had already come with reference to the site of the new Courts. The often contemplated project for the fusion of law and equity would be likely to be indefinitely postponed if the new Chancery and Common Law Courts were to be kept separate in the way which the hon. Member who had just spoken suggested. The proposed Committee would, in his opinion, find itself wholly unable to solve the problem which would be submitted to it. If they selected the design of Mr. Street, a truly noble design would be chosen, in which, according to the opinion of Judges, members of the Bar, attorneys, and suitors, all the requirements for Courts of Law would be well provided for; but the Committee, if unfit to decide the problem proposed to be submitted to them, would be still more unfit to determine the question of law, and he thought that the House should abide by the decision of the Law Officers of the Crown.

Mr. WINTERBOTHAM said, he did not attribute to the Government any object but the appointment of the best architect they could find; but he considered, at the same time, that, desiring to get rid of a very complex subject, they chose rather hastily to cut the knot, and did not show the patience necessary for untying it. He should not have objected if, in the first instance, the Government had appointed an architect and given no reasons for the appointment; but it was important that strict justice should be done in these matters, and when the Government had entered into a distinct contract with certain individuals it should be religiously observed. That had not been done in the present instance. Five Judges of the designs were appointed, and it was declared that their award should be final, and that the successful competitor should be employed as the architect of the building. The Judges recommended two designs. Now, it was obvious at the first blush that each competitor might be willing to compete with the other competitors individually, but not with two combined. The award was not within the terms of the competition, and if the Government were of opinion that the award was invalid, why should individual architects be made to suffer by it? In matters of this description it was absolutely necessary that the public faith should be observed to the very letter. The confusion that had arisen was entirely owing to the circumstance that Messrs. Shaw and Pownall had been raised from the position of assistant architectural clerks to that of Judges. This step had been taken in deference to the Trades' Union feeling of the London architects, who anticipated that this addition to the number of the Judges would neutralize the chance of the competitor from Manchester being successful. The result of this increase in the number of the Judges was that the two Judges who were in favour of Mr. Barry united with the two who were in favour of Mr. Street against the three who were in favour of Mr. Waterhouse, who had succeeded so admirably with regard to the Manchester Law Courts. One of the conditions of the competition was that the element of cost would be taken into consideration. It was stated that the sum of £750,000 had been fixed upon as the limit. Mr. Street's offer was £193,000 outside the amount specified, Mr. Barry's £330,000, and Mr. Waterhouse's only £1,600. But this was not known when the Judges made their award. If some steps were not taken to insure justice being done in this instance by terms of the contract being adhered to, competitions of this kind would be put a stop to entirely. It was already difficult to induce gentlemen of first-class position to enter into them. The honour of Parliament was involved in little things quite as much as in great things, and it was desirable that strict faith should be kept in this matter. He should support the Motion of the hon. Member for a Select Committee, not with the view of obtaining a decision as to the merits of the plans, but in order that it might be ascertained how this miscarriage arose, and how it could be remedied.

MR. CHILDERS said, that this question stood in a different position from any other question relating to public buildings. The new Law Courts were not to be erected at the cost of ordinary Votes of this House; but mainly from balances of Fee Funds and charges specially imposed upon suitors; and the Bill would never have passed had not the responsibility and authority to carry on the work been expressly given to a Royal Commission conjointly with the Treasury. Yet no sooner did they begin to take any action than the House of Commons stepped in and interfered with that responsibility. First, his hon. Friend the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Bentinck) carried a Resolution increasing the number of architects, then the hon. Member for Belfast (Mr. Lanyon) forced the Government to add to the Judges; and the result is the unsatisfactory and inconclusive award of these gentlemen. At the same time, as practically the Judges had bracketed two architects as equal, he regretted that Government had not made a joint appointment, but he was not at all prepared to advise the House of Commons for the third time to step in and interfere with their responsibility; and he trusted the matter would be left as it stood, and would not be relegated to a Select Committee. He hoped the suggestion to have two buildings would not be listened to, and as to putting the Common Law Courts in one, and the Equity Courts in another half-a-mile off, his hon. Friend had probably not considered that perhaps the distinction between Common Law and Equity Courts would not last another Parliament.

MR. BENTINCK said, he thought that as, according to the Instructions, utility was to be more regarded than ornament, the Government ought to have selected Mr. Barry as the architect. In the opinion of the architectural profession, Messrs. Shaw and Pownall were the Judges most to be relied upon, and, sitting as assessors, their opinion could not but exercise great weight with the other Judges. He was sorry that hon. Members had not had an opportunity of inspecting the designs before being called upon to say whether the decision of the Judges was correct. He would not pretend to say whether the design which had been adopted would prove satisfactory to the country; but with regard to the appointment of a Committee, he felt a great objection to it, and on the whole he thought it would be better for the hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Goldsmid) not to divide the House upon his Motion.

Mr. PEASE said, he had been told by Mr. Street that he had done him an injustice, when speaking on this subject on a former occasion, by representing that he had exceeded the estimate by £300,000, instead of £193,000. Mr. Street was entitled to the benefit of the correction. The truth was that the cost had been put very much out of view, and almost all the architects except Mr. Waterhouse had greatly exceeded the original estimate. Mr. Barry was out by £330,000, while Mr. Waterhouse was only £2,000 in excess of the estimate. Whatever celebrity Mr. Street possessed as an architect was in connection with church architecture; but this was not the style they required in the Law Courts. They wanted no "dim religious light" to be introduced there, but that the light of justice should illuminate the judgments to be delivered there.

Mr. MONTAGU CHAMBERS thought that this was a case, of all others, for a Select Committee. The decision of the Government was entirely unsatisfactory to the House and to the public out-of-doors, and it was remarkable that not one hon. Member who had spoken concurred in the appointment of Mr. Street. Messrs. Shaw and Pownall, who were called in as surveyors, were desired to go through the detailed plans. They were eminent and honourable men, whose characters were above suspicion, and who had no prejudice in favour of one candidate over another; and their judgment in favour of Mr. Barry, on the score that he had complied with the requisitions, ought to have been conclusive. Mr. Street was only entitled to be mentioned with regard to elevation. He could not help saying that when certain details had been sent to the competing architects, and when elevation was the condition placed last, it was a hard case that the Government should finally say to Mr. Barry, "Although you have been most successful in that which we principally demanded, you shall not have the execution of this great work." The leading architects would not have entered into a competition for the mere *bagatelle* of £800, if they had not felt certain that the most successful competitor would have been appointed to erect the building; and there having been a failure with regard to all who competed, it was unjust to all to make the compromise which the Government proposed, which was an awkward and a weak one. He ventured to predict that the thing would be a failure; the building would be commenced, and when the mistake was found out the answer would be that it was too late to interfere, because the works were already too far advanced. It was impossible that a worthy Palace of Justice could be erected on the site which had been cleared, and he believed there was a growing opinion out-of-doors that it ought to be built to front the river. He should vote for the appointment of a Select Committee, and he wished to urge upon the Government the postponement of all other proceedings as the only means of securing a grand, a suitable, and a useful building.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, he must compliment the hon. Member for Honiton on the judicial temper with which he had introduced the subject; but the proposal to inquire into the appointments of architects during the last few months or years was too considerable to be entertained this Session, and on the part of the Govern-he must take exception to it. There had been considerable misapprehension on the subject; and he might, therefore, state that two or three years ago Mr. Waterhouse received from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Hertford (Mr. Cowper) the appointment of architect of the new buildings at South Kensington that were to receive the Natural History Collections from the British Museum; and fresh instructions with reference to the preparation of plans had recently been sent to him. With regard to Mr. Gilbert Scott, he had within the last few weeks been appointed architect of the proposed Colonial and Home Offices that were to complete the quadrangle now partly formed by the Indian and Foreign Offices. The right hon. Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) did not agree with the hon. Member for Honiton as to what was to be referred to the proposed Select Committee. The right hon. Gentleman held that nothing ought to be referred, but whether or not there was a contract between the Government and the competing architects, and whether, in spite of the admitted failure of the Judges to make a binding award, there was not that amount of legal obligation upon the Government which would compel them to adopt, not the recommendations of the Judges, but a certain portion of them with which he happened to agree. The right hon. Gentleman based his opinion not upon anything in the award of the Judges, but upon something that had previously occurred. But it was clear from all that had been said that evening that the Government might, if they chose, have called for a fresh unlimited competition, and that they might have appointed anybody to be the architect of the new Law Courts, without legally violating the contract which had been made. He must entirely dissent from the opinion that the Government should be guided more by the recommendations of Messrs. Shaw and Pownall than by that of the committee of barristers and solicitors. The object which the Government had in view under the circumstances was to arrive at a conclusion which, upon general principles, should be fair to the competitors in the various competitions, and which should secure that the architects selected for the erection of the great works in contemplation should be such as to render it probable that those works would be worthy of the nation. After considering all the circumstances they had appointed Mr. Street to build the new Law Courts, and in so doing they believed they had taken the wisest course open to them; and further, he was glad to think, from the tone of the debate, that that was the opinion of the House of Commons. He quite concurred with the right hon. Gentleman in the opinion that the Judges were bound to take into their consideration the question of internal arrangement; but then it should be borne in mind that a protest against the plan of Mr. Barry had been sent in by the principal Officers of the Probate and Divorce Court, to whose use one-fifth of the space in the new Courts would have to be allotted, and that the Committee of the Bar and solicitors, whose views were endorsed by the Commissioners, also objected to that plan. Now, when it was borne in mind that the architect appointed would, in conjunction with some of those very gentlemen, have to carry out the necessary internal arrangements, it was quite clear that the views of men who would have to use the building, and who possessed a practical knowledge of the requirements of such a building, must prevail over that of any single individual; and under these circumstances the Government were justified, he must contend, in not selecting Mr. Barry, from whose views, as to internal arrangements, those gentlemen differed. If the Government had appointed Mr. Barry to be architect of the interior and Mr. Street to be architect of the exterior this result would have followed — Mr. Street would have been able to carry out his part of the design, while Mr. Barry would have had the mortification of finding that his plan for the interior would have to be materially altered before it would give satisfaction to one important branch of those using the new Courts. The Government then had to take into account the other great competitions in which Mr. Barry was concerned; and, finding that in the opinion of the Judges of the National Gallery competition he had produced the design which showed the greatest architectural skill, they had appointed him to be the architect of that building; so that they had, he thought, come to the fairest decision possible as regarded the two competitions, both of which had failed so far as the legal obligations went. As to Mr. Street's appointment, the Commission had not expressed any opinion; but they had been in communication with Mr. Street as to the preparation of the final plan, and there was no reason to believe that the Commissioners objected to Mr. Street's appointment. Several suggestions had been made as to the course which Government should pursue. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bath (Mr. Tite) had ventured on the suggestion, which was not likely to find favour with legal authorities, that the Courts of Law should be divided into two great groups, and that one should be confided to Mr. Street and the other to Mr. Barry. The hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Winterbotham) had suggested that a Committee should be appointed more for the purpose of considering the claims of Mr. Waterhouse than for anything else; and the hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Goldsmid) took an enlarged view, and suggested an inquiry which would probably last to the end of next Session. All such inquiries would only result in adding to the confusion and complexity with which the subject was already invested. He believed that the Government had made the best decision in their power; and when the natural feelings of disappointment which generally followed all these competitions had subsided, all parties would probably admit that a wise and sound decision had been arrived at.

MR. GOLDSMID explained that he had not intended to suggest that any wide inquiry should be entered on, but that what he wished to be investigated was the question whether the public faith had been kept.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:* — Ayes 90; Noes 45: Majority 45.

Main Question "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Supply *considered* in Committee.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

METROPOLITAN POLICE FUNDS BILL.

(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson.*)

[BILL 132.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in moving "That this Bill be now read a second time," said, in the course of the autumn Session the noble Lord the Member for Middlesex (Viscount Enfield) put some Questions to him respecting the numbers of the police, to which he replied that it was manifest that the police were shorthanded, and that they were overworked, and that it was desirable that they should have that amount of rest without which no force could remain efficient. At that time the men in the police force had only one day's rest in every five or six weeks, or even less, while their duties at the same time were most arduous and difficult. It was under these circumstances that he had determined to add 1,000 men and 120 officers to the force—an addition that did not raise its numbers to the same proportion to the population and the acreage which it bore to them when it was first instituted in 1830. At that time there were only twenty acres to each constable, whereas there were now fifty-seven acres to each constable. The population of the metropolis in 1830 was only 1,496,000, whereas it was at the present time somewhere about 3,506,000. The police force consisted at its first establishment of 3,300 men, officered by two Commissioners; but in 1856 Sir Richard Mayne became the sole Commissioner with two Assistant Commissioners. In 1856 the number of buildings in the metropolis was 368,000; but that number had since been increased to 472,000. The force for the protection of the Thames and of the dockyards was a separate body, and was not paid out of the police rate. Great difficulties had been experienced at one time in keeping up the numbers of the Metropolitan Police; but these difficulties had now disappeared in consequence of the addition that had been made to their pay at the instance of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Walpole) in the course of last year, and since then a good class of men had come into the force. Owing to the favourable regulations that had been made, the numbers of the force were now complete within 200 or 300 men. The pay of the force, however, even now was by no means excessive, and was lower than that of the City Police force, which had, moreover, several privileges not enjoyed by the Metropolitan Police. The lowest pay of the police when they entered the service was 10*s.* a week; but that was only for a week or two, during which they were being trained. The next pay was 19*s.* a week for the third class, and £1 3*s.* for the second class. The pay of the officers according to rank was in proportion. Last autumn his great desire was that the men should be allowed one day of rest in the seven; and he was glad to say that by the augmentation of the force that object had since been attained. An Order had been issued to insure them that rest, and to allow them, as far as possible, to choose the day themselves. It had been stated in the newspapers that too much of the time of the police was occupied in drill; but the fact was that they were only drilled during a portion of the year, and the drill — which was company drill only, not battalion drill — occupied only one hour in the week in the case of full constables. The exaggeration on this subject had been very great. The only objection to the Bill, so far as he was aware, was that it would necessitate a slight increase to the rates of the metropolis. It was, of course, necessary that some additional sum should be raised, and the ¾*d.* in the pound which he had determined to take was the smallest sum which could supply the needful funds. The police rate was now equal to 8*d.* in the pound on the rental, but 2*d.* was paid by the Treasury, so that in fact the metropolis was only rated to the extent of 6*d.* in the pound. He was anxious to observe the greatest economy possible; and under this Bill it was proposed to add ¾*d.* in the pound to the police rate, and ¼*d.* to the proportion to be paid by the Treasury. In case no addition were made to the amount raised there would be a deficit of £82,212. The additional cost would be £88,100.

The extra 1*d.* would raise £72,247, and there would be a surplus in hand at the end of this month of about £15,000, after providing for the pay of the men and for pensions. It was necessary, he might remark, to keep a good balance in hand, as the payments amounted to about £10,000 a month. The estimated cost of pay and clothing for 1868-9 was £616,707. It was necessary to provide a large sum to meet the cost of pensions and superannuations, which amounted this year to £58,836, and was likely ultimately to rise to £100,000. There was a necessity for additional buildings and stations, which were especially demanded for the married men. There was also in the Bill a provision for the increase of the salaries of the two Assistant Commissioners from £800 to £1,100 a year, which he thought only just, considering the great increase of their duties, and the augmentation of late years in the rents of houses and the keep of horses. Considering the manner in which those gentlemen performed their duties, he thought the House would not grudge them this additional remuneration, especially when it was considered that Colonel Fraser, who had a much smaller force to command in the City, had a house and £1,000 a year.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy.*)

MR. AYRTON said, he thought that the inhabitants of London had great reason to complain of the conduct of Government with regard to this Bill. From the first moment of its introduction they had sought to obtain from the Secretary of State for the Home Department some statement of the grounds upon which he proposed the imposition of this additional burden upon them; but he had steadily and sedulously refused to give this information, and even the statement he had now made was inadequate in the last degree. The House ought not, on a mere statement from a Minister of the Crown, without any inquiry being made, to pass a Bill of this kind imposing special taxation. What was the history of that measure? He believed that it originated in a mere panic, arising from events which alarmed the Secretary of State and the public. But what were the facts? He found from the Census that the population of London had increased at the rate of about 18 per cent in ten years; and on turning to the police he found that, without taking into account the Dockyard Police, they had during ten years increased rather more than 18 per cent, whilst the increase of expense in their maintenance had amounted to no less than 48 per cent. Why did they propose that increase? No doubt the police were now governed by a man of great experience; but it was certain that a time came when a man's experience became so great as to be hardly compatible with activity. He did not blame the Chief Commissioner for holding on to his office at present; for if there were any truth in what was said as to the pressure put upon him to induce him to resign, and what would happen when he did resign, he believed that he had rendered great service to the metropolis by clinging to his office. He, however, was assisted by two Assistant Commissioners, whose salaries the Bill proposed to increase. One of the Assistant Commissioners was said to be in ill-health, and the other employed himself in promoting what he called the military organization of the force, and the waste of time in carrying that idea into effect was equal to one-fifth of the power of the force. The Metropolitan Police, moreover, whilst it spread over far too large an area in the surrounding counties to be worked efficiently, had yet to maintain a costly rivalry with another force actually in its own midst. The Metropolitan Police and the City Police were bidding against each other for men, and this rivalry was equivalent to an additional charge on the metropolis of not less than £25,000 a year. Last year a Committee of that House reported that in their opinion there ought to be only one police force in the metropolis. If the Chief Commissioner would surrender his rural charge to the police of the rural districts, he would be much better able to perform his duties in the metropolis. It was not numbers that make a useful police force, but intelligence; and within the past year we had had painful experience of the insufficiency of the Metropolitan Police force in this respect. There had been a panic about the doings of certain Fenians; and what was the real foundation of the panic? It appeared that there were about a dozen drunken tailors who were engaged in emancipating Ireland from the dominion of England. All London was alarmed at the doings of these drunken tailors, and the Home Secretary swore in 25,000 special constables to protect the metropolis against them. The cause of the panic was that there had been no intelligent pursuit of the real criminals, when these men were guilty of certain acts of violence, and rumour was thus allowed to amplify their power. We had at that time 7,000 police, but they had not intelligence enough, when these men were about to commit a great crime, to prevent the commission of that crime, although they had previous information respecting it; and even after it was committed they only succeeded in securing the conviction of one of those engaged in it. No stronger proof could be given of the incapacity of the police of the metropolis. Before asserting that the numbers of the police were insufficient, the Secretary of State ought to have shown that crime had increased, and the cause of that increase. But he had given no such information. It was not easy for a private Member, without the assistance of a Committee, to inform the House on that subject, but he believed that within the last seven years there had been a great increase in the vagrant class, and a disproportionate increase in the number of persons committed for criminal offences to the Sessions; but the number of persons summarily convicted before the magistrates had hardly increased at all. It was quite necessary there should be a searching investigation into the causes of that increase of crime and of vagrancy before any steps were taken to increase the numbers of the police. The House was now asked, however, in a most hurried and inconsiderate manner, to impose a permanent charge on the metropolis, greater than had been found necessary before during thirty years. Latterly the increase in expense of the police had been greater, in proportion to its numbers, than ever it had been before. If the right hon. Gentleman had committed himself in regard to expenditure let him pass a Bill for a year; but the right hon. Gentleman was not entitled to ask the House to pass a Bill creating a permanent increased charge on the metropolis until there was authentic evidence before the House that means had been taken to re-organize the police in accordance with recommendations of Committees of that House. On these grounds he thought it his duty to move that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS seconded the Amendment. He cordially concurred in that portion of the speech of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in which

he had expressed regret at the proposed increase of the taxation of the metropolis. The proposal to increase the police force because the numbers were insufficient to protect the metropolis, and to give the necessary rest to the men, was a very different question from that involved in the Bill, which sought to impose a permanent tax on the metropolis. If the Secretary of State had so far committed himself as to make such a Bill necessary, it ought to be limited in its operation to one year. There was no kind of necessity for increasing the taxation of the metropolis by means of that Bill; because the rapid increase in the number of houses supplied an increase of rates that ought to be amply sufficient. There was no rate imposed upon the metropolis which the ratepayers so much objected to as the police rate, because they had no control over it, and did not know how it was applied. All they had to do with it was to pay it. Crime was continually committed at their very doors, but unless they offered a handsome reward, the police gave no assistance in discovering the perpetrators. They objected also to the absurdity of drilling the police as a military force, and believed that but for such drilling a smaller body of men would be required. The inefficiency of the police had been shown during the recent Fenian alarm. The present time, therefore, seemed most inopportune for increasing the emoluments of the Assistant Commissioners. Efforts had been made, but in vain, to obtain Returns of the police expenditure, such as were made by the Government offices of their disbursements. The rateable value of the Metropolitan Police area had largely increased, and it seemed incredable that the increased cost of the police should have absorbed the rates collected upon the augmented valuation. He held in his hands Returns of the increase in the rateable value of the metropolitan area between 1856 and 1868, which showed that that value had increased from £9,188,070 in the former year to £14,355,068 in the latter. At 8*d.* in the pound that increase would give to the police an addition of £134,556 between 1856 and 1868. In any case, the taxation sought to be imposed by this Bill was not yet necessary; for the county assessment as between 1847 and 1864 showed an increase in the police rates of £159,033, and if, therefore, the Government only waited until the county of Middlesex was re-assessed, as the county of Surrey had been re-assessed, they would obtain a great deal more money for the police than they wanted. But how would the ratepayers then get back the tax it was proposed to levy on them by this Bill ?

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Ayrton*).

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he believed that the failure in the prevention of the Clerkenwell explosion was due rather to mismanagement than to any inadequacy in the numbers of the police. What was wanted was organization, not increase in the force, and even if increase were required, it should not be made without full inquiry for the satisfaction of the ratepayers?

Viscount ENFIELD said, he regretted the tone in which the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) had spoken of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. He (Viscount Enfield) thought the greatest good faith had been displayed by the Secretary of State in dealing with the question under discussion, and he thanked him for the courtesy he invariably exhibited in connection with matters of metropolitan interest. Nothing was easier than to sneer, after the danger was past, at the alarm which had been excited by the Fenian outrages of last winter ; but he did not think the hon. Gentleman's constituents would approve of his remarks. The Secretary for the Home Department had, he believed, only done his duty in making an addition to the police force. He would point out that while in 1830 there were 3,274 men in the Metropolitan Police their duties extended only to ten miles round Charing Cross, and that the population which they had to protect amounted only to 1,500,000. In 1839 the area was extended to fifteen miles from Charing Cross, and at the present day a force of something under 8,000 men of all ranks had to protect a population of 3,400,000. But it should not be forgotten that out of those 8,000 men a considerable number were incapacitated for duty by illness and wounds, and that 1,200 were draughted off for special duty in connection with the palaces, museums, and other public buildings. In the City Police there was one man to two-and-a-half acres of district, and 284 in population. In the Metropolitan Police the proportion was one man to seventy or eighty acres of district, and 600 of population. He contended that the increase in the police force was necessary, but he felt some difficulty with regard to the expense, because the Metropolitan Police force were frequently sent to the country on duty, and the metropolitan ratepayers had to pay for them. He thought that the Imperial Treasury might fairly contribute one-half towards their expenses. When we employed men in the discharge of important duties, they were, he thought, fairly entitled to be paid, and if the right hon. Gentleman opposite would promise to institute a full inquiry next year into the entire organization of the police, he believed the public would be perfectly satisfied. Meantime he would give him his cordial support.

Mr. LOCKE said, he rose for the purpose of pointing out that this Bill was not a just and proper one, for it departed from the principle of the 4 & 5 *Will.* IV., in which Act it was laid down that the ratepayers of the metropolis were only to be required to pay 6*d.* in the pound police rate, and that whatever additional sum might be wanted was to be paid out of the Consolidated Fund. Why should an alteration be made, and a further sum be levied on the metropolis for police purposes ? Fenianism was a national evil, and why should the ratepayers of London be called upon to pay a larger sum for putting down Fenianism than the inhabitants of any other portion of the kingdom ? It was said in justification of this Bill that more police were required as the area was increased, but the increased area would return an increase of rates.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he saw no objection to the police having a holiday once in every seven days, but he thought the money required should not come out of the pockets of his constituents, but from the Consolidated Fund. The Act referred to by the hon. and learned Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke) fixed the police rate in the metropolis at 6*d.* in the pound, but the right hon. Gentleman asked the House to give more money. It was generally supposed that Sir Richard Mayne, of whom he wished to speak with the greatest respect, was only remaining in office for another year to entitle himself to a pension, and he thought it would be better to wait until they could make some permanent arrangement than to increase the salaries of the sub-Commissioners. He should vote against the second reading unless the right hon. Gentleman told them it would be referred to a Select Committee. He protested against the Bill going on without further inquiry.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, a statement had been made to the effect that the population of the City of London was only 112,000; but he wished to point out that there were daily in the City some 600,000 or 700,000 persons, who had to be protected or looked after by the police. He also remarked that nothing was contributed to the support of the City Police Fund out of the Consolidated Fund.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said, he thought it would require a good deal more than had been stated by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) to induce the House to reject the Bill. The measure was only to provide for the additional charge rendered necessary by an increase in the number of police which everybody admitted to be necessary. It was no fault of the Government that the Bill was brought on at so late a period of the Session; and as to having a Select Committee to inquire into the police system, no necessity for it had been proved. The hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets had not stated any facts to warrant the rejection of the Bill, nor was there in his (Sir James Fergusson's) opinion any ground for the attack which had been made upon Sir Richard Mayne. The police force called forth the admiration of the whole country, and much credit was due to the Commissioners for their efficiency. As to drill, the men were only drilled one hour a week, and that only during the summer months; and, as to the increase of the vagrant class, surely if there were such an increase the number of the police should also be increased.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he hoped the House would not take upon itself the responsibility of rejecting this Bill. An increase of the police force had become necessary, not on account of Fenian outrages, but on account of the enormous increase of the metropolis, and for the protection of life and property, and the question rather was out of what fund they should be paid. The new regulation under which a holiday of one day in the week would be given to the force had met with general approval. It would doubtless conduce to the efficiency of the force, and would induce better men to enter it; but its operation was to require a certain increase of the number of police. The Treasury only paid the same proportion of the expenses of the Metropolitan Police as of the County Police. It was said the Government ought to pay more because of the special services rendered to Government property, but these services were paid every year by a special Vote for the police in the Estimates, which amounted to between £50,000 and £60,000. Something had been said about their military organization, but their training was not carried to any excess. If large bodies were to act together it was necessary they should have some organization, and it was impossible to have this unless they received some training and drilling. If a Committee sat in reference to the police system, he believed it would be the means of removing much apprehension, and of showing how efficient the force was.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 192; Noes 22: Majority 170.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday*.

PORTPATRICK AND BELFAST AND COUNTY DOWN RAILWAY COMPANIES BILL.

Resolution *reported*;

"To authorize Loans of Public Money to the Portpatrick and the Belfast and County Down Railway Companies, and a payment to the Portpatrick Company in consequence of the Abandonment of the communication between Donaghadee and Portpatrick."

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DODSON, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 201.]

LIBEL (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN, Bill to assimilate the Law in Ireland to the Law in England as to Costs in Actions of Libel, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN and Mr. PIM.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 199.]

TURNPIKE TRUSTS ARRANGEMENTS BILL.

On Motion of Sir JAMES FERGUSSON, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made under an Act of the fifteenth year of the reign of Her present Majesty, to facilitate arrangements for the relief of Turnpike Trusts, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir JAMES FERGUSSON and Mr. Secretary GATHORNE HARDY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 200.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, June 30, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Courts of Law Fees, &c. (Scotland)* (189); County General Assessment (Scotland)* (190).

Second Reading — Vagrant Act Amendment* (138); Liquidation (181); Judgments Extension (160); Representation of the People (Ireland) (176).

Committee—Representation of the People (Scotland) (164-192); Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* (158); Inclosure (No. 2)* (61); Local Government Supplemental (No. 4)* (165); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* (166).

Report — Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* (158); Inclosure (No. 2)* (61); Local Government Supplemental (No. 4)* (165); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* (166).

LONDON, BRIGHTON, AND SOUTH COAST RAILWAY BILL.

THIRD READING.

Bill read 3^{a}, with the Amendments.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE moved to leave out Clause 26, which empowered the Directors to raise the maximum rates of fares for passengers. The noble Marquess said he was no advocate for extremely low fares on railways; on the contrary, he admitted that they must be fixed at remunerative rates. But when a railway company had undertaken, with the sanction of Parliament, to make and maintain a railway at certain fares, an application by that company to raise the fares, which they themselves then fixed as sufficient, ought not to be acceded to without careful and close inquiry, in order to ascertain whether the demand had not its origin in mere reckless and extravagant management; and, above all, such a case as this ought not to be drawn into a precedent. Now, as far as he could discover, for the last twenty years this Bill had no precedent. And what were the grounds stated for the increase of fares? Only one such ground appeared on the face of the Bill. There might be other grounds, and he was sure the Committee had considered them well; but the Preamble only mentioned one.

> "Whereas," [it said,] "since the passing of the Act"—[meaning the Act of 1863]—"circumstances have become materially altered, and the Company have been involved in a large expenditure, and it is expedient that the Company be authorized to increase to a small extent the tolls and charges for passengers limited by that Act."

But then the question arose how this expenditure had been incurred, and what was the position of the Company. If this expenditure had been incurred not through any reckless extravagance on the part of the Directors, but legitimately for the purposes of the railway and the service of the public, and if the railway had been discreetly managed without blame to the Directors, then a *primâ facie* case was made out for an increased tariff. Their Lordships would see how this was. Up to 1863 the tolls on the London and Brighton line were higher than were fixed by this Bill; but in that year a competing scheme was proposed for the construction of a line called, he believed, the Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton line. The Directors, in consequence, voluntarily offered to reduce their fares, and did so; and the competing line did not pass. Was this reduction of fares conditional? No; it was absolute. Beckenham line or no Beckenham line, it was to be made. To show that, he would quote the evidence given by Mr. Slight, late Secretary of the Company, before the Committee of the House of Commons, to which the Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton Bill was referred in the Session of 1863. The report of the examination was as follows:—

> "Mr. Round: Is there a resolution about reducing the rates?—I have the full authority of the Board in this matter to act in this Committee Room.
>
> "By the Committee: Have you any authority to communicate to this Committee any decision of the Board with regard to the future, or any pledge to give on their part as to the future?—Yes, I think I may say I have. Not in the form of a resolution of the Board?—Of course, if that question is put to me I am bound to say ——, but I am speaking in the presence of three Directors, and there is no doubt about the fact.
>
> "Mr. Hope Scott: You are speaking in the presence of three Directors, and you are aware that what you say will be taken down?—Yes, certainly. You are aware, also, that being taken down it may at any time be quoted against the Brighton Company?—Yes, and quoted against me. Now, under that responsibility, will you say to the Committee what you are prepared and consider yourself authorized by the Board to state to the Committee as to the rates?—I think the question which was put to me was whether I was authorized to pledge the Board and the Company not to increase the present adopted schedule of rates? I have full authority from the Board to give that pledge in the name of the Company."

By these representations, then, the Company succeeded in their opposition to the Bill, and the reduced rate of fares was retained up to the present time. In 1866 a competing line was again proposed, but it was ultimately given up, and the Brighton Company retained their monopoly. The inhabitants of Brighton were therefore still dependent upon one line, and they depended upon the Parliamentary pledge and engagement entered into by the Company. To get rid of the Beckenham, Lewes, and Brighton line the Company were ready to adhere to their reduced rates; but now, having a perfect monopoly and having no dread of competition, the Company asked Parliament to enable them to raise their fares and to make the burdens on the customers of the railway greater than they had ever been before. Looking at the broad facts, he thought their Lordships would pause before they passed the Bill in its present shape. How many railways of the country could adopt the language of the Preamble of this Bill? Or, rather, how many were there that were not in a position to adopt it? How many were there that had not been involved in expenditure that had not been profitable, either to themselves or the public? If this Bill were passed, in the absence of any special circumstance to justify it, other companies would be putting in a similar claim, to the great disturbance of the commerce of the country and to the great increase of the tax which locomotion imposed upon it. The general receipts of railways had not increased as they ought to have done; and he was afraid that that indicated a comparative diminution of the trade of the country, upon which the cost of locomotion was really an inland duty. He believed that the gross amount paid by the public to the railway companies was not less than £38,000,000 annually. He warned the House to pause before making a precedent which might be injurious to the country.

Moved, "To leave out Clause 26."—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

Lord CAMOYS said, that, as Chairman of the Select Committee, he was quite prepared to defend the decision it arrived at, and suggested that if the House did not approve that decision, the proper course was to refer the Bill back to that Select Committee. He denied that any pledge had been given by the Company which ought to preclude it for ever from raising its tolls. It should be remembered that the proposed scale of fares was lower than the scale which was authorized from 1846 to 1863. During that period the first-class express, second-class express, first-class ordinary, second-class ordinary, and third-class rates of fares were respectively as follows:—3*d.*, 3*d.*, 2 2-5*d.*, 1 4-5*d.*, and 1 1-5*d.* per mile; in 1863 the rates were 2½*d.*, 2*d.*, 2*d.*, 1½*d.*, and 1*d.*; and the scale proposed in the Bill was 2¾*d.*, 2¼*d.*, 2¼*d.*, 1¾*d.*, and 1*d.* This scale gave a small increase of ¼*d.* per mile for first and second-class passengers—there being no alteration as regards third-class passengers—beyond the amount which, by an Act of 1863, the Company were authorized to take. The scale authorized by the Act of 1863 was a considerable reduction on the scale which the Company were then, and from the time of the passing of their Act of incorporation of 1846, authorized to take, and it was a reduction which the Company volunteered as a concession to induce Parliament not to sanction a competing line to Brighton. But in a subsequent Session (1866), Parliament did sanction the competing line, after the Company had been put to an enormous expense, in the vain attempt to uphold the decision of 1863. It was, therefore, submitted by the Company that if the adoption of the tolls of 1863 could originally have been considered as a contract between the Company and Parliament, the contract was put an end to by the action of Parliament. The Company were in 1863 supposed to be in a much better financial condition than, in fact, they were, as subsequent investigation had shown; and they had since laid out very large sums of capital in station and other accommodation on the main line for the benefit of the public, upon which they did not get any adequate return;—and indeed the net income for the last year (1867) proved to be insufficient by upwards of £100,000 to pay preference charges. It was manifestly for the interest of the public that railways should be efficiently maintained, and it was impossible to secure that object unless a reasonable sum was received in the shape of tolls. The Company were not asking Parliament to restore the full amount of tolls authorized before 1863; they asked only an increase equal to about half of that reduction, and this only on the first and second-class passengers. They asked no alteration at all as regards third-class passengers, or animals or goods. The promoters submitted that the scale proposed was a very moderate scale, and below the ordinary standard. It was much lower than the authorized maximum charges of the

South-Western, South-Eastern, Chatham, and other adjoining railways in the South of England, and lower than the actual average charges of the eight principal railways having termini in the metropolis. The promoters further said—

> "The reduction of 1863 proves to be more than the undertaking can bear—the resumption of half the amount of that reduction is essential to secure the preference shareholders' interest—and the Company submit that, under the circumstances, they may fairly ask that they shall not be held bound to the full amount of a concession rashly made by their then Directors in 1863, when the shareholders were not aware of the actual position of the Company. The Committee to whom your Lordships referred the Bill gave the subject of tolls very patient, full, and careful attention, and, having heard all that could be adduced on both sides, they decided in favour of the tolls proposed in the Bill."

For these reasons he supported the clause.

Earl FORTESCUE said, he had no interest except that of the public interest in the question before the House. He ventured to submit that this was just one of those great questions of principle which it was desirable the House should decide for itself instead of delegating the responsibility to five of its Members, who, however able they might be, would be destitute of the advantage of being guided by principles laid down by the House itself. At present the question at issue was whether railway companies should be empowered to levy what taxes they pleased on personal locomotion and the movement of goods; or, in other words, whether Parliament should practically hand over to those companies the power of levying import and export duties on the trade, manufactures, and commerce of the country. Railways were practically, and ought to be economically monopolies, well restricted and guarded by Parliamentary provisions enforcing adequate service and restraining them from undue charges. But if it were sanctioned in any one instance that a company was to break through these restraints, and obtain the power to raise their charges a crowd of companies would ask the Legislature for increased powers of taxing our trade and commerce. In the present case there were three Companies which proposed to amalgamate, and all of which had become notorious for extorting high fares from the public. They all had precisely the same object in view; and under the circumstances was it likely that any private individual would deem it worth his while to incur the enormous expense attendant on employing counsel and bringing witnesses before the Committee to oppose the Bill? It was obvious that the Companies possessed an immense advantage over private individuals; and it was, therefore, the duty of that and of the other House of Parliament to lay down general principles instead of throwing so great a responsibility upon a Committee which had before it two sets of counsel, both of whom were interested in recommending the plunder of the public. It was to Parliament itself and not to Select Committees appointed by either House that the public must look for protection against what might become a regular system of increased fares for passengers and increased charges for goods all over the kingdom.

Lord VERNON, as a member of the Committee appointed to examine this Bill, could not for a moment call in question the propriety of submitting it to a thorough examination, without which it could not be framed on definite principles; and he thought their Lordships must feel obliged to the noble Marquess for having brought the subject forward. Although he had had only a brief experience of the business of their Lordships' House he had already come to the conclusion that the whole system of railway legislation was very vague and uncertain, and that the more general principles were adhered to the more simple and less costly would be the working of the system. There was ample proof, however, submitted to the Committee that the fares on the Brighton line were not sufficient to earn a fair dividend. When the line was opened in 1841 the ordinary first-class fare from London to Brighton was 15*s.*, and the second-class 11*s.* In July, 1867, however, they were reduced to 8*s.* 10*d.* and 6*s.* 8*d.* respectively. Therefore, although a slight increase was now proposed, the fares would be nothing like so high as those charged when the railway was first opened. In conclusion, he expressed his belief that the circumstances would fully justify their Lordships in passing the Bill.

The Duke of RICHMOND said, he could not assent to the proposal of the noble Marquess. The speech of the noble Earl opposite (Earl Fortescue) had reference to the whole system of private legislation, but did not contain a single argument tending to show that this particular Committee had arrived at a conclusion contrary to the evidence brought before it. For his own part he differed entirely from the noble Earl, being of opinion that a question of this kind ought to be sifted by a Select Committee, which had the assistance of the counsel on either side and an opportunity of examining witnesses. Indeed, everybody who had paid attention to the Private Bill legislation of this House must be aware that a Bill could not be submitted to a more searching tribunal than a Select Committee. The noble Earl was somewhat in error as to what took place before the Select Committee in 1863. There was no direct assertion made that the fares were reduced in consequence of the opposition scheme of the London, Lewes, and Beckenham railway; but it was notorious that during the progress of that Committee the Brighton Company practically said, "If you think our fares are too high we are willing to reduce them." The result was that the London, Lewes, and Beckenham scheme being thrown out, the Brighton Company had no line to compete with them. In 1866, however, the London, Lewes, and Beckenham Bill was passed. The London, Lewes, and Beckenham line was passed in 1866 as against the London and Brighton Company; but it had never been proceeded with, because the affairs of all the companies had got into so very disastrous a state. The increase of tolls now sanctioned by the Committee did not bring them up to what the Company were entitled to charge in 1863. The total of that increase amounted to only ¼*d.* a mile for first and second-class passengers. There was no increase on the third-class passengers, nor was that injustice done to the agricultural interests which seemed to weigh so much on the noble Marquess. The Committee had displayed great industry. It had brought before it a very large scheme, a part of which would have entitled a company to charge any toll without being bound by any maximum. He had no doubt that the Committee was an able one, and that it had very fully considered the whole subject. He thought, therefore, it would be unwise in their Lordships to do anything which might lead the public to suppose that the Committee had not the confidence of their Lordships' House. In consequence of a decision to which the Committee had come, the Amalgamation Bill, to which so much objection had been taken in their Lordships' House, had not been pressed. Believing that the small increase sanctioned by the Committee was necessary in order to enable the Company to carry on their affairs with advantage to themselves and the public, he hoped their Lordships would not agree to the Motion of the noble Marquess.

Lord REDESDALE regretted the views of the noble Duke. Railway fares, once fixed, should not be increased; and, if the proposed alteration was made in this case, there would soon be a flood of similar applications from the other railway companies of the country. This was a question of principle, in which the House had a right to interfere, and he should certainly support the proposition of the noble Marquess. With regard to the Brighton Company having reduced their fares under fear of competition, they were now in precisely the same position, and held just the same monopoly of the traffic as when they agreed to the reduction, for the London, Lewes, and Beckenham line had fallen through, and was never likely to be revived.

Lord TAUNTON concurred with his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees. He protested against the proposition that railway companies, after giving solemn pledges to Parliament, and obtaining powers and privileges on the strength of those pledges, being allowed afterwards to throw their engagements to the winds. From his former experience in "another place," he could say that it was the practice of the House of Commons to keep railway companies to their pledges. If a company violated any pledge it had given to a Committee of the House of Commons, when it came before that House again, the Board of Trade appeared against it, no matter how unobjectionable the scheme in hand might be—and represented that, as it had broken its promise, it had no right to come again before the House of Commons. That mode of proceeding had made companies very careful of giving pledges which they did not intend to keep. Knowing the ability of his noble Friend the Chairman of the Select Committee (Lord Camoys), in this case he should have voted for upholding its decision, if his noble Friend had not stated the reasons for that decision. His noble Friend said the Committee had been guided by the consideration, whether the increase of toll was not necessary, in order to enable the company to pay its way. He objected to holding out facilities to companies to levy from the public money which they had squandered. He could not concur with the noble Duke the President of the Board of Trade in thinking that the proposed increase of tolls would not have an injurious effect on the trade of the district. But then he could not certainly approve of the course taken by his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees, whose duty it was to preserve an attitude of strict impartiality. On the whole, if the Motion was pressed to a division, he should be obliged to vote with the noble Marquess.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY thought their Lordships would not act wisely in tying up the companies too tightly in the matter of fares, as the companies would be driven to protect themselves by diminishing the accommodation, and so force passengers to pay the higher rate of fares. He trusted their Lordships would not refuse their sanction to the decision of the Committee, as such a proceeding would be calculated to increase the difficulties already felt by Committees, and cause questions of this description to be withdrawn from the legitimate tribunals and bandied about and discussed among the Members of the House.

EARL GREY said, he never wished to over-rule the decision of a Committee upon matters turning on considerations of detail; but it was the positive duty of the House to see that questions of principle received due consideration. It was perfectly clear from what had been said in the course of this discussion that the importance of maintaining the implied contract between the companies and the public had not been duly considered. There were numbers of persons, clerks and others, who had fixed their residences along particular lines of railway on the faith of what they considered the scale of fares established by the companies. An increase of the travelling charges would be practically an increase of rent in the case of these persons, and would be manifestly unjust to the public. There could be no doubt whatever that the Brighton Company possessed exclusive control of their own district; and had the amount of capital expended by them in the construction of their railway been only proportioned to the requirements of the district and the actual cost of the line, they would now be dividing a handsome dividend. It was contrary to all sound policy to sanction an increase of fares under circumstances like the present, merely to earn a dividend upon the preference shares.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he had come to the House not knowing how he should vote upon the Question, and determined to give the benefit of any doubt to the Committee, who had carefully examined the subject, and that disposition certainly was strengthened by the declarations which he had heard as to the intentions of the Government. To rid themselves of competition the Company promised to lower their fares: the bargain was struck, and low fares were tried; but now the question arose whether the fares were remunerative or not. The Committee having gone into the question and decided that the fares were not sufficient to support the railway in a proper condition, he was inclined to side with the Committee.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND thought it would be unwise to reverse the decision of the Committee; but, at the same time, felt it most impolitic to allow railway companies to break solemn promises.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said, the case resolved itself into this—that as long as the Company feared competition it was prepared to lower its fares, and as soon as it had secured a monopoly it asked for powers to levy increased rates from the public. He would not, however, persist in his opposition to the clause.

On Question, *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

On Question, That the Bill do pass,

LORD REDESDALE felt bound to protest against the principle of allowing a Company to raise its fares. Up to this time he had always resisted any demand for such an increase; now, however, the demand had been granted in opposition to him, and he asked,—What am I to do next year? Parties will come asking for an increase of fares, the decision of the House will be quoted against me, and my hands will be tied.

Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 164.)

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

COMMITTEE.

THE EARL OF AIRLIE: I do not desire to oppose or delay the progress of this Bill; but it seems to me, I must say, that we are not in a condition to-night to consider the Amendments which were printed only this morning. I ask any of your Lordships to look at these Amendments. They are so numerous that I have not counted them; but I think, at a rough computation, there are about fifty. One of these Amendments contains a proposal of a most important character. It refers to the representation of the great city of Glasgow, and the intent of the Amendment is no less than this—to extend the Parliamentary boundaries of Glasgow, so as to include within its limits a population, as I am informed, of 62,000 persons who are not now within them. Now, my Lords, this is not the first time the question has been mooted. When the Bill came originally into the other House it proposed to extend the Parliamentary limits of Glasgow. A division took place in the Committee, and the Government were defeated; and now, after this decision of the House of Commons, leaving the boundaries of Glasgow as they are, the Bill having come up to your Lordships' House it is proposed not merely to reverse the decision of the other House, but it is proposed by this Amendment to include a very much larger population than the original draft of the Bill proposed to include. I hold in my hand a petition of the inhabitants of those burghs it is proposed to annex against the Amendment; but I do not want to go into the merits of the case now, for it is merely on the ground of time that I object to going into Committee; and I therefore propose that the Committee be postponed till Monday next.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: I quite agree with the noble Earl that, owing to circumstances over which I had no control, these Papers have been laid upon your Lordships' table later than was intended, and certainly without giving your Lordships time to consider the Amendments. The fact is that the Amendments were sent to be printed on Friday night; but from some cause or other, which I have not ascertained, they have taken longer than usual to print. So far, however, was it from my wish to surprise your Lordships in any way, that I informed my noble Friend who manages the arrangements on the opposite side (the Earl of Bessborough) of the intention of the Government to renew this question, in order that he might communicate with his Friends on the subject. This particular clause is, however, the only one upon which the Amendment is of any importance. The others are merely verbal Amendments, and I shall recommend your Lordships to go into Committee and to proceed with the Bill in Committee; and then on the Report let it be understood that we shall fully discuss this question of the boundaries of Glasgow. I do not think the Government can consent to put it off so long as the noble Earl asks us to do. We have a great deal of Business before the House; and I think if we put it off till Friday, we shall by that time have had sufficient time to obtain all the information we may require. That, I think, will be the most convenient way for your Lordships to proceed.

THE EARL OF AIRLIE said, he had no objection to the course proposed by the noble Earl; but he wished it to be understood that this Bill would be taken the first thing on Friday night.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: Do I understand that the Bill is to be taken in Committee to-night, and the merely verbal Amendments agreed to, and that the Bill will be re-printed with these Amendments and reported to the House on Friday? This question of the boundaries of Glasgow is of considerable importance; and I hope, therefore, that it will be made the first Order of the Day.

House in Committee (according to Order.)

Clauses 1 to 26 *agreed to*, with verbal Amendments.

Clause 27 (Qualifications for Members of General Councils).

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL said, he thought the words of the clause were very wide and liberal, but they omitted all mention of a new degree which a good many students were now beginning to take—he meant the degree of Bachelor of Science. He thought that those who had taken that degree should not be excluded from the franchise, and he would therefore move an Amendment supplying the omission. There was also another matter in this clause to which he wished to refer. Until four or five years ago there were two Universities at Aberdeen—that was to say, the two Colleges were both Universities, and both granted degrees. Now, however, they were united into one University, and had only one body which conferred degrees. It would be obviously wrong that those who had taken degrees from the two Colleges before they were united should be excluded from the franchise, but the wording of the clause would have that effect. He would therefore move words supplying the omission.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that as to the noble Duke's second Amendment there could be no objection, but it was possible that some might arise with respect to the first. He thought, therefore, that the noble Duke had better give Notice, and postpone the Amendments until the Report was brought up.

The Duke of ARGYLL assented.

The LORD CHANCELLOR proposed to add the following proviso:—

"Provided always that no graduate of any University shall be disqualified from being a member of the General Council of such University by reason of his being enrolled as a student in any class of the University."

Proviso *agreed to,* added to the Clause.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 42 (Certain Boroughs in England to cease to return Members).

Lord LYVEDEN said, that on bringing up the Report he should call attention to the proposed disfranchisement of seven English boroughs in a Bill relating to the representation of Scotland, and should propose that, at least, some notice of this fact should be taken in the Preamble. This was one of the edicts of the other House, which their Lordships would be obliged to register now, though they refused to adopt a proposal of his to the same effect last year.

Lord DENMAN said, the disfranchisement of these boroughs to give Members to Scotland was a departure from the principle asserted by the Government that no place should be wholly disfranchised. Mr. Wilkes, who had not been sufficiently acknowledged as the originator of Reform in 1776, had condemned the departure from the proportion of forty-five Members granted to Scotland by the 22nd Article of the Union. Since then, in 1832, eight new Members had been added, and now seven Members were to be taken from England and given to Scotland. He should have thought that on the probable discovery that the representation of minorities, which was only an experiment, did not answer, that fresh seats might hereafter have been found without depriving the small boroughs of their rights; at the same time, he considered that the temptations to bribery in very small places with enlarged constituencies were so very strong that they might soon forfeit their right of having representatives. He could not but remark on the inconvenience pointed out by the noble Viscount the Chairman of the Boundary Commission of the mixed constituencies of the four boroughs — Shoreham, Cricklade, Aylesbury, and East Retford—in which county voters voted with a borough franchise; and as it was observed that very few of the new voters had been in time to be placed on the register, it might be proper even now to deprive each of those boroughs of a Member, and thus part of the required number of seven would be filled up. As time went on, the working of the Bill would be watched, and it might be considered as settled that bribery in small boroughs would be followed by total disfranchisement, which would afford vacancies for further representation.

Clause 48 (Corrupt Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery).

The Duke of ARGYLL said, he did not wish their Lordships to pass a definition of a house which would exclude from the franchise persons resident in boroughs where there were no rates.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he believed there were only two boroughs in that position, and he suggested that the matter should be allowed to stand over until the Report.

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received on *Friday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 192.)

LIQUIDATION BILL—(No. 181.)

(*The Lord Westbury.*)

SECOND READING.

Lord WESTBURY, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, explained that of one its principal objects was to enable liquidators and assignees to apply securities to the redemption of claims of creditors without taking them into the market, and thereby reducing their value until they had to be sold at low, and, perhaps, nominal prices. The distribution was to be made under a scheme prepared by the liquidators, and sanctioned by the Court of Chancery. Another portion of the Bill related to creditors holding securities by way of mortgage or pledge, and provided for the realization of property so held. The Bill would only apply to companies now in the course of liquidation.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Westbury.*)

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, the cases to which this Bill applied were of a very exceptional and peculiar kind, and he believed his noble and learned Friend was correct in stating that it would be utterly impossible to conduct and finally execute the winding-up of such cases without the aid of some exceptional power unknown to the Common Law and inapplicable to ordinary cases. As the Bill was to be confined to the peculiar cases referred to, it ought, in his opinion, to receive their Lordships' assent.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

JUDGMENTS EXTENSION BILL.

(*The Lord Chelmsford.*)

(NO. 160.) SECOND READING.

LORD CHELMSFORD, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that the object of the measure, which was to render the judgments or decrees of certain Courts in England, Scotland, and Ireland effectual in all parts of the United Kingdom. At present, if a creditor recovered a judgment in one part of the United Kingdom, and the debtor withdrew to another part, the judgment could not be made effectual; but the creditor was compelled, if he wished to follow his debtor, to commence a fresh action, and obtain another judgment in that part of the kingdom to which the debtor had retired. Prior to the year 1857, several Bills were introduced into the other House to alter this unsatisfactory state of things; but all those measures were rejected in consequence of a fear prevalent among the Irish Members that the jurisdiction of the Irish Courts would be unduly interfered with. No change had been attempted since 1857 until the present Session, when the present Bill was brought into the House of Commons, and referred to a Select Committee, among the Members of which were the late and the present Attorney General for Ireland, and the late and the present Lord Advocate. Ultimately, it passed the lower House without any division at all.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª." (*Lord Chelmsford.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he saw no objection to the measure, which would really tend to consolidate the three different portions of the kingdom by making a judgment obtained in one enforcible into the other two.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

The Lord Chancellor

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 176.)

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

SECOND READING.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, I believe your Lordships will not expect that I shall now enter into any lengthened explanation of its provisions. I need only remind your Lordships that in the year 1850 Parliament had made great progress in the reform of the Irish representation, while no corresponding measure has been passed until last Session for this country. The Bill will therefore make very little alteration in the Irish franchise. It will leave the county franchise unchanged at its present amount of £12, and it will lower the borough franchise from £8 to £4. This arrangement will practically give household suffrage to all who pay rates in boroughs in Ireland—for in Ireland those persons whose houses are worth less than £4 are not liable to the payment of the rate, which is paid by the lessor. The provisions with respect to the county franchise and the borough franchise are the two main points in the measure. I propose that your Lordships should go into Committee on the Bill on Monday next.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

EARL GRANVILLE said, he thought the noble Earl might have given them some further explanations with respect to the Bill, and more particularly in reference to their abandonment of that doctrine on the subject of the "hard and fast line" on which they had insisted in dealing with the subject of Reform in this country. But their Lordships might enter into the general subject, if they should think proper, on the Motion for going into Committee on Monday next.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter past
Eight o'clock, to Thursday next,
half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, June 30, 1868.

MINUTES.]— Public Bills — *Resolutions reported*—Inland Revenue Acts.

Ordered—Fairs (Metropolis); Inland Revenue.

First Reading—Fairs (Metropolis)* [205].

Second Reading—Military at Elections (Ireland) [95], *negatived;* Municipal Corporations (Metropolis) [105], *negatived;* Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit* [184]; Libel (Ireland)* [199]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangement* [200]; Colonial Governors' Pensions Act Amendment* [202].

Committee — Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal [76]; Larceny and Embezzlement [157] — R.P.; Assignees of Marine Policies [147]; Burials (Ireland)* [5]; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances* [177]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2)* [195]; Medway Regulation Act Continuance* [196]; Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts Amendment (*re-comm.*)* [197]; Bankruptcy Act (1861) Amendment [145].

Report—Revenue Officers' Disabilities Removal [76]; Assignees of Marine Policies [147-203]; Burials (Ireland)* [5-204]; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances* [177]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2)* [195]; Medway Regulation Act Continuance* [196]; Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts Amendment (*re-comm.*)* [197]; Bankruptcy Act (1861) Amendment [145].

Considered as amended — University Elections (Voting Papers)* [187]; Bank of Bombay* [178].

Third Reading — Curragh of Kildare* [192]; New Zealand (Legislative Council)* [185]; Consular Marriages* [188]; Bank Holidays and Bills of Exchange* [180], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Landed Property Improvement (Ireland)* [32].

COMMITTALS (SCOTLAND).

QUESTION.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he wished to ask the Lord Advocate, Whether his attention has been directed to a Return made to this House dated 18th May 1868, No. 279, showing the number of Committals in Scotland for 1866-7, by which it appears that in sixteen cases 200 days and over, in sixty-six cases 150 days and over, and in 176 cases 100 days and over elapsed between the committal and the trial of prisoners; and, whether it is his intention to take any steps to insure the shortening of such serious delay in the administration of justice?

The LORD ADVOCATE said, in reply, that the sixteen cases mentioned in the Question, in which the prisoners had been detained for 200 days and upwards were very special cases. In some of them the prisoners were insane, in others unwell, and in others the cases were attended with peculiar difficulty. But no innocent person had suffered, and all the prisoners were convicted, except one, who was found to have been insane. With reference to the other class of cases included in the Question, he might explain that the Assize or Circuit Courts were held in Scotland, in the provinces, once in six months, except in Glasgow, where there was also a winter assize. Of course there must be detention to await the circuit; but Scotland was not in a different position from England in that respect. Further, the course of proceeding was just what it had always been. In serious cases the trials occasionally were removed to Edinburgh; but it would cause very great expense to the country, great inconvenience to witnesses, and also occupy the time of the Court more than was desirable, if all trials for criminal cases were held in Edinburgh. There was, however, a proceeding under the Scotch law by which it was competent for a prisoner who was detained to force on his trial if he was unwilling to wait for the circuit, so that not only in bailable offences could he get out of prison on finding security, but in the case of offences that were not bailable he might take proceedings to force on his trial. As to the concluding part of the Question of the hon. Baronet, provisions were contained in the Justiciary Court Bill now before the House—and which he hoped would be passed this Session—that would greatly facilitate the trial of prisoners who pleaded guilty to the charges brought against them.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER asked, Whether the insane prisoners were insane when first imprisoned?

The LORD ADVOCATE said, some of the prisoners were insane previous to apprehension, and others became insane afterwards. Persons who committed such crimes were often not in the most sane state of mind.

LOSS OF THE "GARONNE."

QUESTION.

Admiral ERSKINE said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade (with reference to an inquiry lately held at Penzance into the loss of the steamer *Garonne*), Whether the Report of the inquiry published in the

Western Times, wherein it is stated that Mr. O'Dowd, Solicitor of the Board of Customs, said in his speech, "The boats were got out, and he would be able to show that the men who were saved brought with them bags full of clothes" is true; and whether the fact so stated by Mr. O'Dowd has not been proved by the evidence to have occurred, whilst the passengers, including several women and children were left to perish; and, if he will lay Copy of the Evidence and Report upon the Table of the House?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE said, in reply, that Mr. O'Dowd was in Ireland; but that a telegram from him had been received that afternoon stating that the report of his speech referred to by the hon. and gallant Admiral was accurate, and it certainly appeared from the evidence that some of the sailors who were saved had bags of clothes with them. Very little effort seemed to have been made to save the passengers. There appeared to have been a total absence of order and discipline, owing, no doubt, to a want of firmness and presence of mind in the master and chief officer, who, it was only fair to say, were also regardless of their own safety, and went down with the vessel. The Report and main part of the evidence, which were somewhat voluminous, had been published in the *Western Times*. If the hon. and gallant Admiral wished to move for those documents there would be no objection to produce them.

METROPOLIS—HYDE PARK—RIDE IN ROTTEN ROW.—QUESTION.

Mr. COWPER said, that as steps were being taken for intersecting the western portion of Rotten Row by a carriage road, and apprehending that that intersection might increase the inconvenience already existing from the crowding of that part of Rotten Row where persons had been accustomed to ride, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether there will be any extension of or addition to the Ride in Rotten Row to compensate for the interference with the Ride, occasioned by the carriage road now being made across Rotten Row near Kensington Gardens?

Lord JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, the Government did not contemplate this year making any addition to Rotten Row in consequence of the road that would shortly be made across it in the direction mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman. But, undoubtedly, next year, on the north side of the Albert Memorial it would be necessary to make considerable alterations and improvements in connection with that Memorial. Then, at the western portion of Rotten Row, which was now very inconvenient and narrow, it would be requisite to take steps to compensate for the part of the Ride that would be taken for the road.

Mr. CHILDERS wished to ask, Whether that would be in addition to the £6,000 taken this year?

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, that the £6,000 taken this year would be absorbed by the new roads and lodges to the south and east of the Memorial.

OVERLOADING OF MERCHANT SHIPS.

QUESTION.

Mr. WEGUELIN said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, Whether any regulations have been promulgated by the Board of Trade to prevent the overloading of Merchant Ships?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE said, in reply, that no such regulations had been issued by the Board of Trade, who had in fact no power to issue any. It had, however, been proposed to insert a clause in the Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill with the view of enabling a seaman to obtain a speedy survey of a ship in which he refused to sail on the ground of overloading, or other cause. It had also been suggested, and the suggestion seemed reasonable, that in order to facilitate the obtaining by underwriters of evidence of overloading, the draught of water should be painted in legible figures on the stem and stern of every vessel, and that the officers of the dock or Custom House should take note of the depth she drew as she proceeded to sea. It was impossible to lay down rules on that subject which should apply to all vessels, and it might be questioned whether they did not, even now, err in such matters on the side of over legislation, which must tend to diminish unduly the responsibility of the shipowner.

PRISON MINISTERS ACT.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. MAGUIRE said, the interests affected by his Motion were graver than might appear at first sight. Some years since the state of things in the prisons of

England and Wales with respect to the spiritual instruction of Roman Catholic prisoners was so unsatisfactory that the Government introduced and carried what was commonly known as a permissive Bill—namely, the Prison Ministers Act. That measure made legal what was not legal before, and gave ample power to magistrates to provide spiritual instruction for the prisoners under their care. Speakers in that House, and on the platform, as well as writers in the public Press, frequently quoted certain statistics as to the number of Roman Catholic prisoners in the larger towns of England, and sought to trace a connection between those statistics and the teaching of his Church. Now, his answer to that was, that the authorities of the gaols of those towns—or those, rather, who had control over them—were mainly responsible for the consequences which were thus attributed to the doctrine and teaching of his Church. At present there was by law in Ireland a Protestant and a Roman Catholic chaplain for every prison—a system which had been attended with the most beneficial results. In passing the Prison Ministers Act for England and Wales the Legislature expected that the magistrates or other prison authorities would take advantage of the measure and put its provisions into operation; but his complaint was that they had failed to do so to any considerable extent; and thus a great wrong was inflicted, not only on the most helpless, and probably the most degraded class of the community, but also upon society at large, and especially upon the ratepayers. In England and Wales there were 119 gaols in which Protestant chaplains were engaged, the aggregate of their salaries being £20,133; while Catholic chaplains were only engaged in fifteen of these, and the whole amount paid to them was £1,255. It was a fact, further, that in addition to the £20,133 paid to Protestant chaplains there were additional sums paid to assistants and Scripture readers, bringing up the total to nearly, if not quite, £30,000. In London, which, as the capital, gave the tone to the rest of the nation, there were on the 2nd of April this year 649 Roman Catholic prisoners in five gaols; and the Protestant clergymen attending those gaols were paid over £2,000 for their services in connection with them, besides the £500 or £600 which he had no doubt their assistants received. But, while the Protestant clergy were thus remunerated for the spiritual instruction which they afforded to their co-religionists, not a single farthing was given for the instruction of the Roman Catholic prisoners. In the prison of Coldbath Fields application had been made that, on Easter Sunday, opportunity might be given for the celebration of the greatest solemnity of their Church; but a room was refused. At last better treatment was given, but no clerk was allowed to give the responses of the sacred office, till at length a Catholic magistrate attended for the purpose; and afterwards a boy of ten years of age was allowed to perform the clerk's office. The Roman Catholic clergyman at Tothill Fields did not ask for a single pound for his ministration, but had simply expressed a wish that a lady, the daughter of a Peer and the wife of a Member of Parliament, might be allowed to play during the time of Divine service. Permission was, however, refused; and the lady, who was a woman of high spirit, waited on the visiting justice and asked to be allowed to play on Sundays for the benefit of the prisoners, observing that his own daughter was allowed to attend in the gaol. "Oh," replied the magistrate, "my daughter is not the only lady who attends; there are three or four others who come here." Did that, he should like to know, look like religious equality? Was that "levelling up" or "levelling down?" Further still, it was true that several priests had broken down with health shattered by the indignity and contumely with which they were treated by the prison authorities and officials. For his own part he did not wish to see a single farthing of the money which they received taken from the Protestant clergy. What he was protesting against was the manner in which the Roman Catholic clergyman was treated. The Government prisons were managed admirably, and he could not see why the same principle could not be adopted in all the gaols. These poor people should not be told that while they committed smaller offences they would not receive fair play in prison, but that as soon as they committed crimes which subjected them to penal servitude, then fair play would be extended to them. At the last meeting of the Board the Chairman said that everything necessary had been provided for the conduct of the Roman Catholic worship in the prison; the fact being, on the contrary, that the priest could not proceed with his duties until he had expended £120 out of his own pocket in the purchase of altar furniture, vestments, and other things that were absolutely necessary for the conduct of Catholic worship. Catholic clergymen who visited prisons were treated with studied indignity, and everything was done to discourage them. Protestants wished to be attended only by Protestant clergymen, and Catholics only by Catholic clergymen ; and if a Catholic chaplain attempted to interfere with the faith of a Protestant prisoner he should be expelled from the prison ; but nothing of the kind ever happened. The good effects of allowing the visits of Catholic clergymen to prisoners of their own persuasion were seen by experience, as in the prison of the Isle of Wight ; whereas when prisoners did not obtain spiritual consolation they were committed and re-committed, and descended the hardened steep of crime. This was a question also for the ratepayers, because persons committed over and over again to gaol occasioned a great expense to the community ; and perseverance in a system of mere punishment without improvement would only add to the number of the dangerous classes of society, which were the most costly classes of all. All means of improvement should be adopted. They had been tried with admirable effect in Ireland, and the result was that the Irish Judges were going the circuits having scarcely any crime to inquire into. Poverty and misery were the causes of the crimes committed by the poor Irish in London : they were more exposed to temptation than any other class ; and he implored the House not to make crime deeper and darker by refusing the means of religious improvement. The matter was one which called for the vigorous action of Government, instead of leaving it to a body of magistrates, who were quite unfit for the purpose, to sit in judgment as to the religion of 200,000,000 of the human race. If the Prison Ministers Act were not made compulsory, ten or a dozen years might elapse before the law would be put into active operation ; and as he did not wish to wait so long for such a result, he now, in the name of justice—in the name of the honour and character of that House—in the name of fair play to the poor and oppressed—in the name of civil and religious liberty—would move the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

LORD EDWARD HOWARD seconded the Motion ; and said that it was very gratifying to those who had laboured in this cause to find that the magistrates of the country generally, aided by the Acts passed in 1863 and 1865, had to a considerable extent conceded the principle that the Roman Catholics had in view, by appointing Roman Catholic ministers to attend to members of their flock who were in gaol. This, however, had only been done to a too limited extent. The principle had been acted upon in large and enlightened towns like Preston, Liverpool, and Manchester, where salaries had been given to Roman Catholic ministers, and various steps taken to facilitate the instruction and reformation of the prisoners. Under the former system Catholic prisoners had to endure hardships of which gentlemen, whether in or out of the House, had no idea. They were exposed to great ill-usage and oppression if they avowed themselves Catholics, and temptations were held out to them to attend the Protestant service, with increased severities if they refused. The Reports of Inspectors showed that there was a striking improvement in the conduct of Roman Catholic prisoners in consequence of their being brought into communication with their priests ; and it was shown that in places where the discipline of the prison had been very bad indeed a complete reformation had taken place. It appeared from a Report in December, 1866, that the chaplain at Parkhurst Prison had interfered in reference to the school for Roman Catholic children ; a system which he (Lord Edward Howard) thought ought not to exist. It was too bad that persons wishing to be reformed were not allowed the means of reformation, thus increasing the expense on the ratepayers of the country. The matter was not so important in reference to the Protestant Dissenters, because in many cases they did not object to attend the services of the Church of England ; but the Roman Catholics refused the ministrations of the Protestant clergymen. He hoped that an appeal to the enlarged constituency would tend to afford a remedy to that state of things of which he complained. In the present Home Secretary they had a talent of administration and a vigour of action that promised the best results, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would give his earnest attention to the matter, and do what it was possible to do to redress a wrong and confer a benefit.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in consequence of the persistent refusal or neglect of the authorities having control over certain of the county and borough Prisons of Great Britain to put in operation the powers given to them by the Prison Ministers Act, it is necessary they should be compelled by Law to make adequate provision for the religious instruction and Divine Worship of Catholic Prisoners."—(*Mr. Maguire.*)

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the Returns moved for had two sides, one of which only had been presented by the hon. Member to the House. The Returns would show that throughout the country great progress had been made in this matter since the Prison Ministers' Act had come into operation. As he had said last year a permissive Act on a subject of this sort would in most cases lead to controversy and this had been the case in this instance. Still, however, great steps had been taken in order to secure to persons in custody who were of a particular religion an opportunity of seeing the ministers to whose creed they belonged in order to be instructed by them. There were, however, in many parts of the country considerable difficulties, where the number of Roman Catholic prisoners were, perhaps, only four, five, or six, and where, the Roman Catholic population being few, there was no priest or chapel near the prison. In these cases it was almost impossible that there should be a regular Roman Catholic chaplain attached to the gaol; but he found that in no case mentioned in the Returns had there been any refusal of access, and in most cases there was a growing freedom of access for the priest. In the county of Middlesex, for instance, to which special reference was made, considerable progress had been made both as to access to prisoners and the assignment of a proper place for the peformance of religious worship. No one in the gaols was debarred from access to a minister of his own creed for the purpose of religious instruction. With respect to the supply of those things that were necessary for religious ceremonies, he thought that it would be found very difficult for any legislation to compel a supply, for they could hardly by legislation lay down rules to be applied to such matters. If there had been what the hon. Member would call a sort of repulsive coldness in the reception of Roman Catholic priests in gaols he (Mr. G. Hardy) did not see how that could be got rid of by legislation. The hon. Member would take steps by his Motion to call on the House to decide the sort of thing that should in the future be done; but he (Mr. G. Hardy) must confess that he was not in favour of that kind of Motion unless immediate legislation could be founded on it. He was not surprised that Gentlemen who professed a religion which they thought was neglected should be impatient; but he trusted that the House, having thought proper to act by permissive legislation, would give a certain time to see how such legislation would act, and more especially so as facilities for religious instruction were being increased. He trusted that the hon. Member would not press his Motion to a division.

MR. MONSELL acknowledged the courteous and conciliatory remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department, and expressed his concurrence with him that it would be inexpedient for his hon. Friend the Member for Cork, under the circumstances, to press his Motion to a division. It would be inadvisable for the House to pass a mere abstract Resolution upon the subject unless it were immediately followed up by legislation. He (Mr. Monsell), however, ventured to submit to the right hon. Gentleman that in all the prisons of the United Kingdom there should be an equal system observed in regard to the religious wants of the prisoners. It was curious to mark how differently the prisoners belonging to the religion of the minority were treated in Ireland to the prisoners of the minority as regarded faith in England. He need not speak of the prisoners professing the religion of the Established Church in Ireland, who had always the assistance of the ministers of their own faith. But he would take the Presbyterians as an example. In 1865 he found there were on an average only eighty-two Presbyterian prisoners in Ireland. Well, for the spiritual wants of those eighty-two prisoners there were fourteen paid chaplains. In the county Louth there was only one Presbyterian prisoner, and in Fermanagh two Presbyterian prisoners. Nevertheless, there was a Presbyterian chaplain with a salary of upwards of £30 to attend to each of these gaols. He by no means complained of this expenditure. On the contrary, however few the prisoners were, he believed that the ministrations of the clergy were attended with the best results. In this country, however, the greatest difficulty was experienced in obtaining for the Roman Catholic prisoners in many of the gaols the religious consolation and instruction of their own priests. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would take the question into his serious consideration, and would endeavour to introduce a Bill next Session which should extend the system now in force in Ireland into this country, and not leave to the discretion of the magistrates that which was fixed by law in Ireland.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he understood that the hon. Member for Cork had animadverted upon the conduct of the Middlesex magistrates. Now, he (Mr. Newdegate) had been for many years a justice of the peace for Middlesex, and he knew that the Bench of magistrates at Clerkenwell had made some wise concessions in the sense of the demands made by the hon. Member for Cork. What was the result? Had that hon. Gentleman, or any other of the Roman Catholic Members of that House, expressed any satisfaction? Not the least. Count de Montalembert, in writing on the political future of England, described the religious agitation that was going on in this country, of which they had had a sample that day. The Count recommended the Roman Catholics to demand the principle of religious equality for their prisoners in gaols — a principle, by-the-by, which their Church repudiated whenever it had power. Was the fact not enough to prove that whatever concessions that House might make short of granting complete supremacy to the Roman Catholic Church—a supremacy insisted upon by the Pope in his Encyclical — they would give no satisfaction. On the contrary, the result of such concessions acted as a mere encouragement to agitation. So confident was he that the advice given by Count de Montalembert would be followed out, that he voted against the last of those concessions, and he privately expressed his conviction that those concessions would not be received with satisfaction, but would only lead to further demands. The hon. Member for Cork now proposed to deprive them of the discretion that was vested in the magistrates in respect to the appointment of Roman Catholic chaplains to gaols, although such magistrates were responsible for the good conduct of those chaplains that were allowed to visit the prisoners. To satisfy the Roman Catholic priesthood was simply impossible. They had the assurance of the Papacy and the Roman Catholic clergy that anything short of supremacy would fail to satisfy them. The Home Secretary, consistently with the amiability of his character, expressed his satisfaction at the concessions being made by the magistrates generally upon this point, and his hope that those concessions would continue to progress. But in the face of the Encyclical of the Pope, all such concessions would be utterly inadequate to the demands of the Roman Catholic Church. The claim of the hon. Member for Cork now was this, that wherever there was an assembly of persons belonging to the Roman Catholic community there should be by law present a Roman Catholic priest to govern them. Many who profess Liberal opinions would, he had no doubt, arrive at the conviction that there was no true liberality or religious freedom to be found in the course they were invited to pursue, and would join with those of his political opinions who preferred incurring the odium cast upon them by the party opposite, rather than resign that trust which as magistrates they were anxious to discharge with a due regard to the sacred interests involved and to the best of their understandings.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, as he understood the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) although he thought the present application fair and just in itself, he refused his assent to it because he feared that it would be followed by other applications which, in his view of the case, would not be fair and just. He (Mr. C. Fortescue) hoped that the House would decide this question upon its simple merits without reference to anything else. He denied the application of the word "concession," which had been so frequently used by the hon. Member to the proposition now made by his hon. Friend the Member for Cork. Concession meant the granting of something to a party who had no right to ask for it. The application now made was one founded upon right and justice, and therefore could not be considered a concession if granted. He concurred with his right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) in thinking that the advice and instruction of a chaplain to prisoners, however few in number, were calculated to produce great good. Speaking from his own knowledge of what occurred in Ireland, and especially in his own county, he would say that the system of securing for the inmates of public institutions the benefit of religious administrations by law was carried out most completely, even to an extent that might be described as pedantic. He remembered with shame the treatment of the Roman Catholic minority in England when he compared it with the more liberal treatment of the Protestant minority in Ireland. In the workhouse, for example, which he was in the habit of attending, there was a mere handful of Protestant paupers—often only half-a-dozen—among a mass of Roman Catholics, and yet there was a regularly paid chaplain of the Church of England, and a room was fitted up as a chapel for Divine service. Unless the principle of appointing Roman Catholic chaplains to those places in England was more generally acknowledged and acted upon, his belief was that it would be the duty of the House to interfere stringently in the matter.

MR. SYNAN observed that the Prison Ministers Act of 1863 was permissive, but the Act of 1865, which provided that a prisoner, unless he objected, should be visited by a minister of his own denomination, limited to a great extent the discretion of the magistrates. He could not agree with the Home Secretary that great progress was being made, because in 1866 it appeared there were forty-one gaols, at which ten Roman Catholic chaplains were employed, while in the latest Return, referring to 119 prisons, only fifteen chaplains had been appointed. The Returns showed that at several prisons, containing a very considerable number of Roman Catholics, no Roman Catholic chaplain was appointed.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, he considered the speech of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) irrelevant to the subject. The question was a very narrow one, being confined to a question merely of prison administration—namely, whether Roman Catholic priests should be allowed to attend Roman Catholic prisoners when in gaol for the benefit of such prisoners, and for the real object for which they were confined—that of their improvement, and for the good order and discipline of the prison. This was not a concession to Roman Catholics, but whether it was right or wrong that Roman Catholic priests should be admitted to prisoners who belonged to that Church. If it was wrong to permit them, there was an end of the question. Prisoners, however, were not sent to gaol merely for their punishment. The State was certainly interested in the reformation of her prisoners, and as the only means of reforming prisoners was through the instrumentality of religion, and as it was impossible to expect the Roman Catholic prisoners to be reformed by the doctrines of a religion in which they did not believe, he regarded this so-called concession as a simple act of justice. He had always objected to the present permissive state of the law, because there was an ingenious perverseness in the nature of Englishmen which frequently prevented their carrying out the benevolent intentions contemplated by Parliament. Looking at the question as he did, purely in the light of an act of justice towards the Roman Catholic prisoners, and of benefit to the State, he trusted that Her Majesty's Government would bring in a Bill in the early part of next Session to make the appointment of Roman Catholic chaplains in prisons necessary.

MR. KINNAIRD remarked, that though it was true the contributions to the gaols were not so large for the Nonconformist body as they were for the Roman Catholic portion of the population, the principle was alike the same in each case. The gradual addition to the public expenditure was worthy of serious attention, and he believed that all that was necessary in this case was to resort to voluntary efforts, which had been found successful in so many other directions, and which, if adopted, would put an end to the continual squabbles on all hands for payment from State funds.

MR. NEATE desired to allude to an important and delicate point which had not yet received any attention during the progress of this discussion—the principle of concealing the confessions of prisoners who were sentenced to death. He did not think that it was necessary that the details should be published; but, before the House assented to any proposition for the appointment of Roman Catholic chaplains, it should be distinctly laid down that it was incumbent on the priest to say whether the prisoner had confessed his guilt or not. The peace of mind of twelve honest jurymen, even occasionally of the Judge, was involved in the question, and their minds ought, above all priestly considerations, to be set at rest, so that they might not be afflicted with those unpleasant misgivings which, in the absence of any confession of guilt, would prey upon their minds at the most unseasonable hours. ["Question!"] The objection applied equally in the appointment of clergymen of any denomination, for, but for the interposition of the priest or clergyman, the criminal, finding all his hopes gone, would frequently yield to the dictates of that natural morality which was superior to the morality of any priest, either Protestant or Roman Catholic. ["Question!"]

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he was sure his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Neate) would not be the man to call upon an ordained priest of God to violate his ordinated vow, which would be the result of adopting the suggestion with which he closed his speech. Believing as he did that the desire of the Catholic Members who supported the Resolution before the House was not to increase the resources of the Church to which they belonged, but simply to carry out their conscientious views, he should support the Resolution. He did this mainly on the ground that in his opinion the magistrates of England are at this moment acting in reference to this matter in a manner the House ought not to countenance; and for this reason: the Judges upon whom the duty devolved sentenced convicted criminals to terms of imprisonment commensurate with their offences; but after this had been done, the magistrates, whose duties were, in fact, simply ministerial, inflicted a cumulative punishment by depriving the prisoners of the ministrations of the Church to which they belonged.

MR. MAGUIRE, in reply, said, that he had in some respects been misrepresented by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary. He did not deny that progress had been made, or was still being made, but said that progress had been very slow. The Roman Catholic Members did not want chaplains to be appointed in cases where they were not required; but they said that, in common justice, a chaplain should be appointed to minister to Roman Catholic prisoners in cases where there were many of them confined in gaols. The Roman Catholic Members of the House represented 9,000,000 of Her Majesty's subjects, and they would not rest until they had obtained that justice and equality to which they considered themselves entitled. He asked the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli), who had made so many professions of his desire to do justice to the Roman Catholics, to carry out his professions by placing a Government Bill on the table of the House next Session, to make the law compulsory instead of permissive. He would not now press his Motion to a division.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

PARLIAMENT—DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.—RESOLUTION.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN rose to call attention to the practice of the House in not allowing Members who went by inadvertence into the wrong Lobby in divisions to have their votes recorded in the manner in which they wished to give them, and said it was his intention to move a Resolution which would enable mistakes of that kind, when made hereafter, to be corrected. He had himself, in June 1864, been the victim of the existing rule, having then gone into the wrong Lobby, and consequently had his vote recorded in the opposite sense to that which he intended. The effect of that was that, there being a majority of 1 against the view which he desired to support, a Bill of considerable interest was thrown over for that Session. A similar inadvertence in 1856 was committed by the hon. Member for Rochester (Mr. P. Wykeham-Martin). There were instances of even some of the most experienced Members of the House—including Government "tellers" themselves—sometimes going into the wrong Lobby by mistake; and on the occasion of the first division taken upon the Resolution of the right hon. Member for South Lancashire respecting the Irish Church, the majority was 60; while on the second division when the Resolution was put the majority was 56; the difference between the two majorities being caused by two Scotch Members—for even Scotch Members at times made mistakes—going into the wrong Lobby. A Member, if he made a mistake by going into the wrong Lobby, ought to have an opportunity of correcting it. In the House of Lords the practice was different; and although he should not wish to follow the House of Lords in all things, the Resolution which they had, at the instance of Lord Redesdale, adopted to meet the case of Members of that House going into a wrong Lobby, might, he thought, very well be made the rule of practice in the taking of divisions in the House of Commons. He begged, therefore, to move a Resolution in precisely similar terms.

MR. P. WYKEHAM-MARTIN seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That if any Member shall, by mistake, go out with the Ayes or the Noes (as the case may be), having intended to vote on the other side, he shall wait until the other Members in the same Lobby shall have passed out, and, on presenting himself to the Tellers, he shall desire that he may not be counted with them, he having entered the Lobby by mistake; and the Tellers shall thereupon come with such Member to the Table, and inform the House of the circumstance, and the Speaker or Chairman (as the case may be), shall thereupon

ask such Member whether he was in the House when the Question was put, and, if he shall answer in the affirmative, the Speaker or Chairman (as the case may be), shall then ask such Member whether he desires to vote Aye or No on such Question, and the vote of such Member as then declared by him shall be taken by the Tellers in the House, and reported by them accordingly."—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen.*)

LORD HOTHAM said, he hoped the House would not agree to the Resolution. The only effect of such a Motion would be to point out to the country that mistakes were made from want of attention which were anything but creditable either to the individual Members or to the House. Why was not the House told the names of the Members who had been in the wrong? How they came to be in the wrong box? Whether they were in the House when the Question was put? It argued very little for the competence of Members if, when they were told "Ayes to the right, Noes to the left," they did not know which way to go. If hon. Members were asleep, or on the terrace smoking, or reading newspapers in the vicinity of the House, or, in short, doing anything except what they ought—attending to the Business of the House in their places—that was their own fault, and the matter was, in his opinion, not of such importance as to require special legislation. It would be much better to go on in the old paths, and not draw too much attention to their faults.

MR. P. WYKEHAM-MARTIN said, the mistake in his case had occurred on a Wednesday, when he had been in the House almost the whole morning. It was the first time he had voted in his life, and he was standing at the Bar, when the predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair said the "Ayes" were to go to the right. He thereupon went to his own right, and that was the way in which the error arose. As to the Resolution of the hon. and learned Baronet, he did not think it was a matter of much importance one way or another.

SIR HENRY WINSTON-BARRON said, he was astonished that any hon. Member should oppose so simple a Motion. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Hotham) was a most punctual and painstaking Member of the House himself; but that was no good reason why he should object to the adoption of a rule by which mistakes in voting might be avoided.

MR. BOUVERIE said, the hon. and learned Baronet must remember the legal maxim, *Vigilantibus non dormientibus subveniunt leges.* He did not think it desirable to make Resolutions to encourage mistakes. The rules and practice of the House assumed that Members knew what they were about, understood the Questions that were put, and gave their votes intelligently. The rules and practice were simple, if hon. Members would only take the pains to comprehend them. If they endeavoured to provide for those weaker Members who made mistakes after dinner, they would be led into confusion, the proceedings of the House would be brought into ridicule, and there would be much less care taken to prevent mistakes.

MR. ESMONDE said, he hoped the hon. and learned Baronet would withdraw his Motion. Its operation, if carried, would, he was afraid, be something like that which was said to have followed the invention of life buoys, when the sailors were constantly falling overboard, knowing that the means of safety were at hand.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he was sorry that the Leader of the House had not made any observations on a matter affecting the conduct of the Business of the House; but after what had fallen from the few hon. Members who had spoken he would not press his Resolution.

MR. DISRAELI: The hon. and learned Baronet has alluded to me, and as I should be very sorry to be suspected of any want of courtesy to the House, I must say that once or twice I was on the point of rising, but was prevented addressing the House by reason of the fact that other hon. Members were the first to catch Mr. Speaker's eye. I should, if I had had an opportunity, have given an uncompromising opposition to the Motion of the hon. and learned Baronet, which would have, as it appears to me, produced this effect: we should have had two divisions on every subject—there would be a division and a revision of a division in each case. That practice would create many mistakes. I think it is always unwise to alter our rules of procedure without grave consideration, and I think that in this case we have not sufficient data upon which to base such considerations. I do not think we are entirely acquainted with the motives which occasion these apparent mistakes. I have sometimes ascribed them to a desire in hon. Members for change of society; and on many occasions it has been the case that hon. Members going into the wrong Lobby have been in a state of some social excitement. As I think also that an agreement with the Motion of the hon. and learned Baronet would cause Members to be more careless than they are at present, I should, if it had not been stated that the Amendment was to be withdrawn, have opposed its passage.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

CASE OF ADJOURI.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. BAZLEY, in moving an Address for Papers and Correspondence relating to the case of a merchant named Adjouri, said, that in 1865 a partnership was entered into at Manchester, which two years afterwards became embarrassed. In 1867 the partner in Manchester received a telegraphic message from Aleppo to invoice £10,000 of Manchester goods for Aleppo, for which a remittance would be provided. The remittance did not arrive. The house of Adjouri and Company had conducted itself with punctuality and respect; but having suspended payment a bankruptcy became inevitable, and Adjouri was made a bankrupt in February. In 1867 Adjouri absconded from Manchester. The merchants of that city sent a messenger to Aleppo to secure debts, but he obtained no payment whatever. An action was instituted in Aleppo, in a Court framed for the trial of international causes. In the course of the trial indications were manifest favourable to the creditors. But as the trial proceeded, very much to the surprise of those engaged in it, the Turkish authorities suspended the trial. Lord Lyons was leaving Constantinople at the time, and Mr. Elliott, his successor, was in a state of transition. Communications took place between various parties, but the Turkish authorities contested the rights of British nationality. What, then, was the British Consul doing? The sum of £2,000 had been spent in seeking redress of the grievance. At this time last year application was made to the Government for redress. The answer was that more information was needed as to what took place in Constantinople. His constituents had had great wrong done them. He did not doubt that ultimately Her Majesty's Government would give them redress. But what he complained of was the unnecessary delay. He wished to have no further delay, "which made the heart sick."

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of Papers and Correspondence relative to the absconding of Adjouri from Manchester, leaving large debts owing to the merchants of that city."—(*Mr. Bazley.*)

Lord STANLEY said, that so far as he could understand the case, the facts were these — A man named Adjouri had creditors in England and partners in Turkey. He became bankrupt, and the creditors in Manchester thought that they had a claim upon his Turkish property. In order to enforce this claim they instituted a suit against the partners in the Mixed Court at Aleppo. The Turkish Government interposed, and by a Vizerial order stopped the proceedings on the ground that the case ought not to have been taken into the Mixed Court at all, but to have been tried by the ordinary tribunals. This was unquestionably a sufficient ground for the interference, supposing it to be proved that the Mixed Court had no jurisdiction. Whether, in that view of the case, the Turkish authorities were right or wrong was a very difficult and intricate question of law. It had been several times referred to the Law Officers of the Crown, before whom every facility had been given to the parties to lay their case. It was not very easy to ascertain the precise facts on which the legality or illegality of the proceedings of the Turkish Government depended. Very lately, by the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown, he had written to Constantinople to obtain some fresh information, which might assist them materially in coming to a decision. Everything turned upon this — was the Court qualified to deal with the case, or was it not? If not, the Turkish local authorities had a perfect right to do what they did. If they were competent to try the case, the Native authorities had no right to interfere, and there was ground for addressing representations to them on the subject. The delay which had arisen had been occasioned partly by the complication of the case itself, and partly, also, from the statement, as first laid before the Law Officers, not arriving in a shape on which it was possible to form a conclusive opinion. He did not know any other course that could have been taken than that a legal question should be settled by legal advice. Certainly, there was no evidence of any improper influence being brought to bear upon the Turkish authorities. Nothing of that kind had been stated to him. It was an assertion that parties were very apt to make, but on which no stress should be laid unless it could be proved. When the information for which he had written was received, no doubt his learned Friends would be able to advise the Government as to the course they ought to take, and Parliament would then be informed on the subject. He thought the hon. Gentleman exercised a very wise discretion in not asking for the production of the Papers, for he thought that would only injure the parties who applied for them.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

REVENUE OFFICERS DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL—[Bill 76.]

(*Mr. Monk, Sir Harry Verney, Mr. Otway.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. MONK, in moving that the Speaker do now leave the Chair, was about to address the House, when

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER rose to Order. The hon. Member had on a previous occasion addressed the House on the Question that the Speaker do leave the Chair, when the Secretary to the Treasury moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MONK observed that the Motion for the adjournment was negatived; but he had subsequently assented to the Motion for going into Committee being negatived.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Monk.*)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he had not the slightest wish to curtail the hon. Member's observations on the Bill; but he had a most distinct recollection that the hon. Gentleman did address some observations to the House on the Question of the Speaker leaving the Chair. Until an Amendment was moved, the hon. Gentleman could not again speak.

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member had on a previous occasion made the Motion that he do now leave the Chair, on which, subsequently, the adjournment of the House and the debate had been moved. The Chancellor of the Exchequer would now be in order in moving his Amendment.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he only wished to be in Order, having no desire whatever to curtail the privileges of the hon. Member. The Bill had been read a second time without any observations on the part of the Government or by any hon. Member; and, as the House might recollect, it was by a mere accident that he had not been present when the Motion for the second reading was made. Looking to the really important character of this measure, he regretted there was not a more full attendance of Members when it came on for discussion. The natural tendency of every mind must be to accede at once to the principle of this Bill; it was only in discussion that doubts arose as to whether it would be desirable to do so. It would have been far more agreeable to his own feelings to support the Bill, which was intended to confer the franchise on a very meritorious and efficient body of men, to whom the country and the House were very greatly indebted, than to move, as he felt bound to do, that it be committed this day three months. It was of no slight importance that the action of the officers concerned in the collection of the Revenue should be above all imputation as to their motives; that political intrigue and political feeling should be kept entirely out of the question so far as their conduct was concerned; that they should be able to carry on the discipline necessary for the conduct of business, to make changes and removals from one part of the country to another, and direct their officers to take proceedings with reference to the Revenue without regard to political considerations. The original ground for withholding the franchise from officers thus employed was that it would be giving too great power to the Crown; the feeling of those who were in favour of the measure was, that the franchise having been so widely extended, their numbers were now so small in comparison with those of the electors generally that they would have very little weight in an election. He was not disposed to attach much weight to the argument relative to the power of the Crown; but he thought that in the event of the Bill becoming law, if not the Crown, some of the permanent officers of the establishment might have very great power and influence in particular cases. There were certain places where the number of officers who would be affected by the measure was very considerable. In the port of London between 1,700 and 1,800 Custom House officials alone would be enfranchised by this Bill. The number in some constituencies would be very considerable, besides those employed in the Excise and Post Office. In the port of Liverpool there were no fewer than 840 Custom House officers; and at the last election the lowest of two successful candidates only outstripped his competitor by 300 votes, so that in that particular case the Custom House officers would be three times as many as the majority of the successful candidate. Supposing that in the port of Liverpool the collector should be a strong partizan, and that these 840 officers considered that their position and prospects in the service depended upon him, a knowledge of human nature would enable them to judge pretty well of how the greater part of those officials would vote. If that were understood and known he should not feel called upon to oppose the Bill on that ground, because it was an evil which other considerations might induce them not to rate too highly.

Mr. MONK rose to a point of Order, and asked that the record of the proceedings on the former occasion should be referred to, which he believed would show that he was in Order in his endeavour to commence the debate upon this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER said that he had referred to the records of the proceedings upon the last occasion this Bill was before the House, and he found that the original Motion for going into Committee upon the Bill had been negatived, and required to be renewed, and therefore the hon. Member (Mr. Monk) was in Order in commencing the debate. He, however, was given to understand that the hon. Member did not wish to press his right to address the House, but merely desired that it should be understood that he was not out of Order in the attempt he made to recommence the debate.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he was afraid that some mistake had been made in the record of the proceedings. In resuming the thread of his argument, he had to state that his main objection to this Bill was that these officers were scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land, and upon their reports and representations to their superiors rested the question whether persons should be prosecuted for offences against the laws of the Revenue, so that there was in their hands virtually the control of the prosecutions. That being the case, it must be evident to every one that it would give to officers so situated very great influence in elections. At present they were not allowed by the rules of the service to take part in any political proceedings, so that their political opinions, if they had any, were suppressed; but if they were allowed to take part in political proceedings connected with elections, they would be allowed to adopt a political colour, and it might be said that they were not in the habit of shutting their eyes to the frauds and defalcations of those of their own political party. He was afraid that such imputations would be cast widely about, and the efficiency of the service would be greatly impaired. Very great discretion was required in those engaged in carrying out the administration of the laws, and it was not to be wished that the difficulties of their duty should be enhanced by allowing political convictions on the part of those officers. It was said that it was a grievance for those gentleman not to be admitted to the full rights of citizenship. He had made careful inquiries amongst the superior officers of the Department, and they made no complaint of being debarred from the exercise of the franchise; on the contrary, they thought it rather a privilege sometimes to be free from the political turmoil which surrounded them. If the superiors made no complaint, he did not see why the subordinates should do so. It was optional with any subject of Her Majesty to enter any of these services, and if he did so, he did so with a full knowledge of the disabilities attaching to the office. The police throughout the country were also affected with the same disability. If they had been introduced into the Bill, it might have been urged that they would follow the lead of the county and borough magistrates: but he thought that when it was desired to enfranchise the Revenue officers, it was hardly fair to the police that they should not have been included in the Bill. There was an anomaly in our laws on this subject; the dockyard labourers were not disfranchised; but if the matter were inquired into calmly and dispassionately, he was not at all sure that a good case might not be made out for affixing to them the same disability that now attached to Revenue officers. The fact did not at all tend to the purity or the impartiality of electors in places where many of these men were employed, and strenuous efforts were made by Members representing them to increase the privileges of the dockyard men and the number of persons employed, which did not tend to economy, or the proper husbanding of the national resources. The heads of the Revenue Departments held their offices permanently, so that, supposing a strong partizan to be at the head of one, he might for a whole generation influence the votes of those under his authority. At present all these places were filled up on the representations and applications of the supporters of the Government of the day, and if a person was appointed to an office of this kind, it was perfectly well known that the Government would get no political good by him; but if the present law were changed, it would be understood throughout the country that the Member who procured an appointment for a man would be entitled for ever afterwards to his vote. Continual applications were made by these gentlemen respecting their position and salaries, and those applications had of late years taken a very peculiar form, being not merely made through Heads of Departments, or by simple memorials to the Treasury, but in the form of resolutions at public meetings held by them, and communications to Members of Parliament by delegates appointed to represent their interests. He put it to the House whether, in the circumstances supposed, the influence possessed by them would not be very considerably increased, and whether the Government of the day would not have far greater difficulty in administering these Departments with respect to the position and salaries of the officers concerned, if the measure were carried. The Report of the Inquiry Commissioners referred to the great mischief that would ensue if the Bill should become law, and stated that the efficient administration of the Inland Department and the due collection of the Revenue would, under the circumstances supposed, be next to impossible. Considering that that Department was concerned with the collection of a Revenue of upwards of £40,000,000, he thought the House would not be surprised if the person principally responsible for it should ask them to pause before assenting to a measure of this kind.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer,*)

—instead thereof.

Sir HARRY VERNEY said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman to be consistent ought to bring in a Bill to disfranchise all the servants of the Crown. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to think that these officers could not be trusted to exercise the rights of citizenship, though the Government themselves had assented to largely enfranchise the people of this country, and though these officers, whom the Government declined to admit to the privileges which it had lately so widely extended, were superior, in point of education and trustworthiness, to any similar class in the world. If the right hon. Gentleman's argument, that these officers ought not to vote because their appointments were the result of political influence, were good for anything, it was an argument against the House of Lords, which was continually strengthened by the creation of Peers, who were usually very loyal adherents of the party from whom they were selected, though they were frequently by no means its most eminent or distinguished Members. This was no party question; it was one which involved a Department in which there were as many Conservatives as Liberals. He hoped that the House would consent to pass the Bill of his hon. Friend, because, by so doing, they would remove from a worthy class a sense of degradation and insult.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he hoped his hon. Friend who had just spoken would not think it betokened any want of respect to him if he said that, after listening to the remarks he had made, they left on his mind the impression that he had not so far entered into the question as to become aware of the difficulties with which it was surrounded. He thought his hon. Friend, with the benevolence which characterized him, had taken the philanthropic view of the matter; he had been shocked by an apparent anomaly in the existing law, and he had rushed to a practical conclusion with a rapidity too great to allow of his guidance being considered a safe one for the decision of the House upon the question. If it was not being too bold, he thought his hon. Friend would see that he had not used the words lightly, and that he had something to say in support of them. He did not intend to approach the subject in the spirit of partizanship—political partizanship was unknown in connection with it, but in the spirit of official or any other partizanship. It was not a matter to be decided by any considerations of this kind, but they must consider broadly and fairly the right course to pursue. On that occasion, he could not join with anyone in attempting to force the hands of the Government. It seemed to him a very serious matter indeed to have a Government responsible, amongst other things, for the collection of £70,000,000 of Revenue, most of it raised by processes of a very peculiar and delicate kind, practicable in this country, but many of them hardly attempted in any other country in the world, for he did not believe that Schedule D of the income tax had a parallel in any other country on the face of the globe. It was a most serious evil to take up these questions on general grounds of philanthropy and liberality, and force upon a Government responsible for their duties, measures which the persons so responsible declared to be incompatible with their due discharge. He was not prepared to assume that responsibility, and so long as the Government of the day resisted the passing of a measure of that kind, his vote must be with the Government of the day. Others might not take that view, and he did not intend to limit the field of the discussion. He wished not to force the Government, and he thought that those who supported the measure should endeavour so to dispute as to induce the Government to deal with it in a fair and liberal spirit. He presumed that the arguments to be urged in favour of the Bill would arise from the anomalous circumstance that while a portion of those engaged in the public service were permitted to vote, these officers were not allowed to exercise that privilege; that other citizens had been admitted to the franchise, and that these ought to share in the general extension of electoral rights; and thirdly, that these officers themselves were exceedingly anxious to possess the privilege from which they alone were excluded. The first consideration of anomaly weighed very little in his mind, more especially as the Bill did not remove it, but rather brought it out more sharply. The case of the police would serve to show that there was a great deal more in the matter than the mere franchise of the officers and servants of the Revenue Department. If they were going to remove an anomaly, and if that be a reason for legislation, they should have something like consistency, and consistency was not to be obtained by passing on a Motion like this such a Bill as was now before them. With regard to the rights of citizenship, it was said that these persons ought not to be deprived of the franchise, when Parliament had admitted the majority of the male adult population to the suffrage. But Parliament had done nothing of the kind. The number of the adult male population was about 5,500,000, while the number of voters who would in future enjoy the franchise would not amount to more than one in three. Then there was in the third place, the desire of the parties themselves. He was sorry that a series of accidents had prevented his hon. Friend (Mr. Monk) from giving a full exposition of his views, and he confessed he was not aware of the existence of this general and wide-spread desire for the franchise among the 35,000 persons concerned. [Mr. MONK: There is a very considerable desire.] How many petitions had there been? [Mr. MONK: Eighty petitions, signed by about 8,000 persons.] That was about one-fourth or one-fifth of the whole, and it by no means showed a universal desire among a thoroughly organized body. There was a great deal more to be considered, and the House ought not to proceed to legislate in haste on such a subject. The case of the police was an important one, and the Bill should not pass until that claim was considered, and they should decide whether the police should be included in it or not. The claim was also brought into view of those to whom the franchise was theoretically given, but from whom it was practically withheld by the regulations of the public service—he meant the military service. It might be said the soldier was not excluded. Certainly not so far as the letter of the law was concerned; but he was excluded by the regulations to which, under the conditions of the standing army, they chose to subject him. ["No, no!"] How was a soldier living in barracks to be a ratepayer? [Mr. MONK: He might be a freeholder.] He might be a freeholder—one in a thousand of the voters; but how was he to ascertain that the conditions of the service would allow him to attend and vote where his freehold lay? They were barred as to the possession of an occupation franchise, because the public found their residence. The same was the case with the Marines; and in the case of sailors generally, the nature of the service offered the greatest impediment to the possession of the franchise. In dealing with this question as affecting public servants, the House ought to be prepared to examine the case of each class on its own merits, and then determine how far they would go and at what point they would stop. Of all the public servants with whom he had been in contact—and he did not exclude Members of that House or Ministers of the Crown—he never had known a body actuated by a more enlightened spirit, and more simply desirous of promoting the public service, than the Board of Inland Revenue. He did not speak with the least disparagement of other Boards; but it was very difficult for Members of Parliament to read the papers that had been sent in and not see that there was much to consider in the case. The suggestion he would make would be that Parliament should give the vote, and, at the same time, leave it in the discretion of the Government to inhibit any of these officers from taking any part in politics beyond giving their simple vote. But in doing that they did not get rid of the anomaly when one class of voter could speak as well as vote and exhibit himself as he pleased while another class could only vote silently. He believed that a rule prevailed in the dockyards prohibiting persons connected with those establishments from taking an active and prominent part and doing many things which, if they were not public officers, they would be permitted to do. It was a matter for grave consideration whether if the vote were given to these men it should be given subject to that limitation or not. Again, before they proceeded to lay down the principle of general enfranchisement, one thing to be considered was the very peculiar relations between the Revenue officers and the Members of that House. There it was necessary to speak plainly. He was not afraid of Government influence in that matter, nor of an influence in favour of one political party or another; but he owned that he had some apprehension of what might be called class influence in that House, which in his opinion was the great reproach of the Reformed Parliament, as he believed history would record. Whether they were going to emerge into a new state of things in which class influence would be weaker he knew not; but that class influence had been in many things an evil and a scandal to them, especially for the last fifteen or twenty years; and he was fearful of its increase in consequence of the possession of the franchise, through the power which men who, as members of a regular service, were already organized might bring to bear on Members of Parliament. What, he asked, was the Civil Service of this country? It was a service in which there was a great deal of complaint of inadequate pay, of slow promotion, and all the rest of it. But, at the same time, it was a service which there was an extraordinary desire to get into. And whose privilege was it to regulate that desire? That of the Members of that House. At one period the Government of this country was carried on by patronage through the medium, to a great extent, of the Civil Service; and gross corruption was supposed to be an essential instrument for working the machinery of the State. Lord Liverpool, as he believed, entirely of his own motion, did an act which entitled him to the highest praise, for he voluntarily surrendered the whole power of promotion in the Civil Service and gave it to the permanent heads of Departments. That was an immense reform; but it was very difficult to keep that reform from being touched by profane hands. There was a tendency to interfere in regard to promotion lodging among Members of that House, and it was difficult for them to resist it, because, although Members of the Civil Service had not a vote, yet representations were made to them to recommend the promotion of A B or C D. The nomination to first appointments was in the hands of Members of that House; but the possession of that supposed privilege was, in point of fact, a nuisance of which he believed many of them would be glad to get rid. But if that patronage was to continue vested in Members of that House, it imported a new element of delicacy and embarrassment into the question of the franchise; and it would certainly make it additionally difficult to keep promotion in the Revenue Departments exclusively, as they ought to be, in the hands of the permanent heads of those Departments, if the persons whose promotion was involved were voters and were also active and perhaps vigorous and zealous partizans of Members of that House. That difficulty became greater in proportion as the service became more intelligent, Excisemen, surveyors in the Inland Revenue Department, and those public servants who had to surcharge tradesmen and get intimations of suspected insolvency, were somewhat like the agents of a mercantile house, who must, in a certain sense, almost act as spies for that House. Those Inland Revenue officers must watch for and make use of all the information they could find for the purposes of the Department; and it was in regard to the exercise of those functions that a difficulty again arose. He had never read a document proceeding from persons of higher authority than the letter of the Board of Inland Revenue, and he thought the men who had signed that Paper were worthy of being heard and examined either in that House or elsewhere on that subject. By those gentlemen exchanging views with the Members of that House it might be seen whether it was possible to arrive at a solution of that matter. In conclusion, he hoped his hon. Friend would concur with him so far as to admit that the anomalies he desired to remove could not be got rid of by a mere stroke of the pen, that the question involved many branches, and required much more careful and detailed examination than could be given to it in a debate in that House, before they could proceed to legislate in a satisfactory manner, and to dispose not only of the case of the Revenue officers, but of all those other cases which were more or less analogous to it.

Mr. CLAY said, he thought there was a difference between the case of the Revenue officer and that of the soldier, because the latter was excluded from the franchise by a mere accident of his profession and by the exigencies of the service, whereas the exclusion of the former proceeded on an entirely different principle. Undoubtedly the exclusion of the Revenue officers originated in the assumption that they were not to be trusted—that they would not be proof against the influence of their superiors. In the borough he represented (Hull) there was a considerable number of persons connected with the Custom House, the Post Office, and the Inland Revenue. He had known them for many years, and could say that the vast majority of those who had formed any opinion on the subject had always felt their exclusion very much, and now felt it more keenly since the recent extension of the franchise conferred that privilege on many men who certainly were in no way their superiors. Were those officers still to be told that they were either so cowardly that they could not resist the influence of their superiors, or were so much more selfish than other classes that they would use their influence in urging Members of Parliament to obtain professional advancement for them? The patronage of Members of that House only extended to nominations for first admission to the service, and, moreover, there was an easy cure for any undue pressure such as had been referred to. He believed it was a rule that any application through a Member of Parliament for promotion or increased pay should be visited as an offence upon the officer making it. Now, he enjoyed the intimacy of the Chairman of the Boards of Inland Revenue and of Customs, and he knew from them that that rule was not a sham, but one which was in reality carried into effect. He could not help, he might add, thinking that the exclusion which was the subject of discussion was the remains of a barbarous age, and that any argument which might be urged in support of it might be applied with still greater force to men in the service of a private employer. He said with greater force, because if there were at the present day employers who, more than any others, were precluded from unduly influencing the votes of those in their service, those employers were the Government, for no Government against which the exercise of such influence could be proved dare face the House of Commons. He could not, he might further observe, see why so ridiculous a rule as that which precluded stipendiary magistrates and police magistrates from voting in the districts in which their profession was carried on should be maintained. By that means picked men were, it seemed to him, excluded from the franchise. He was surprised that the Bill did not go further; but he should certainly support it as far as it went. He hoped that it would become law, and that the disabilities with which it dealt, as well as other similar disabilities, would be removed.

Mr. P. WYKEHAM-MARTIN said, that the exclusion of the police had occurred only ten years ago, and was attributable to the circumstance that it was considered to be their duty to keep order during election contests, when it was supposed that if they took part in them the temptation might be too strong to break their neighbours' heads not quite impartially. As to the officers in the Excise and Customs, they enjoyed the franchise upwards of seventy years ago, and they were deprived of it to protect themselves rather than because of any distrust of them which prevailed. There were at the time only 300,000 electors in the whole of England, while there were 60,000 of those persons holding office under the direct patronage of the First Lord of the Treasury. It so happened that in one small borough of 500 electors 120 officers were appointed, and Lord North who was about to retire from Office, and expected shortly to return to it, caused them to be informed that they were to expect no quarter if he returned to Office if they voted, while they were threatened with no quarter from the existing First Lord if they did not immediately vote. Under these circumstances, they memorialised the House to be disfranchised, and thus relieved from the painful position in which they were placed. He felt sure, however, that no First Lord of the Treasury would at the present day dare to issue such circulars as those which had been issued in the days of Lord North, and if promotion were left in the hands of the heads of Departments, and the power of nomination taken from Members of that House, there could, in his opinion, be no objection to the change proposed in the Bill.

MR. GRAVES said, he had been repeatedly asked to co-operate with the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) in seeking to bring about the object which he had in view. As a measure of abstract justice, he felt that the officers in question had a fair claim to the rights of citizenship which the Bill would confer upon them, and if it were pressed to a division that evening he should vote for it. But, as had been stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire, there were many grave considerations connected with the subject which the Bill did not touch, such, for instance, as how far it was consistent with the privileges which it was proposed to give, that the present system of nomination should be allowed to continue in the case of the Inland Revenue and Customs. Now, if the Bill were referred to a Select Committee, as he understood the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire to suggest, that would be one of the leading points to which their attention must be directed. His own belief was that the nominations must be made non-political. But, be that as it might, he hoped the hon. Member for Gloucester would be satisfied, in the event of the Government assenting to the reference of the whole subject to a Select Committee, with the progress which he had already made in furthering his measure, and would not proceed hastily in the endeavour to legislate on a matter of such importance.

MR. M. CHAMBERS confessed that he had not very clearly understood the speech of the right hon. Member for South Lancashire; but his (Mr. M. Chambers') position was this, that he was, and always had been, in favour of enfranchisement. It had been said by grave authorities about a century ago, that the Prerogative of the Crown had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished. Well, it was then thought desirable, in order to effect that object, to disfranchise all the officers employed in the Civil Service, they being looked upon as the great supporters of the Royal Prerogative; and a Bill for that purpose was introduced into Parliament. That Bill gave rise to some remarkable debates, in which the leading statesmen and orators of the day took part. Amongst the most distinguished opponents of the Bill in the House of Lords was the great Lord Mansfield, who, in a speech of wonderful power and eloquence, denounced the measure as an attempt to effect a dangerous depression of the Royal Prerogative, by depriving an honourable class of His Majesty's subjects of the enjoyment of that which ought to be looked upon as the inalienable birthright of all good citizens. The first efforts to take away those rights failed, for the Bill was rejected. Now, he (Mr. M. Chambers) founded his support to the present measure for the restoration of those rights which had been subsequently extinguished upon the noble expressions used by Lord Mansfield on the occasion to which he had referred. No answer whatever to those arguments had been given in the fluctuating speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire. It was no answer to this Bill to say that it was only removing one anomaly in the Constitution, and that it should remove them all. They must proceed step by step and by degrees. They said that Parliament ought to remove the disability from the class of public servants comprehended by the Bill — a class who received universal commendation for their integrity and ability, and who did not deserve this slur to be cast on them any longer, particularly when Parliament had just passed an Act to extend the franchise widely all over the United Kingdom. No one had ever charged those officials with acting unworthily or dishonourable, or with a betrayal of their duties or their trust to their Sovereign or their country. It was an idle subterfuge for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire to say that because they did not petition the House in greater numbers they did not want the privilege. He (Mr. M. Chambers) was surprised that so many of them had the moral courage to declare their opinions to that House, considering the pressure he believed was generally exercised by the Heads of Departments to prevent them taking action in the matter. What would be said of those officers if they had banded themselves together for the purpose of addressing Parliament on the subject of their grievances? If they did so, would they not be charged with a breach of privilege and a violation of the regulations of their Departments? Would they not be accused of combining and confederating together for the purpose of revolting against their superiors? They had, however, in private conversation, expressed their anxiety for the franchise; and the hon. Member for Hull and other Gentlemen who knew them, and the Heads of their Departments, well said that the Revenue officers, as a body, were men well qualified to exercise the franchise. Their right of choosing their representatives had been unjustly taken from them, because if any wrong had been done in respect of the exercise of patronage, it had not been done by them. Some of the observations which had been made showed, in point of fact, not how corrupt, but how soft and delicate the House of Commons had become. In former times, Members of Parliament listened to applications which were made to them, and no doubt very great improprieties had occurred as to the introduction of persons into the public service. But from time to time rules were made with the view of checking irregularities in the course of promotion; and he was informed that very strict regulations had been passed, if they were but insisted upon, against the interference of Members of Parliament. He agreed, however, with the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves), who was a very practical man, and knew what was going on, that it might be desirable to alter the system of nomination, which still left much more power in the hands of those sitting for the time being on the Ministerial than on the Opposition side of the House. Both the political parties had been to blame for the proposals which from time to time they put forward for disfranchising what were commonly called "the dockyard men," including a very large number of persons not properly dockyard labourers, but engaged in the public service in those places where the Government dockyards were situated. Those proposals, however, had the effect of exciting a very strong counter feeling to the effect that it was highly impolitic and inconsistent to disfranchise persons at the very time when the franchise was being extended as widely as possible. He (Mr. M. Chambers) would not attempt to follow either the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire in their objections to this Bill, because both of those right hon. Gentlemen had entered into what he would call petty details, and had overlooked the great principle of enfranchisement, which, though recognized by the leading men on both sides of the House, was wilfully violated in the persons of those who were admitted to be an honourable and trustworthy class of public servants. He therefore felt unable to vote with either of those right hon. Gentlemen on the present occasion.

Mr. Alderman LUSK supported the Motion for going into Committee on the Bill. After twenty-five years personal experience of their habits and conduct, he was able to bear testimony to their honesty, industry, and integrity. The civil servants in the Customs he could vouch for being enlightened and educated men, and such as ought to be entrusted with the franchise.

[Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,]

Mr. Alderman LUSK continued: He could not understand why the Government hesitated to enfranchise this class of Revenue servants. They would honestly exercise the franchise, and as it was not known which way these men would vote it could not be said it was a party question. He hoped the Government would withdraw their opposition to the measure.

Mr. OTWAY expressed his regret that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Colchester (Mr. Karslake), should have endeavoured to count out the House during a discussion on the proposition to confer the franchise on 29,000 of his fellow-countrymen. It seemed an improper proceeding, too, that the hon. and learned Gentleman, after making the Motion for counting the House, should immediately run from his place, and not return to it, to hear the comments which were sure to be made on such conduct. With regard to the question under discussion, he observed that at present there were only three classes of persons deprived of the franchise—paupers, criminals, and Revenue officers; and it was threfore incumbent on the Government to show why this degradation was placed on the last-mentioned body of men. There appeared to be no reasons for the disabilities under which the Revenue officers laboured, except such as were embodied in the Reports containing the opinions of the Commissioners of Customs and of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue. It would not be difficult to show that there was no force in those opinions, and if they were assumed to be valid they would go the length of justifying the extension of the existing restrictions so as to deprive the Revenue officers of the power of exercising either parochial or municipal duties. The great fallacy of the argument of the Commissioners was, however, that the possession of the vote would produce all the evils and lead to a political combination to obtain higher wages. But it was absurd to suppose that the mere possession of a vote gave a man political influence. He possessed that influence already through his friends and neighbours. The Government had circulated the Reports of the Commissioners of Customs and of the Inland Revenue; but why had they not made known the opinions of officers of the other Departments upon the question? For the simple reason that they were favourable to the Bill without exception. The bulk of opinion was in favour of the Bill, and he hoped the Government would not decline to crown the edifice of enfranchisement by conferring the vote upon 29,000 or 30,000 men who so well deserved it, and who were most capable of using it.

MR. MONK said, he was glad of the opportunity of replying to the speeches of his right hon. Friends the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Member for South Lancashire, in order that he might set them right in respect to the extraordinary error into which they had fallen in common with the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, whose Report had been laid upon the table of the House. The Bill before the House was simply and solely a Franchise Bill, and would merely enable the officers in the Revenue Departments to walk up to the polling-booths and there record their votes; whereas his right hon. Friends took it for granted that they might become political partizans, and act upon the committees of candidates at Parliamentary Elections. His Bill would enable them to do nothing of the sort. It did not repeal the Acts of William and Mary, of William III., and Anne, which made it penal in officers of the Revenue Departments to interfere in elections by persuading persons to vote, or by dissuading them from voting at the election of Members to serve in Parliament. The main objection to the Bill therefore fell to the ground. Its sole object was to relieve the officers in the Customs, Post Office, and Excise from the disability to vote which was imposed upon them by an Act of 1782, passed in consequence of their power to return the Members in seventy boroughs at a time when the House of Commons was numerically smaller than it now was. The principal argument made use of in favour of that Disability Act was that the officers themselves would be thereby relieved of a disagreeable task, the interpretation of which was, that they would be relieved of the painful necessity of voting for the Whig or for the Tory candidate according to the orders of the Government of the day. It was also stated that they had petitioned to be relieved of the franchise, as they were liable to dismissal if they dared to vote as they pleased. Those arguments no longer held good; but they were superseded by other arguments which, if they meant anything, meant that all the civil servants of the Crown should be disqualified from voting. He was certain that the House would be of opinion that there ought not to be one law for one class and another law for another class in the Civil Service. If these restrictions were to be maintained in the case of the officers in the Revenue Departments they ought to be extended to officers in the Army and Navy, and to every paid servant of the Crown, from the highest to the lowest, commencing with the hon. and right hon. occupants of the Treasury Bench. He was glad to see the First Lord of the Treasury in his place, as he wished to remind the right hon. Gentleman that when the Reform Bill of 1867 was in Committee in "another place," Earl Grey proposed to add a clause prohibiting all persons employed in the Civil Service, or other Departments of Government, from voting. That clause was strongly and successfully opposed by Her Majesty's Government. The Earl of Malmesbury, in stating the views of the Government, said—

> "He opposed the clause on the ground that this Bill was an enfranchising and not a disfranchising measure; and on that ground, if on no other, he should oppose the Amendment. But he also objected to it because it would disfranchise a class of persons as well educated and as competent to exercise the franchise as any body of men in England; and, thirdly, because it would be most invidious at the present moment

to make an exception in the case of these persons, against whom no imputation, as far as he was aware, had ever been brought in respect of the way in which they had exercised the franchise. He could not conceive a more insulting act to this very useful body of men than to disfranchise them."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxxix. 748-9.]

He commended these words and these sentiments to the consideration of Her Majesty's Ministers and of the House, for he had that faith in the sense of justice which animated hon. Members on both sides of the House that he believed there would be a general feeling in favour of applying them to the case of the civil servants generally. If they refused to allow free discussion and freedom of action in respect of the franchise, they would certainly raise a suspicion of unfairness, which would be detrimental to the interests of the State, and bring discredit upon the Executive. In truth, the Government was straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. The Chancellor of the Exchequer refused to grant the franchise to the highly-educated class of civil servants in the Revenue Departments, while he had no hesitation in extending it broadcast to those classes, among whom would be found many a "Horder's lot," who would vote for a pot of beer and 10*s.* a piece. He would ask what were the objections to this Bill? In reference to the Report of the Commissioners of Customs, he could not but express his astonishment that gentlemen of the high character and position of Mr. Goulburn and Mr. Grenville Berkeley could have signed such a document. He did not think he was using too strong an expression when he characterized their objections as of a frivolous and puerile description. The first objection, that the measure would introduce political agitation into Departments at present free from it, militated against any extension of the franchise whatsoever. Were the Revenue officers to have no political opinions, no political aspirations? In point of fact, they had them now, and they deemed it a stigma and a disgrace to be placed upon a different footing with respect to the franchise from their brethren in the other branches of the Civil Service. Social, religious, and political subjects were freely discussed in the Customs as in any other large establishment in the United Kingdom. The Commissioners went on to say that it would interfere with the convenience and discipline of the service to grant leave of absence to officers whenever they might request it for the purpose of voting, however inconvenient it might be to the public service. Was the microscopic inconvenience of granting leave of absence for an hour or two once in four or five years to be deemed a sufficient reason against restoring to them the franchise? Did not the same objection apply to clerks in the Treasury, the Home Office, the Foreign Office, the War Office, and the Admiralty? Was this argument allowed to weigh against the dockyard men when they were confirmed in their electoral rights last year? But, in point of fact, in nineteen cases out of twenty the Revenue officers would exercise the franchise in the place where they resided, and as the polling-booths were opened at eight o'clock in the morning they might record their votes before their official duties commenced. He would only observe, in reference to the objection, "that it might lead to political combinations for the purpose of obtaining from Her Majesty's Government an increase of salary," that if those officers had just cause of complaint or were insufficiently paid it was far better that their grievances should be brought before that House by their representatives in Parliament than they should be left to seethe below the surface and be brought to light through irregular channels. To the next objection he would reply, that if the superior officers dared not face the imputation of political motives they must be unfit for their high position. He then came to the crowning objection of all—

> "That it would be inconvenient to the officers themselves, as subjecting them at times to solicitations for their votes from which they are now free, and might place them in equivocal and difficult positions."

He thought it would be enough to remind the Commissioners of the well-known line—

> "Invitum qui servat, idem facit occidenti."

The Revenue officers did not fear being asked for their votes. But he would put it to the House whether that was not an extraordinary argument against conferring the franchise on as highly-educated a class as any in the country for a gentleman to use, who was not many years ago well known in that House as the "Whip" of the great Whig party—the namesake and relative of his hon. Friend the Member for Bristol? The force of absurdity could go no further. He came then to the Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue. But he must first ask, where was the Report from the General Post Office? The

Bill had been in the hands of the Post Office officials for more than twelve weeks, and yet "the oracles were dumb." Had Mr. Scudamore nothing to say on the subject? He (Mr. Monk) could assure the House that the Post Office officials had not been mute. He had presented a petition signed by nearly 1,000 *employés* in the London Post Office in favour of the Bill. Not a single petition had been presented against it. The Post Office Department employed upwards of 26,000 men scattered over the United Kingdom—nearly five times as many as the Customs, more than five times as many as the Excise Department. The obvious inference was, that the Post Office was favourable to the measure. He had already observed on the extraordinary error which pervaded the whole Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue. He was astonished that they should not have made themselves better acquainted with the provisions of the Bill. He observed that they abandoned the argument that the power of the Government would be unduly increased by conferring the franchise upon the officers of Excise; but they urged that it would be fatal to discipline in the country if the officers should become political partizans, and serve on election committees, or canvass for the candidates. As, however, they could do no more than simply record their votes under the Bill before the House, and would be liable to penal consequences if they interfered in elections as partizans, *cadit quæstio.* In conclusion, he would remind the House that the political objections of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue would apply with equal force to the local Commissioners of Taxes. Those gentlemen were allowed to vote. Of his own knowledge, he could state that they were sometimes election agents, frequently strong political partizans. He would allude to one case more — and one only. Some years ago the Coastguard Office was transferred from the control of the Board of Customs to the Admiralty. The men and the duties remained the same, but the disability to vote was removed, and he would ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether their duties were less efficiently performed in consequence of their enfranchisement? He trusted that the House would give a decided negative to the Amendment of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he felt confident that the decision of the House would be in favour of going into Committee upon the Bill.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided :* — Ayes 79 ; Noes 47 : Majority 32.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported* without Amendment ; to be read the third time upon *Thursday.*

MILITARY AT ELECTIONS (IRELAND) BILL—[Bill 95.]

(*Mr Serjeant Barry, Major Gavin, Mr. Esmonde.*)

SECOND READING. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [12th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time ;" and which Amendment was, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*The Earl of Mayo.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. BAGWELL said, this Bill was intended simply to extend to Ireland the law at present in force in England with regard to the employment of military at elections. Unwilling voters ought not to be escorted to the poll by soldiers for the purpose of being made to vote on the unpopular side, in accordance with the opinions of their landlords. The real truth was that the soldiers were employed not so much to protect the voters from violence as to prevent them from running away. In the county of Waterford at the late election the people were very anxious to support the Liberal candidate, whose father had represented the county before, and was highly popular. It happened that in a mountainous district a body of voters who were being brought under military escort to record their votes in favour of the unpopular candidate were stopped by a multitude of men and women, who refused to allow them to proceed. The resident magistrate who accompanied the troops, a man of great prudence and, at the same time, great determination, told him that he had scarcely pulled the Riot Act out of his pocket, when on looking round he saw that every one of the voters had made their escape. The fact was that it was the friends and neighbours, the sons and brothers of the voters themselves that had stopped them, and the voters were only too glad to get an excuse for running away. The success of the mountaineers on that occasion had the very worst consequences, for it was looked upon by them as a victory over the Queen's troops, while the troops, on the other hand, were greatly exasperated. The following day there were two tragical events in Dungarvan; the harbour-master of the town, a man who had always been on the Conservative side, was struck with a lance by one of the soldiers and killed at his own door, and another man in humble position was also killed. A verdict of "wilful murder" in the one case, and "manslaughter" in the other, was returned. [The SOLICITOR GENERAL: By a coroner's jury.] That was so. The soldiers were never brought to trial, for every opposition was given by the military authorities to the attempts that were made to find out the guilty parties. [The Earl of MAYO: That is quite contrary to the fact.] All he could say was that the soldiers were not brought forward for identification. [The Earl of MAYO: They were.] The noble Lord spoke from official knowledge, and therefore he would take it for granted that what he said was correct. But, at all events, he had stated what he had seen happen over and over again at elections, and he believed that it was decidedly impolitic, dangerous, and unconstitutional to employ the troops as they were now employed. The same things would happen at elections again, and at last some great disaster would occur. Then the Government would see that they had been wrong, and would consent to pass a Bill such as that which the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. Serjeant Barry) had introduced.

MR. SYNAN said, as an Irish Member, he thought the Bill was of some importance. It was one of a very simple character. It was a Bill to extend to Ireland a law which had been confirmed by a statute of George II., and by a subsequent statute of Her Majesty. The Resolutions of that House from time to time, commencing so far back as a declaratory Act of Edward I., repeated the words of the Act which he should now read to them as dealing with the constitutional question—namely, "That all elections be made without interruption or molestation by any commoner, governor, officer, or soldier." The Act also said "that all elections shall be free," and that it was essential to the rights and liberties of the people that it should be so. It further enacted that, as it had been the practice to remove all soldiers two miles out of town where an election took place, that should be so in future, only certain exceptions being made with respect to Royal troops in attendance on the Sovereign or Royal Family, and any person in the army entitled to vote. Then came an Act of the present reign, reciting the Act of George II., in which it was said that great expense was involved by the removal of the soldiers, and in which it was enacted that the soldiers be confined within barracks within two miles. That was the constitutional and Common Law of this country, directly aimed at attaining an object which was now of very vital consequence indeed in Ireland — namely, the freedom of election. They had lately been discussing in that House the provision of an Act for securing purity of election; but it appeared that at the present time freedom of election was more assailed in Ireland, and that that vice ought to be provided against. The state of this country at the time of the passing of the Acts referred to appeared to have been similar to what Ireland now was, and he could say with regard to Ireland that the purity of election in Ireland was seldom, indeed, in any way violated or corrupted. That being the state of things, one would suppose that, *primâ facie*, there would be no objection from any Member of this House on either side to so simple a Bill as this. As an hon. Member had stated, whenever a proposal was made in that House to assimilate the law of Ireland to that of England, the *onus probandi* rested with the opponents to show why the law should not be assimilated. He might say that the *onus probandi* laid with Her Majesty's Government to show why this Bill should not be passed — to show why they considered it improper, imprudent, and dangerous to extend the law of England to Ireland. He understood the noble Lord last night to assume the fact that there were exceptional circumstances in Ireland, and that therefore the law in England and Ireland ought not to be assimilated in this respect. But he apprehended that the assumption of the exceptional circumstances was not proof that the law ought not to be assimilated. The noble Lord said these troops were used with great prudence, and went on to show that the exceptional circumstances rendered it desirable that the law should remain as it was. The noble Lord stated that the law ought not to be assimilated; but these are no arguments against assimilation. He (Mr. Synan) did not like to make any particular mention of any particular boroughs, as that would be invidious; but he ventured to say this, that upon an examination of the Reports of Committees upon the subject it would be found that there had been more violence proved against representatives of the boroughs in England than in the Irish boroughs. He contended, therefore, that there were no exceptional circumstances to warrant a different law as to Ireland to that which applied to England on the subject. He admitted there were exceptional circumstances; but he denied that they could be urged as reasons for not assimilating the law. As regarded the elections, generally speaking, of course if there be not any particularly strong political feeling among the electors there was likely to be no hostility whatever between the proprietors and the rural voters, who, as far as the counties were concerned, were three-fourths tenants-at-will. But when any particularly exciting question arose — when the feeling was strong on both sides, this is what occurred —The landlord requested of his tenants to vote against the known and avowed political opinion of the tenant, and the known and avowed political opinion of the non-electors. When the ballot was asked for the purpose of protecting the Irish voter, the answer given was that the elector held his vote as a trust for the non-elector. The non-elector expressed his opinion; opinions were expressed on both sides; the elector not wishing to vote found out that the non-elector would not allow him to go to vote; the local agent, who might be a justice of the peace, took the matter in hand, and there was an order for the military. There was nobody to ascertain the opinion of the voter or of the non-elector. The order goes forth for the troops. The night before the election the electors were collected together: sometimes they were sent into the hotel, and sometimes taken into the house of the landlord for safe custody. But they got warning that they were to be escorted by the troops. The non-electors of the district, among whom were the families of the very voters themselves, met the troops and pelted them with stones. The troops then rushed at the mob, and the voters rushed off the cars and ran away: that was the invariable thing. These voters wanted an excuse to say to the landlord that they had done all they could to vote, but that they were prevented. An inspector of constabulary was examined in the Waterford case, and he said that when he came up to the place the voters had escaped, because, he said, the dragoons were not fit to escort them. Now, they made that which was a popular force in Ireland unpopular. The Irishman was by nature a soldier. He wished to join in the conflicts of war; but when they made the military force unpopular in Ireland they prevented that which ought to make Ireland a recruiting ground for the army. There certainly did not appear any exceptional circumstances of a nature to prevent an assimilation of the law of Ireland to that of England in this respect. There were no exceptional circumstances to warrant the use of the military. Whenever they asked for remedial legislation in other matters, and showed exceptional circumstances to warrant legislation, the answer they got was, "You cannot have remedial legislation. The law of England must be the law of Ireland. We cannot have one law for the one country and another for the other." The exceptional circumstances in Ireland were those he had shown, and they were such as to warrant, not to prevent, that House assimilating the law of Ireland to that of England in that respect. He came now to two extraordinary Acts of Parliament, which seemed to make the case conclusive. The Act of 25 & 26 *Vict.* c. 62, enabled a party who complained of not being allowed to vote to make application to the sheriff who was obliged to postpone the polling until voters came to the poll. Was that law enforced? No. In thousands of cases it had been proved that the voters did not want to come. They wanted an excuse; therefore, the military was of use for the purpose of taking away from the voter an excuse for justifying his absence, and for the purpose of coercing the public opinion of the district. There was another Act of Parliament which showed the total want of any necessity for this practice in Ireland. It was the Act of 13 & 14 *Vict.* c. 68, which enabled the voters to apply for as many polling-places as they liked. They did not take advantage of that power—they did not want it—therefore, neither of those Acts of Parliament were put into operation for the reason he had stated. It appeared to him that upon all the circumstances of the case, there was no reason whatever why the law of England and

Ireland should be different in that respect; and he thought, both in an Imperial point of view and in a point of view confined to Ireland, it would be a great advantage to both sides of the House if the law were assimilated. It would teach the Irish people that that House had that confidence in them that they would make a law to enable them to exercise their votes free from all control from whatever quarter it might come.

MR. BLAKE, in supporting the Bill, said that the military employed at Irish elections were really no other than election agents. He did not blame the noble Lord, who, when requisitions were sent to him, had no option but to send the military and escort voters who, at the bidding of the Conservative agents, were about to vote against their inclinations. Voters so escorted were looked upon by the people as prisoners; and, in proof of this, a party of convicts who were handcuffed, and were, unluckily, proceeding to their destination on the day of the County Waterford election, were carried off by the mob, against all the efforts of the constabulary. He had himself been assured by voters who were escorted by military to the poll that their earnest prayer was for the success of the candidate against whom, for want of leases, and for fear of being turned out of their holdings, they were compelled to vote. The first step towards establishing freedom of election in Ireland would be the passing of this Bill, and he hoped it would be carried by a large majority.

MR. O'BEIRNE said it had always been a principle of the British Constitution to look with the greatest jealousy on the employment of military at elections. By the ancient Common Law of this country all elections ought to be free, and an Act provided that previous to English elections the troops should be removed from the places of election to a distance of two miles. The onus of proof that in Ireland there were exceptional circumstances which prevented the carrying out of that principle in that country lay upon those who opposed this Bill. It was most impolitic to irritate the feelings of the Irish people against the military by employing them at elections. Irish elections might be conducted without the presence of troops at least as safely as English elections. The measure was founded on justice and expediency, and he was surprised that opposition to the Bill should come from the other side. Ireland was not behind England in its aspirations for military glory; but the noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland had admitted that the 12th Lancers had been received with execration at Dublin.

THE EARL OF MAYO denied that he had ever said that the 12th Lancers were received with execration; he had said that they were received with some hisses.

MR. O'BEIRNE continued to refer to the enactments against the employment of the military at elections in England, and contended that no election proceedings in Ireland had ever exceeded in brutality the exhibitions of an English mob at the right hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Lowe's) election for Kidderminster in 1857. In this unfortunate affair two persons lost their lives who had taken no part in the affray. He wished that the danger of the recurrence of such scenes should be obviated by the most stringent enactments. He deeply regretted that any such occurrence should have taken place, because it was calculated to shake the foundation of that affectionate confidence which had always subsisted between the people of Ireland and the soldiery of England.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN thought the time was come when they should put an end to the exceptional legislation which had been too much in vogue for Ireland. He did not believe that the present system was a fair one, and because it was not justifiable he thought that proper amendments should be effected.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WARREN) said, that the arguments advanced in support of the Bill, divested of exaggeration, were conclusive against it. The employment of the military at elections was alleged to have occasioned mischievous results; and yet the only instance that had been adduced was that of Dungarvan, in which it was not clearly established that the military were responsible for what occurred. The next argument which had been urged in support of the Bill was that it was desirable that the laws of England and of Ireland should be assimilated. In his opinion, however, if any alteration were made, the law of England ought to be assimilated to that of Ireland, for at Nottingham and Kidderminster there had been outrages of a kind almost unknown in Ireland. The English law in regard to the employment of the military at elections was founded on the assumption that the power of the Crown might be used to control the electors; but the history of Ireland did not record a single case where the Crown had, since the Union, exercised its influence at elections by means of the military. It had been argued that the present measure would promote freedom of election; but in answer to that it was sufficient to remark that the military were employed in Ireland not to coerce the voters, but to protect them from the violence of excited mobs. Speaking in reference to his personal knowledge of the West Riding of the county of Cork, and of some other districts, he could affirm that the tenants were perfectly aware that their interests were identical with the interests of their landlords, and that the great majority of them would vote with their landlords if they were not coerced in the opposite direction by the spiritual power of the priesthood.

Sir JOHN GRAY said, it was unfortunately true that instances had been known in Ireland of bands of tenants being brought up and forced to poll under the terror of the bayonets of the military. On every occasion when party feeling was strongly excited they had had these military riots. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to have utterly forgotten the case of Six Mile Bridge in 1862, when several persons were bayoneted. The military were used as the electioneering agents of the landlord ; and it was to put a stop to such abuses that they wished an effective measure to be passed. If they really wished for freedom of election, why not take the reasonable and practical mode of ensuring the freedom of the voters ? Nothing could be more inconsistent than to give perfect freedom to the electors in England, and, at the same time, to place the whole armed force of the Crown at the disposal of the landlords, for the purpose of coercing their tenantry to vote against their consciences, and driving them up to the polling-booths like prisoners. That was a state of things demanding a remedy. He did not complain that the influence of the Crown was exercised wrongfully; but he maintained that the power of the military was. He held that it was the duty of Parliament to equalize the laws of England and Ireland.

Lord CREMORNE remarked that in the county which he had the honour to represent a case occurred where a man was killed in consequence, not of the presence of the soldiers, but of their absence. He was afraid that that circumstance would prevent him from voting in support of the present Bill.

Mr. ESMONDE supported the Bill. He claimed that the troops were attacked in the first instance by the populace at Waterford. He would mention to the House a case which had occurred during an election at which he was a candidate. Forty voters belonging to a friend of his — [*Laughter.*] — Why, hon. Gentlemen seemed disposed to treat this high moral question very lightly. Those forty voters belonged to a friend of his own. He was not going to enter into a disquisition as to his friend's title to those voters. His friend had had the bad taste to order them to vote against him ; but, in order to avoid doing so, the voters requested that a "mob" might be sent out to stop them on their way to the poll. They further requested that they might be stopped near a wood, in order that they might get into it and avoid being caught again. He had reason to believe that the desired movement had been duly executed. Some of the voters polled for him, as his friend had not been able to recover the whole of his property after they got into the wood. It was to maintain the landlord's right in such property the military were employed at elections in Ireland. He believed the military would be delighted to be relieved from the duty of attending at elections.

Mr. Serjeant BARRY, in replying, reminded the House that, in the matter of the Westminster election, the House had passed a Resolution condemnatory of the employment of military at elections. It had been stated that the 12th Lancers, who had acted on the occasion of the Dungarvan riots, were hooted while forming part of the escort on the entry of the Prince and Princess of Wales into Dublin. The noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland had accused him of bad taste, because he had mentioned that circumstance in a former debate. The noble Lord's explanation of the circumstance was as extraordinary as that which he gave of the sense in which he had used the words "levelling up." [The Earl of Mayo : I never used the words.] Well, it was as extraordinary as the noble Lord's explanation of the sense in which he had used the words "elevation, and not confiscation."

Question put.

The House *divided* :—Ayes 55 ; Noes 96 : Majority 41.

Words *added*.

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*.

Bill *put off* for three months.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (METROPOLIS) BILL—[Bill 105.]

(*Mr. Mill, Mr. Thomas Hughes, Mr. Tomline, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Layard.*)

SECOND READING. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [17th June], "That the Bill be now read a second time;" and which Amendment was, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Bentinck.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. J. STUART MILL appealed to the Secretary of State for India, by whom the adjournment of the debate had been moved on the former occasion, to proceed with his argument.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, that at that late hour he did not feel justified in launching the House upon a fresh discusssion.

Mr. J. STUART MILL then briefly replied to some of the arguments advanced in the course of the debate a few days since upon this Bill, expressing his regret that the measure, instead of being met with a direct negative by a private Member, had not been left for the consideration of the Government.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *put off* for three months.

ASSIGNEES OF MARINE POLICIES BILL—[Bill 147.]

(*Mr. Candlish, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Norwood.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. CANDLISH moved that the House go into Committee *pro formâ*, with the view of making certain Amendments in the Bill to meet the objections of the Government, and having the Bill re-printed.

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE said, as this Bill originally stood, it would have been impossible for the Government to have given their assent to its proceeding further; because whatever may have been the intention of the promoters, there appeared on the face of the Bill an attempt to legalize what the law has always set its face against—namely, the dealing in marine policies, as if they were life policies, passing current like bills of exchange. Now, an endeavour has lately been made in this House to alter the law in the same sense with respect to fire policies—this was unsuccessful, and such a change would be fraught with peril. What is fire or marine insurance? It is a contract of indemnity from loss or damage arising from an uncertain event—the object is not to make a positive gain, but to avert possible loss. There cannot be indemnity without loss, or loss without interest. A policy, therefore, without interest is not insurance but a mere wager, and it would, in fact, hold out temptation to the assignee to set fire to the house, or scuttle the ship, which is the subject of the insurance. The hon. Member has, however, accepted Amendments, and is ready to adopt others which will very much alter his Bill, and will, I hope, secure two necessary things—first, the non-severance of the policy from interest in the property insured; and secondly, that which is absolutely essential when you assign an obligation or contract, subject to rights of set off and mutual credit—namely, protection to the underwriter from all liability beyond that to which he would have been subjected if the policy had not been assigned. The hon. Member has stated that there is a strong desire among the commercial classes connected with shipping for this measure. Under these circumstances, though objection may be taken to it as fragmentary legislation, I have no objection to the Motion that you, Sir, leave the Chair, in order that the Bill may be committed *pro formâ*, for the purpose of its being re-printed with Amendments.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

Bill *reported;* to be *printed*, as amended [Bill 203]; *re-committed* for *Thursday.*

BRISTOL WRIT.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Bristol, in the room of John William Miles, esquire, whose Election has been determined to be void."—(*Mr. Noel.*)

MR. BASS moved, as an Amendment, that—

"The writ for the City of Bristol be not issued till seven days after the evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Bristol Election Petition has been printed."

The hon. Member for Clackmannan (Mr. Adam) had given notice that he intended to move for the Writ; but the matter had been allowed to drop, and the prevailing opinion among hon. Members was that the Motion would not be made without a renewal of the Notice. In the case of Derby, in 1858, the Committee reported that there had been nine acts of bribery committed, and that in only one instance had the bribe reached £5. But under those circumstances the House had not permitted a Writ to be issued for that borough for a period of six months. He was informed, he might add, that great excitement prevailed in Bristol, and that a regular saturnalia was in progress there, owing to the impression that the House would find it impracticable in the present state of affairs to deal with any acts of bribery or to visit them with punishment. That being so, he hoped the House would see the propriety of assenting to his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Writ for the City of Bristol be not issued till seven days after the evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Bristol Election Petition has been printed."—(*Mr. Bass.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. LABOUCHERE contended that the question was one of too much importance to be discussed at so late an hour as one o'clock, and moved the adjournment of the debate.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

MR. AYRTON said, he thought the occupants of the Treasury Bench ought to give the House some reason for the mode of proceeding adopted by them in the present instance. It could not be necessary at that hour of the morning to surprise the House with such a Motion, unless an election were necessary within two or three days. The Report of the Chairman of the Bristol Election Committee was to the effect that bribery had not extensively prevailed at the recent election, considering the number of the electors. Now, that was a statement which involved some ambiguity, and the House could not, in his opinion, properly deal with the matter until they had before them the evidence which had been taken. ["Divide!"] He had no doubt that Gentlemen opposite, in the state of the House, wished to divide; but he objected to this matter being made the subject of a "catch" majority, as was the case the other night when the Chancellor of the Exchequer was placed in a very peculiar and difficult position. A stigma would attach to the Government if they lent themselves to the proposition just made by one with less responsibility than themselves, and he thought that the course in which the Government was now engaged was derogatory to their honour.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the hon. and learned Gentleman, who had spoken with his usual fluency, had not adduced a single argument to induce the House to postpone the issue of the Writ. The hon. and learned Gentleman assumed that corrupt practices extensively prevailed at the last election for Bristol; but had not adduced one fact in support of his assumption.

MR. AYRTON moved that the Report of the Bristol Election Committee be read.

Report of Committee [25th June] read.

MR. LOCKE observed, that the commission of every improper act which could occur at an election—bribery, corruption, treating, and personation—was mentioned in the Report; and he therefore thought that the House should not be in a desperate hurry to issue the Writ. They should have the opportunity of considering how the Bristol election had been conducted. He was at a loss to know why the Ministerial Benches should now be so well filled, and why there was now such a great desire for the issue of the Writ. He would sit to any hour, and move those Motions which were necessary to save the honour of the House on this occasion, when such a surprise was attempted by the other side.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he thought the sudden proceeding on the other side required explanation. The Report of the Committee showed that corrupt practices did not extensively prevail in Bristol, and when a Report of that sort was presented it was the practice to issue a Writ in order that a large number of persons who had a right to be represented should not suffer by the misconduct of a limited portion of the constituency. No surprise was intended, and the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Noel) told several hon. Members that he was about to move the Writ. He did not see why they should not come to a conclusion to-night, rather than adjourn the matter to another evening.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER considered that the Writ should have been moved at the commencement of the proceedings, not at the rising of the House. There were twenty-four cases of bribery proved, and a strong case had been made out for making an example in such a case. He was disappointed at the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman, as he thought he would have acceded to the Motion to adjourn the debate. There were good reasons to postpone the issue of the Writ until the evidence was before the House; and there was no time when it was more necessary to give a warning to the new constituencies.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he could see nothing to warrant the suspension of the Writ; but the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Ayrton) having expressed his determination to employ his great physical strength in preventing the decision of the question to-night, and misapprehension having been said to exist on the part of some hon. Members, he thought the best course was to agree to the adjournment.

Debate *adjourned* till *Thursday.*

FAIRS (METROPOLIS) BILL.

On Motion of Sir James Fergusson, Bill for the prevention of the holding of unlawful Fairs within the limits of the Metropolitan Police District, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir James Fergusson and Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 205.

COURT OF SESSION (SCOTLAND) [SALARIES.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament for that purpose, of the Salaries of the Officers of the Court of Session, and of the Bill Chamber of the said Court, and of the Commissioners for Teinds, in pursuance of the provisions of any Act of the present Session relating to the Court of Session in Scotland.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

Sir Stafford Northcote

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 1, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Ordered*—General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment*; Indorsing of Warrants*.

First Reading—General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment* [206]; Inland Revenue* [207]; Indorsing of Warrants* [208].

Second Reading — Oxford and Cambridge Universities [30]; Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland)* [194].

Select Committee — Electric Telegraphs, Major Cornwall Legh *disch.* and Colonel John W. Fane *added.*

Committee — University Elections (Voting Papers)* [187]; Libel (Ireland) [199]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [200].

Report—University Elections (Voting Papers)* [187]; Libel (Ireland) [199]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [200].

Considered as amended — University Elections (Voting Papers)* [187]; Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts Amendment* [197]; Bankruptcy Act (1861) Amendment* [145].

Third Reading — University Elections (Voting Papers)* [187]; Medway Regulation Act Continuance* [196]; Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts Amendment* [197].

Withdrawn — Weights and Measures (Metric System) [44]; County Financial Boards (No. 1)* [51]; Libel [3].

NAVY—NAVAL CHAPLAINS.

QUESTION.

Mr. EYKYN said, he wished to ask, If the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty have come to any decision on the organization in regard to the improvement, pay, and position of Naval Chaplains; and, whether it is the intention of the Board of Admiralty to appoint commissioned Presbyterian and Roman Catholic Chaplains for the service of Her Majesty's Fleet at home and abroad?

Lord HENRY LENNOX, in reply, said, that in pursuance of a promise given by the First Lord of the Admiralty an inquiry had been made as to the position of navy chaplains, and the Board of Admiralty were unanimously agreed that these gentlemen had a perfect right to be placed on the same footing with their brethren in the army, both as to pay and position; but the Government had not been able, in the present financial year, to make arrangements for carrying this into effect. In reply to the second part of the Question, he must inform the hon. Gentleman that it was not the intention of the Government to grant commissions to Roman Catholic and Presbyterian chaplains for the service of Her Majesty's Fleet; but they desired to improve the pay and position of the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian chaplains at Sheerness, Chatham, and Portsmouth, and also to entitle them to the receipt of pensions. The same financial reason to which he had already alluded had prevented this being done at present.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL—[BILL 44.]

(*Mr. Ewart, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Baines, Mr. John Benjamin Smith, Mr. Graves.*)

COMMITTEE. BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for Committee read.

MR. J. B. SMITH said, that before moving that the Order be discharged, he wished to call the attention of the House and of the Government to the present anomalous state of the law. The late Government opposed a Bill brought in by his hon. Friend the Member for Dumfries (Mr. Ewart) for the adoption of the system of metric weights and measures; but being defeated by a large majority, they agreed to bring in a Bill permitting the use of metric weights and measures. Persons, however, who were found using them were prosecuted for having these measures in their possession. The case was laid before the Law Officers of the Crown, who held that it was lawful, according to this Act, to use metric weights and measures, but that if a person were found in possession of them he would be liable to be prosecuted. His hon. Friend the Member for Dumfries (Mr. Ewart) thereupon brought in a Bill enacting that the metric system of metric weights and measures should be adopted in this country. A large majority had affirmed the second reading of his hon. Friend's Bill, and he must do the present Government the justice to say that they had heartily supported the measure. It was, however, necessary that proper metric standards should be provided to verify these weights and measures, and the Government had appointed a Royal Commission to consider the question. Next year he hoped the Government would bring in a Bill and carry this great question to a successful issue. Countries containing a population of no less than 270,000,000 had adopted the metric system of weights and measures, and only a few days ago the King of Prussia congratulated his Parliament upon the adoption of this system throughout the whole of Germany. The Parliament of Prussia, on its part, had moved the Government to take into its consideration the best means of carrying into effect an international system of monies as well as weights and measures. He moved that the Order of the Day be now discharged.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE denied that the division on the second reading was a proof of the general feeling on the subject. It was one of those political contrivances by which both parties—the Government and the Opposition—had avoided an issue which neither wished to encounter. The second reading was affirmed on the understanding that the measure was not to proceed further. Practical men in the country were largely protesting against the inconvenience which the adoption of the system would entail.

MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that that was not the time to discuss the merits of the measure.

Order *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITIES BILL—[BILL 30.]

(*Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Grant Duff.*)

SECOND READING. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [13th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time;" and which Amendment was, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Walpole.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. POWELL said, he would point out, as one of the objections to this Bill, that it had not received the favour of the Universities themselves, for as regarded Cambridge alone, petitions signed by no fewer than 2,232 Members of the Senate had been presented against it. It was a common thing to compare the German and other Continental Universities with the English; but, in truth, they were wholly dissimilar. The former were founded by the State, directed by the State, and, in fact, were the creatures of the State; whereas the latter consisted in a great degree of Colleges which were the result of private benefactions. But although the

Continental Universities were the creatures of the State, the State was sometimes afraid of its own creation. We often heard of foreign Universities being closed on account of disturbances among the students; but when had it happened, at least in recent generations, that Oxford or Cambridge University had been closed in consequence of disturbances among the students? He thought the old Universities of England had no cause to shrink from the comparison, and that they had not failed in their first duty of guiding and forming the character of the youth of the country. Most of the Colleges of our Universities were founded or enriched by wealthy Prelates, who gave of their abundance, by clergymen who gave from their small pittances, or by laymen whose affection to the interests of religion and learning induced them to give according to their ability. Though some Royal personages had in certain cases contributed to their funds, they were in the main the result of private donations given, not for the support of any merely secular system, but for the promotion of a higher education, to be conducted in the spirit of religion. That object they had fulfilled, and the interest now taken in theological subjects, not only by those who were preparing for Holy Orders, but also by students who were preparing for lay careers, showed that religion was still alive and active in those ancient institutions. No one could say that the Universities had not been faithful to their trust. He spoke particularly of Cambridge—his own University—and he was able to say that there never was a time when the Colleges did their work more effectually, when the altars of their chapels were resorted to by more earnest worshippers, and when those who were designed for Holy Orders received a more effective training. He asked the House, therefore, to pause before it rudely broke up a system which worked so well and so beneficially. The great object which he and those who believed with him had in view was, that the governing power in the Universities should be in the hands of persons holding one faith; they had no wish to keep Nonconformist students out of the Colleges, but would rather they should come in. It was most desirable that Nonconformists should participate in the higher culture and the genial influences of a University education; and he hoped the effect of that culture and those influences upon that class of students would be to induce them, at least in after life, if not before, to join the Communion of the Church of England. But it was most important to keep the governing bodies in intimate connection with that Church. When dealing with ethics, with history, and even with law, it might be requisite that the teaching should retain the impress of the Church of England; but with respect to chemistry, and some other sciences, the same necessity might not exist; theology might, indeed, be turned into acids, but it would not be easy to turn acids into theology. It was not possible to expel religion from places of education. The cry for its expulsion reminded him of the words of the Roman poet, reproving the proud and highly-luxurious men of his time—

> "Naturam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurret,
> Et mala perrumpet furtim fastidia victrix."

Such would be the case with Christianity and religion. They might endeavour to expel religion from their seats of learning; yet, once expelled, he believed it would ever return. But they did not know in what shape it would return. They should note the fact that the same year which had seen the Liberal party endeavouring to throw open Trinity College, Dublin, had been characterized by the putting forth of claims on the part of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to exclusive religious teaching, such as had not before been advanced in this country. They knew what the religious teaching in Oxford and Cambridge was—it was the teaching of the Church of England; a Church comprehensive in her articles of belief, and even more comprehensive in her practice than in the letter of her laws. Let them take heed that they did not expel that which was so beneficent, and which worked so well; let them retain, while they still had it, that which combined a firm adherence to faith with fearless investigation, and which, while it taught the tenets of an ancient and venerable religion, at the same time appealed to reason, without which religion was apt to degenerate into the assertions of unscrupulous theologians, and the superstition of a misguided and an ignorant people.

Mr. GRANT DUFF said: The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has told us a great deal about the petitions which have been presented against this Bill; but although the two Universities have affixed their corporate seals to petitions against it, as indeed they have done to petitions against almost every good Bill in which they have been pleased to take an interest for several ages, the House is nevertheless aware that, in weighing petitions, quality must be considered as well as quantity. Now, petitions have been received by the House which show that our Bill is supported very powerfully indeed amongst the persons who are really carrying on the educational work of our two Universities. So strongly, indeed, is it already supported by resident opinion in Oxford and Cambridge, and so steadily are the reformers gaining ground there, that I, for one, after what has happened with regard to the Bill of the hon. Member for Dumfries (Mr. Ewart), would be quite content to leave this matter of tests in the hands of the working tutors and Professors of the Universities, if they had the power to deal with it. Unfortunately, however, the ultimate power in the Universities resides not in the Universities themselves, but with the country clergy; and even if the country clergy were favourable to us, they could do nothing without the interference of this House, because what we are striking at are not mere University regulations, but legislative enactments. In advocating this Bill, I, though a humble member of the Church of England, admit most fully that I am thinking only of the nation at large, and of the higher education in particular, and am taking no thought whatever of the sectarian interests either of the Church of England or of any other religious body; but, if it were any special business of mine to look after the sectarian interests of the Church of England, I have no hesitation in saying that I should adopt precisely the same policy. I am afraid I think better of the strength of the Church of England than her professed advocates; for I firmly believe that out of 100 Nonconformists who should go up to Oxford, 95 per cent would leave it, if not Churchmen, at least very willing to live good friends of the Church considered as a religious institution, "buttresses," as Sidney Smith said, "if not pillars." Hon. Gentlemen opposite are as anxious to prevent Nonconformists going to Oxford, as was the friend of the Jew in Decameron, to prevent him going to Rome; but, however badly they may think of the Church of England, as it appears in its favourite University, they may take comfort from that famous story, since they will remember that the Jew came back from Rome a very good Christian, for he said—

> "That religion must be indeed divine which can maintain itself in spite of all that goes on in the high places of the Church."

I take a different view from hon. Gentlemen opposite. It appears to me that the English Church shows so well in both her Universities that the members of all sects who go up thither will be greatly shaken in their allegiance to their own sects, and drawn to one or other of her religious parties, always, of course, excepting the Roman Catholics, who can meet her prestige and traditions by a prestige and traditions older than her own; but then everyone knows that, for the present, and for, I fear, a long time to come, the number of Roman Catholics who will go to our Universities is quite trifling. The whole influence of the Roman hierarchy in England, and the whole strength of the party now in power at Rome, will be exerted against their doing so. Gentlemen on the other side are misled, I think, by the long connection between the Universities and the Church; but do they not comprehend that the only reason why the people have not long since interfered to put the Universities on a new footing is that, till quite recently, the mass of the people has felt no more interest in the internal affairs of Oxford and Cambridge than they have in the internal affairs of the Carlton or of Brooks's? Now, all that is being changed. The people are beginning to take an interest in the Universities. The question of their reform is becoming a question for addresses and hustings speeches. How, then, should the people of this free country, when they once begin to care about the Universities, allow them to remain in the hands of the dominant Church any more than is the case with the Universities of France or of Prussia, of Holland or of Switzerland; nay, even with those of Italy, hard by the cave of the old lion himself, if I may be permitted to borrow the expression of a Cardinal? More than twenty years have gone by since the Scotch Universities liberated themselves, except as to their Theological Chairs, from the last remnants of ecclesiastical control. Why is it that they so long preceded England in the path of reform? Simply because the Scotch Universities have a far greater hold on the masses of the nation than Oxford and Cambridge have hitherto had. If their concerns had been as remote from the business and bosoms of the majority of Scotchmen, as have been the concerns of the corresponding institutions in England from the business and bosoms of the vast majority of Englishmen, who knows what strange customs and foolish tests might be now prevailing in Aberdeen or Glasgow? Till a few years ago, the truest reflection of the spirit, of Oxford at least, was to be found in the pages of the *Lyra Apostolica.* I suppose it would be difficult, in the whole range of English 19th century literature, to find a book more utterly and hopelessly uncongenial to the feelings and ideas of the great mass of Englishmen—of that great mass which will henceforward rule the rulers. The ideal University which we oppose to that semi-monastic University, of which the men of the 1833 movement dreamed, is a University which shall gather into one focus all the light of the age, which shall lead the scientific movement in every branch of knowledge. We want a University which shall occupy itself in the discovery and dissemination of truth, wholly irrespective of the interests of any sect or party, religious or political. I do not know that I can better express the sort of spirit which we wish to see prevailing in the seats of our highest education, than by reading a few lines from an address lately delivered on the subject of Universities by the German historian, Von Sybel. If the hon. Member who has just sat down had given a tithe of the attention to the German Universities which he has done to the English, he would not, of all accusations in the world, have brought against the German Universities the accusation of being mere echoes and creatures of the State. Von Sybel says—

> "During the preparatory years of school life, the principle of authority must necessarily hold paramount sway; and again, in later life, the force of circumstances and authority have a large share in determining our course of action; but there should be at least one moment in the life of every educated man in which all the organs of authority—the nation, the State, and the teacher himself—should proclaim to him, as his first and highest commandment, that he be intellectually free. . . . Whether the individual man, as a result of his studies and labours, takes this or that direction—whether he becomes Liberal or Conservative, re-actionary or progressist, orthodox or Liberal—for us who direct the University system, that which is really essential is this, that whatever the youth becomes, he should become it, not from mere youthful habit, not from dim sentiment, or traditional obedience, but that for the rest of his life he should be whatever he is as a result of scientific consideration, critical examination, and independent resolve."

Is that the sort of language which the hon. Member expects from echoes and creatures of the State? Why, he ought to know that *Lehrfreiheit*—the freedom of speech in the Professor's chair—is the very life

of the German Universities. Now, which of these two spirits—the mediæval spirit of bondage, or the modern spirit of liberty—do hon. Gentlemen think that the people of England will wish to see for the future prevailing in our Universities? If anyone answers "the first"—if he really believes that the English people will allow these vast endowments to be directed to the support of semi-monastic Utopias—it is, of course, very right for him to oppose our Bill. But if this is hopeless, surely he must accept our idea of what a University should be, and endeavour to break down these sectarian barriers as quickly as possible. I do not see what alternative there is, for no one can wish to prolong the present wholly illogical and unsatisfactory state of things. No one can wish to see the Universities continuing year after year the battle-field of contending political parties. Hon. Gentlemen opposite blame us and our friends at the Universities for stirring up strife; but they do us much injustice. It is not us with whom they are fighting. The whole spirit of the age, the whole of its literature, the whole of its deepest and calmest political tendencies, the whole of its fierce and feverish life is in the opposing camp. As has been truly said, "the stars in their courses are fighting against them." Depend upon it, he was one of the most far-seeing, as he assuredly was one of the sternest, of 19th century Conservatives, who cried—"Power is against us, the masses are against us, the stream of time is against us."

MR. BERESFORD HOPE said: I am sorry that my hon. Friend the Member for the Elgin burghs, who has just addressed the House, should have done himself an injustice in the line of argument which he has adopted in supporting this Bill. Those who have listened to his speech and who have merely read the Bill of my hon. Friend opposite, on the back of which the name of the hon. Member for Elgin is also found, would be tempted to believe that he had not himself read the Bill which he has been supporting. This measure is an amalgamation of two preceding Bills—the one of the hon. and learned Member for Exeter for opening the Universities, and the other of the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock for opening the Colleges. But from first to last of the speech just concluded not one word was heard with regard to the constitution of the Colleges. From first to last my hon. Friend dealt with the secondary and minor element of the present Bill — the opening of the Universities—and so ignorance on his own part of his own measure might have been reasonably inferred by those who have been listening to his oration; but in exposing himself to such criticisms, he really does himself an injustice. He is not forgetful, but only too candid. He overleaps the present stage of the controversy, and opens up to us the further designs of that section of thinking men whose mouthpiece he has constituted himself in this House. He tells us that which, if he had been a better tactician, he would have kept to himself—that by supporting this Bill we shall be entrapped into further concessions to the party of relentless progress. He lets out the secret of this Bill, and he tells us what it has for its ultimate object with an unconsciousness of results which is from its innocence almost engaging. It is almost with an exuberance of intellectual *abandon* that he throws himself forward into that dreamland in the promised advent of which the friends of free thought love to indulge, and it does not occur while indulging in such visions that there is such a thing as binding force in the limitations no less than in the permissions of an Act of Parliament. He suppresses the restrictive provisions of the printed Bill, while he flaunts before us that which he intends shall be the ultimate result. There is no disguise about the goal at which we are to arrive; the Bill, as drafted and printed, is intended in the first place to open seats in the Senate of the University of Cambridge and of the Convocation of the University of Oxford to Nonconformists. Well, that is a proposal which may be good or may be bad—I shall have something to say on that subject presently—but which is in itself a clear and intelligible issue. In the second place the Bill goes on to repeal a portion of the Act of Uniformity, so as to enable the Colleges to elect, if they please, Nonconformists as Fellows, independent of the Church of England. [Mr. FAWCETT: Hear, hear!] The hon. Member for Brighton cheers this, and I admit that it is so far a clear and intelligible issue which we are called upon to discuss. But after we have agreed upon the abstract nature of the Bill, we shall have to consider what the effect of these changes will be. Here I seek enlightenment from my hon. Friend the Member for the Elgin burghs, who, in his chivalrous and ardent manner, puts himself forward as the mouthpiece of the movement party in this House. If he has realized to himself what it is proposed to do under this Bill, the conclusion in which he lands us is that the object is not to admit Mr. Aldis and other eminent Nonconformists to Fellowships; it is not to admit Mr. Aldis and those who are in the same case with him to votes in the Senate House; but it is to put in a position of independence and of power boys—it may be of twenty years of age—at the moment when, in the glowing language of my hon. Friend, they have in the pride of scientific superiority cast aside all their former faith, all traditionary influences, all school teaching, all home associations, and are starting forward on a career of absolute and triumphant scepticism from the stand-point of a moment of unqualified and unblushing nihilism. That is the enticing picture drawn with a glowing pencil, which is presented to us as the thing which we should desire if we consent to read this Bill a second time. So enlightened and so forewarned, I call upon the believing Nonconformists, men of a fixed faith which they accept, and in whose behalf they are ready to make substantial sacrifices, to say if that is a picture which meets with their approval? I call upon them to see the final issues of that movement which they are now blindly helping on.

The advocates of this Bill may be divided into four classes; there is, first, the class of Liberal Churchmen, members of the Church of England, who would honestly and anxiously endeavour to maintain the predominance of Church teaching and Church influence in the Universities, but who still wish to offer some more liberal concessions towards Dissenters than the Universities at present hold out; and to frame, so to speak, a wide Conscience Clause. Without agreeing with this party, I understand it and I sympathize with it, and I should hail some suitable point at which we might meet. That party is ably and honourably represented by my hon. and learned Friend who brought in this Bill. No doubt there were passages in his speeches which might lead those who are less acquainted with him than I am to doubt this conclusion; but he must allow me to say that though there were these sentences which I heard with regret, yet that they might be described by a phrase which he has himself made classical in another place—namely, "tall talk." But, putting aside this "tall talk," I venture to class him as an advocate of this Bill out of no evil feeling towards the Church of England, but from a conscientious belief that the liberty he claims will be beneficial to the Church as well as to the State. That is one intelligible view of the case. Another view, which is also clear and intelligible, was expressed with great ability and fairness in the maiden speech of the hon. and learned Member for Stroud. That Gentleman desired additional culture for the Nonconformists, to whom he himself belongs, as well as an equal share in collegiate advantages; and he asserted their moral right to enjoy a position in the Universities adequate for the objects which he was advocating. In supporting his cause with such arguments, and in extolling the value of those good things in which he claimed a share for his co-religionists, the hon. and learned Member was in truth paying a high compliment, although from the other side of the hedge, to the old Church system of University teaching, which, by his own showing, had borne such good fruits, of which the Dissenting stock could show no parallel. Well, I can respect that feeling. I can deal with a claim urged upon such considerations. I respect also the feeling of the Member for Exeter. Either or both of them might form the elements for a satisfactory compromise on this subject. But there is a third party which it is not unfair to say is represented in this House by a Member whom I do not see here now—if he were, I would say to him what I have already said of the party he represents—I mean my right hon. Friend the Member for Calne. That is a party which, without disrespect, I may call the hard and dry secular educationists. That party cares comparatively little for the supernatural and the future—they do not regard theology as a study which must have its place provided for it in the great scheme of education; their wish is to turn out good human machines for getting on in the battle of life. That party's standpoint is one with which I do not sympathize; but still I can understand it. They desire to create a good school of students in the natural sciences, to turn out eminent engineers, to teach the abstruser branches of mathematics and arithmetic, and all those other things of which the elements are to be ground in by village schoolmasters, to the advanced classes and the bigger boys of the State. Their school is a complete chainwork embracing all grades, embracing fine-drawn secular teaching. But there is yet a fourth class of which the hon. Member for Elgin is the outspoken mouthpiece. That is the party of absolute free thought. Its leaders care as little for Dissent in itself as they do for the Church, and I believe that they care very little either for the hard practical educationists; they stand upon their own pedestals—self-sent apostles of a new philosophy of which the foundation is denial of all authority—iconoclasts of traditionary beliefs, on the ruins of which they profess to rear the temple of a system, of which the main condition is the unfettered recognition of free thought on all questions. That is the party of which my hon. Friend desires us to take him as the representative. Here let me guard myself, and let me beg the House not to think that I am opposed to free thought, supposing that it is thought, and that it is free but not unbridled. On the contrary, I hail it, if taken up in the spirit —I will not say of Christian—but of intellectual humility, with a deep sense of the littleness of the human intellect, even when most acute, and of the claim to respect which the accumulated authority of the collective intellect of ages past and present presents when brought in contact with the single intellect of the individual investigator. Let the intellectual school proceed in this spirit, and if it pursue its course in the freest spirit of investigation, I shall hail it with satisfaction. I look upon the recent discoveries in geology and the physical sciences as among the greatest blessings given to our race. But if you are to carry on free investigation you must do so in a constructive, not in a destructive spirit; you must analyze as men who are rather hopeful to prove, as the result of your inquiries, that the old truths stand sound upon your new principles, than yearning to wipe away that which has been the solace and the mainstay of the human soul in former days, whether in matters moral or intellectual. You must labour as men who treat all truth as portions of one great circle of which revelation stands at one pole and investigation at the other—a circle so vast in its circumference that long segments seem but straight lines, and that the students starting right and left from the same point —some following the guidance of investigation, and others of authority—seem to be moving in opposite directions, never again to meet, while really they are but traversing different segments of that one great circle destined in the dim coming ages to face again at the other end of the unperceived diameter. This is the spirit of investigation followed by the Christian and open to the philosopher, whether in politics, science, or morals; and if the abolition of all tests would have the effect of increasing this spirit in our Universities, I would heartily bid the enterprize God speed. But I cannot help seeing that the very contrary is the case with some who are foremost in the present contest, and that there is a party among us so eminently philosophic that it looks upon every opinion which has been held by former schools as a narrow bigotry which can only injure and weaken free thought. I am driven to the conviction that it does not wish for the happy marriage of religion and philosophy, but would rather construct the new system upon the ruins of that which all who have gone before them held divine and sacred. If I seek the prototype of this party I fear that I must look for it in the school of the comedian's sophist, hung up aloft in his basket, and loudly proclaiming by the mouth of his disciples that his lecture-room is the "thinking place of wise souls" —*Ψυχῶν σοφων τοῦτ᾽ ἔστι φροντιστῆριον.* To the cloud-deities of this sham Socrates —not that real Socrates who died as a martyr for his convictions, but the imaginary and burlesque Socrates presented by Aristophanes—we may be called upon to sacrifice our Universities, if we throw open the endowments not in the name of conscientious though dissident belief, but of free thought. I am not talking without book. I have lately been perusin a volume written by one of the most moderate representatives of the advanced thinkers—the head of a House in Oxford —a gentleman for whom personally I have a high regard and respect, and who I am sure is sincere in whatever views he promulgates. He was one of two contributors to *Essays and Reviews* out of seven, whose discourse did not give any considerable shock to tolerably well-balanced minds. I mean the Rector of Lincoln College, Mr. Mark Pattison, who has lately published a remarkable book, entitled *Suggestions on Academical Organization with especial Reference to Oxford.* I seldom trouble the House with quotations; but I will produce one passage, which I can testify fairly represents the general spirit of the Essay. Mr. Pattison's scheme of reform is singularly wide and sweeping. He is a disciple of the "higher culture," so called—the philosophy that is of my hon. Friend—descended by a very authentic pedigree from the teaching of the old sophist up in his basket. In the eyes of those who represent this phase of opinion, the simple and laborious task of educating youth is a base and mechanical pursuit, and the Universities are bound to subordinate it to higher flights of thinking and theorizing. There are indeed certain Colleges in Oxford of an outer class that might be called upon to fulfil such subaltern functions as the academical Gibeonites, as hewing out scholars and drawing for Fellows. The remaining Colleges are to be filled with men of science, who are to share their endowments, not with undergraduates, but with men of mature years and scientific pursuits, whose function in life will be perpetual argument. Here is one of the passages from Mr. Pattison's book. He is speaking of the Church revival—he calls it the Catholic revival—but, as he explains, it is the revival of zeal and earnestness which has characterized the Church of England as well as that of Rome, and he declares it to be the great opponent of his schemes of University reform. He says—

> "For my own part, I think the fears of the Catholic party, whether within or without the National Establishment, are substantially well founded." . . . . . "It is the school of classics (*Literæ Humaniores*) only, and specifically the philosophical subjects which have developed themselves within that school, which alarm the Church party. This the party must either conquer, or be content to see all the minds that come under the influence of that training—that is, all the minds of any promise that pass through Oxford—hopelessly lost to them."—[pp. 298-9.]

The House will see that this conflict of opinion is represented as an internecine conflict, in which either the Church party must destroy philosophy or philosophy must destroy the Church party. There is no compromise possible, no accommodation to be thought of. Now that is an assumption which I peremptorily deny. I do not want to see either party destroyed; and yet it is the deliberate opinion of a moderate and eminent and learned member of the advanced party that fusion is impossible, and that the bitter end must lead to destruction on the one side or on the other. This is a warning which, as men of sense, we must heed while dealing with the Bill before the House. Mr. Pattison then denounces a pamphlet, which had been previously published on the same subject, as virtually a reactionary pronouncement; and to show to the House what is the nature of the views contained in that pamphlet, which has brought down the dissent of the Rector of Lincoln, I will read the passage which he singles out for criticism —

> "I venture very earnestly to urge the conviction that the intellectual freedom for which Mr. Mill gives Oxford credit, and which, within the bounds defined by Christian humility, I do not desire to abridge, would be more safely exercised, and would be stronger and more healthy, if there were less ignorance of common principles and laws of nature, more security for sound training in exact studies, admitting of definite certainty, requiring care in the statement of the *datum* and the *quæsitum*, imposing due regard to the statement of evidence, before young men are plunged into the ocean of doubt about the reality of the faculties, intellectual and moral, with which we are endowed by our Creator."—[pp. 302-3.]

Well, now, who is the author of that pamphlet? Is it Dr. Pusey, or some right rev. Bishop? Not at all. It is the production of a Member of this House, known and respected by us all, himself a prominent advocate of this Bill. Those are the words of the hon. Member for North Devon (Mr. Acland), a supporter of the proposed concession, but from a different stand-point from that occupied by the Rector of Lincoln or the hon. Member for the Elgin burghs.

Now, what is the inference which I would draw from these passages, and from the fact of the different parties which I have mentioned combining to push on the change? It is that those who come forward to urge these reforms do not merely differ in the intensity of their views, but that they hold positions absolutely irreconcilable, and that while they agree in the immediate cry they are in total discord as to their ultimate intentions. There are on one side—not to talk of the secular educationists—orthodox Dissenters and liberal Churchmen, both fairly agreeing together; and there is on the other the party to which I will not pay so unpalatable a compliment as to say that its members are either Churchmen or Dissenters. Their thoughts are far too occupied with new-world speculations to leave them time to care for such secondary questions as forms or creeds. If they are born Churchmen they naturally go on calling themselves Churchmen; if they are born Dissenters they naturally go on calling themselves Dissenters; while, in a case of doubt, they probably give the preference to the Establishmentas such. To resume, then: on the one side are marshalled the votaries of free thought under the banner of the negation of absolute dogma and traditional authority, on the other there are the phalanxes of the Church—High and Low—for on this point there is perfect agreement between the two parties—of the orthodox Dissenters and of the Roman Catholics. The old school of Dissenters, while differing in so many things from the Church of England, agrees with her in accepting the Apostles' Creed as the foundation of all which has a right to be called Christianity. In this they agree not only with us but with the Roman Catholics. How far, then, do these men see under whose banners they are now asked to enter? How far do they realize that, by the confession of the hon. Member for the Elgin burghs, those whom they called upon to accept as the Leaders of this movement are as completely opposed to the dogmas of their religion as to those of the Church herself; and how far are they prepared, without misgiving, to embark in a controversy, the ultimate motives of which are so little disguised? Take the test of the poll—poll the people of England—poll Churchmen, both those who are afraid of, and those who are anxious for the admission of Dissenters to the Universities, provided it can be done with safety to the Christian faith — poll the Dissenters who are scandalized by the party of free thought — poll the Roman Catholics, and then tell me if the views of the hon. Member for the Elgin burghs will not be left in an inconsiderable minority; even if we make him a present of the section whose watchword is the promotion of exclusively secular teaching. If such then be the case, I venture to assert that the party of so-called free thought, from the interest they have lavished upon this Bill, and from the bustling importance with which they have put themselves forward as the patrons and promoters of University Reform, have thrown back the case of the Dissenters to an indefinite period. Without their interference the case was ripe for hearing; the Church was prepared and ready to see what could be done to meet their claims—the claims of men, the hardship of whose personal position we feel as much as they themselves can. We would gladly have promoted their views, as far as the general good estate of the Universities made it possible—we would gladly have put them in a position commensurate with their intelligence and ability, provided only that it was done in a way that would not affect the fundamental position of the Universities themselves. If this has not been done, the friends of free thought are responsible for the miscarriage. If they were to be allowed to carry out their views, it is probable that the Dissenters themselves would decline to have anything to do with the Universities. The hon. and learned Member for Stroud referred the other day to the inferior culture of the Nonconformist ministers; but if the free thought movement were to gain the upper hand, it is not improbable that the Nonconformists would pass a prohibitory measure—such as we are told that the Roman Catholics have done, on the ground of danger to the faith from contact with that school—to the faith, provided no other remedy could be found. [Mr. WINTERBOTHAM: Certainly not.] If so, it may be that the Dissenters also are divided into parties, and that the principle of disintegration is at work amongst them.

But at any rate the supply of clergymen for the Church of England would fall off. We have heard much of the grievances of Dissenters, but we need to be reminded of the grievances of the large body out of whom our 15,000 parochial clergymen have to be supplied—men requiring high culture, enlarged minds, and an acquaintance with many things which no exclusive theological seminary can impart, and which are only to be found in a University. What would the House say of the grievances of such a body of men if the clergymen of the Church of England no longer found it safe or possible to obtain the education of the Universities? Would not that impossibility amount to the magnitude of a national misfortune? Would it not be a national calamity to separate the clergy of the national Church from the wide discipline of general academic training—from the teaching of the College hall and the combination-room, from the lecture-room and the union, from the companionship of those preparing for the battle of life in all and any profession—aye, and from the teaching of the river and the cricket-ground? If the Universities became forbidden ground to our future clergy, would these advantages be supplied by the training of any seminary? We shall very possibly be told that the clergy who refused to take advantage of the education which the Universities under the new system would provide were hopeless bigots. But that is a mode of meeting the difficulty which is not only unworthy of enlightened disputants, but it is founded on an assumption which is contrary to the real nature of things. If there is any body of men who are anxious for the most ample culture—who have earned the highest distinction in science and philosophy—it is the clergy of the Church of England. It is sometimes said that the clergy have had a monopoly of University learning. I do not now quarrel with the word; but I will ask if that monopoly has not produced men of the highest scientific eminence—men of distinction in mathematics, in physical science, in philology, in history, in poetry, not less than in theology—men who have made names for themselves in literature of which all England and the world may be proud? Let any man say whether the privilege which the clergy may claim in the Universities has been forfeited by any recent neglect on their part. Neglect there may once have been; but that was at the dead time of the last century, when the nation and all the professions as well as the Church were slumbering together in forgetfulness of conscience and responsibility. That time is passed, and in the stir of active life, which has since made itself felt, have not the clergy been foremost in the teachers' chairs at the Universities? Look, among many more, at the names of Whewell and Peacock, of Mansel and Mill, of Willis and Challis, of Arnold and Hawkins, and Merivale, of Pusey and Jowett. You may meet me on this point and say that I have recited the names of men whose philosophic views and religious doctrines are as widely different as it is possible for them to be; you may argue that if we can already admit in the Universities men whose teaching is so dissimilar, but who yet act together because of the corporate bond of the Church of England, where is the valid argument against opening the doors of the Universities still wider? This is, perhaps, the most plausible argument that can be urged in favour of the present Bill; but after all it is a mere begging of the question. It assumes that because there is an existing state of things which, from its liability to certain antecedent restrictions, is found to be advantageously workable, although with admitted difficulties, therefore if you remove those restrictions the working power would still exist. On the other hand, I maintain that it is the fact that men of diverse theological opinions from belonging to the same Church have a bond of union—unfelt it may be by themselves, or hardly ever felt, but which is not less real—which does in fact maintain the peace, and makes free action within the Church of England possible under those restrictions. Let men cease to feel that they are members of a larger communion than their own school of thinkers by belonging to the Church, then the spirit of controversy may seem to go out of the University for a time, but it will speedily return, bringing back with it seven other spirits more reckless than itself. Looking at the present Bill, I cannot resist the conclusion that such would be the result. Certain petitions against the Bill have already been referred to by the hon. Member for the borough of Cambridge. But there is one petition that has not yet been mentioned in this House—a petition that was signed exclusively by members of the University of Cambridge, fifty-six in number, and which was presented in "another place" by a right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London)—himself a distinguished light of the sister University—which urges that some means should be found for opening the Universities more widely to Dissenters than they are at present, while the restrictions as to collegiate endowments should be maintained. That petition was supported in an able and temperate speech by the learned Prelate, who while advocating the former portion of it, vindicated the latter one by arguments founded on his own experience as a former College tutor. I do not know whether the scheme there proposed would work or not. It is a scheme which, if we once got rid of the present Bill, we might be seriously called to consider. There is certainly a *primâ facie* objection in the fact that the governing bodies in the University regulate the studies of the University, and that it is therefore difficult to admit Nonconformists to be members of those governing bodies—and not only Nonconformists but also the members of the school of free thought—without giving them a considerable and, possibly at last, a preponderating influence in the studies of the University, and thereby in the collegiate arrangements themselves. This is a point, however, which I decline at present to argue, as it is more a matter for the Universities themselves to consider. But here at least is the basis for a compromise which may be made fair and reasonable; but which it is out of our power to deal with so long as we are threatened with such a Bill as the present. A peculiarity in the petition to which I have adverted is that among those who have signed it are the names of some who have also signed against this Bill, and of one or two who have signed in its favour; so that the document, including as it does the names of many of our most eminent professors, and clergymen of distinguished official standing, includes persons who are able to petition both on the one side and the other of this Bill, but who agree nevertheless that a compromise on this subject is the result which will really be the most satisfactory. Clearly, therefore, there is a disposition among moderate men on both sides to see what can be done for the benefit of those persons who have reached the highest honours of the University without reaping their solid fruits. But I say you must give the Universities time to inquire for themselves into the remedy. Something might be devised in the way of prelectorships, or of University fellowships, in the nature of an honorarium for those gentlemen, which can be given without breaking in upon the Church life of the Colleges, and which may be accepted by them without any injury to that sense of self-dependence and self-respect which is felt by them, as shown by the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Stroud. Something of this kind might be done; but the only way to do it is to trust the Universities, and to leave them to themselves. I know that there is a section of liberals who are always ready to attribute to the members of any corporation that reproach which the Greek poet attributes to the man who has become poor—that of only having half a man's nobler qualities—and who seem to think that there is something in the spirit of a corporation which deadens every sense of moral and intellectual feeling, and leaves its members in perpetual danger of committing some great injustice, unless there is a State policeman constantly at hand to watch them, and to search their pockets. My answer to arguments such as these, is simply to say that I entirely and indignantly repudiate the imputation as applied to the Universities. If men will approach us with arguments like these there is nothing to be done but to fight to the uttermost. But if not in this House, I am sure that in the country—if not universally, at least very generally—there is found a generous spirit of confidence in the Universities. The advocates of this Bill demand concessions which we believe to be unnecessary, and which cannot co-exist with the principles on which the Universities are based. To these we will not yield ; but, in taking our stand, we desire to express the utmost tenderness for those students who cannot subscribe to our formularies, and we wish to see if something cannot be done to meet their case by prelectorships, by University Fellowships, or by any other scheme which will not interfere with the government of the Colleges. If we go to work in that spirit do not treat us as enemies to all reform—do not bring this House to bear upon our affairs. Let Parliament attend to its own legitimate business—to questions of its own internal reform, to the Budget and foreign politics—and let it believe that the Senate and the Convocation of Cambridge and Oxford possess men who desire to promote the cause of liberal education for all the nation, who are anxious and earnest to devise a scheme which will work well, which will be honest and reasonable, and which will give satisfaction to moderate men of all shades of opinion.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, that amidst the lights and shades of what he might call the kaleidoscopic speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down it was difficult to find anything substantial upon which the eye could rest or with which he (Mr. C. Fortescue) could deal in the way of serious argument. But he was surprised to hear a representative of one of our great Universities — a place which professed to be the very temple of intellect — adopt a tone of something like undisguised contempt for what he termed "free thought," or, in other words, intellect freely used. For his own part, he should rather have heard from a Member for the University of Cambridge expressions of even pedantic admiration for intellect so used. The hon. Gentleman seemed to imagine that if once the restrictions which the Bill was intended to abolish were removed, and the Universities thus exposed to the rude air of liberty, the cause of religion in the Established Church would be hopeless — an argument which would not, perhaps, be regarded as strange if it came from a member of the clerical body, but which appeared to him to savour too much of the ecclesiastic in its tone, and to be scarcely worthy of the lay representative of a lay University. Now, the Bill before the House presented itself for consideration under two aspects — as it affected members of the Church of England, and as it affected those outside her pale. Speaking as a member of that Church, he, for one, desired to see the tests in question finally removed. In the opinion of the great majority of the members of the Church of England, which derived its origin from the exercise of private judgment, she did not profess to impose on them absolutely, as of authority, a great body of controversial divinity. But if the Church of England did not do that, was it not monstrous that Parliament should take a contrary course ? All that the House was asked to do was to put an end to restrictions which were maintained by Parliamentary authority alone. Nor were these tests mere matters of form, or acts of submission, as was shown by the conduct of Parliament itself. A very few years ago they were imposed not only on Masters of Arts and Fellows of Colleges, but on Bachelors of Arts and upon schoolboys who came up to Oxford for the first time ; but Parliament had since thought it right that they should be done away with in the case of the latter. Passing from that point to the case of those who were outside the Church of England, he would ask, were Nonconformists to be debarred from their share in the privileges which the Universities had it in their power to bestow ? In dealing with that part of the question two considerations of an opposite character presented themselves. There was, in the first place, a desire to render the Universities what they once were—really national institutions ; while, on the other hand, fears were entertained lest changes proposed with that view might injure the religious education which those who became members of them received. They had an Established Church fulfilling great duties and supported by a great preponderance of national sentiment, but they were bound to take care that the rights and feelings of other classes were not sacrificed to the maintenance of that Church. They had not yet accomplished that object, and the present state of things was bad for the parties excluded and dangerous to the Established Church itself. He would recommend to the consideration of all friends of the Church whether it was not a scandal that it should be upheld and maintained as an obstacle in the way of the attainment by a great portion of the population of the educational and social advantages to which they were entitled. What was the position of things? By recent legislation Nonconformists had been admitted to those advantages of the Universities which could be obtained by mere students. They were told that they might enter in any number, but that they must not be members of Congregation, Fellows, or Tutors. The parties in possession, and ever likely to be in a great majority, asked the minority to join their ranks as students, but refused them any representation in the teaching and governing bodies, and any share in the great prizes and emoluments of the place. Ought those difficulties and perils to be anticipated which some feared from the mixture of Protestants of different communions in every portion of the Universities? If there is any cause of alarm it ought to be felt by the Nonconformists who will be the new comers and the minority. Could it be denied that the dogmatic differences were greater within the walls of the Established Church than between a vast number of the Nonconformists and a vast number of the members of the Established Church? He fully admitted that the case of the Colleges was not identical with that of the Universities, and that the difficulty in respect to them, though it had been much exaggerated, was greater than in respect to the Universities. The obligation of Parliament also to interfere with bodies like the Colleges was not so imperative as in the case of the Universities; but the House should not forget that the present measure was nothing with respect to the Colleges but an enabling Bill, and if it passed, no doubt some of the Colleges would remain exclusively connected with the Established Church, while others would open their doors to Nonconformists. Again, it was impossible not to connect this measure with reforms now taking place at Oxford, which would tend to increase the importance of the University as distinguished from the Colleges, and which, by admitting non-Collegiate students, would materially affect the position of Nonconformists, but especially of Roman Catholics, who would object to enter mixed Colleges. He trusted that before long they might look forward to see, by means of such a Bill as the present, the termination of an injustice perpetrated in the name of religion, and the admission of a great body of the Queen's subjects, now suffering disabilities, to the full enjoyment of the advantages of the Universities.

Mr. BENTINCK said, the hon. and learned Member for Exeter (Mr. Coleridge) had stated the misrepresentations as to this Bill to be extravagant and incomprehensible; but two of its objects were clear enough, one to appropriate property which belonged to the Church of England, and the other to raise a hustings cry to gain the Nonconformist vote. But there was a great division of opinion among the supporters of the Bill as to its policy. One section, with the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor), desired to seize the property of all Establishments, in order that the Church of England "might go farther and fare worse." Another section maintained, with the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), and also, if he was not mistaken, with the right hon. Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe), that when a man parted with property for a public purpose the State might apply it as it pleased, without regard to the intentions and desire of the donor. Now, if this doctrine prevailed, there would be an end of charitable dispositions; for no one would leave property for a particular public object if he believed it might be forthwith otherwise applied. Those opinions were, however, intelligible, and in accordance with the spirit of the Bill; but there was still a large section of hon. Gentlemen opposite who held that faith should be kept with founders; and their support of this measure, so long as the Church of England was the religion of the majority, was incomprehensible. He would not revive the question of pre-Reformation endowments which were held by the same title as ecclesiastical property; but he would remind the hon. and learned Member for Exeter that one-half of the Cambridge College endowments, comprising three Colleges, many Bye Fellowships, and twenty-two Professorships were given after the Reformation, and there was no more right to seize these benefactions than the property of Nonconformist institutions or than that of the hospitals. It would be monstrous to do this simply because, in the course of thirty years, six individuals had declined to take the tests necessary for holding Fellowships. The hon. and learned Member for Exeter had recently laid down that there was no such thing as the principle of an establishment, but that in respect of establishments, time, place, and circumstances were the essence of the question. But if the main grievances alleged by the advocates of the Bill were considered, these dicta would tell against the measure. What were those grievances? 1. That the Universities were national establishments. 2. As alleged by the hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Winterbotham) that for 200 years the Dissenting clergy had not been educated and that Dissenters generally wanted "culture, refinement, and a higher life;" and again, the hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Grant Duff) wished to reduce Oxford and Cambridge to the condition of a foreign University. He (Mr. Bentinck) did not think much culture would be the result of this plan; but as regards the other grievances he asserted the Universities were now practically free, and he desired to make them entirely so. Dissenters were now at perfect liberty to erect their own Colleges or Halls in the Universities. Colleges could be founded where no religious tests were required, and students might now enter the Universities independently of the Colleges altogether. He could see no ground whatever, therefore, for destroying the religious character of the Colleges so long as the Church of England was the religion, as he believed, of the majority of the nation. With reference to this last question, he argued that a fair religious Census had not been taken in 1851, but the reverse. In 1861, the hon. Member for Leeds (Mr. Baines) and other leading Dissenters in the House of Commons defeated by clamour the plan proposed by Lord Palmerston for obtaining a fair religious Census, though their objections did not extend to Ireland. But, even if the Church was not in an actual majority in England—taking any general section of society—it would be found that the great majority of the education, intelligence, and property of the country, and of those who desired University training for their sons, belonged to the Church. Thus, in most populous and wealthy districts, the majority of the upper and the upper-middle class went to Church, while the lower-middle and lower classes were—and often from causes which he would not detail and which he regretted—necessarily, driven to Dissent; while in other districts—Wales, for instance—Dissenters generally belonged to the lowest classes of society. ["No, no!"] These results might be inferred from such statistics as were available. They would show that in Westminster and Marylebone, where house-rent was high, scarcely any Dissenting chapels existed; and many similar cases could be cited. He therefore urged that the majority favoured denominational education, and that so long as this state of things continued and until a real grievance could be shown, it was both unjust and inexpedient to abolish the denominational character the Colleges possessed. Moreover, he believed that few Nonconformists and none of the large, influential, and respected Wesleyan body, who were in a position to afford a College education for their sons, would object to the religious teaching at the Colleges and prefer "Godless Colleges;" but if they did, it was notorious that the College authorities did not now enforce any religious education on students not members of the Church. An examination of the petitions presented in favour of the Bill would bear out his view, for, with the exception of the few emanating from learned bodies, these for the most part came from small Dissenting congregations, who were never likely to avail themselves of the benefits of the Universities, and who appeared to be ignorant of the dangerous principles as regards their own property which they were advocating. He would conclude with an appeal to the Roman Catholic Members not to support this Bill. At the present time the Roman Catholic clergy all over the world were insisting upon the absolute necessity of denominational education. In the Pope's late Encyclical the following passage occurs:—

> "Those who frequent free Universities incur dangers to morals as well as to faith. It is impossible to discover circumstances which would allow Roman Catholics without sin to attend non-Catholic Universities."

If, therefore, the Roman Catholics desired denominational education for themselves they could not deny the same benefit to others; they should do as they would be done by. He desired that every religious communion should continue to enjoy its property, so far as the rules of law permitted, without State interference. But this Bill was only part of a great projected system of disestablishment and disendowment, and was supported on grounds entirely different from those on which concessions had been made on previous occasions; and he trusted the House would reject it altogether.

MR. MELLY rose to address the House with feelings of very considerable diffidence for two reasons. In the first place he was a Nonconformist, who had therefore not had the great advantage of an Oxford or Cambridge University training, and never had he so painfully felt the want of those advantages as at that moment; and, in the second place, he had also the unhappiness to belong to the small, low, and insignificant section of the community to which the hon. Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had alluded—a class which, he said, was not even rich enough to have a single chapel in Westminster. [Mr. BENTINCK explained—he did not say that it was small and insignificant, but that it was small in some parts of London.] He would show that if it were small in London, which was news to him, it was a very large, powerful, and rich section of the community in the Northern parts of this country. The hon. Member for Cambridge University divided the persons who were in favour of this Bill into three parties, and he (Mr. Melly) belonged to the second of those—the party that sent up a cry for University culture for themselves and for their children. For himself, he hoped to see his sons rise from what the hon. Member for Cambridge University called "the depths of nothingness," and become scholars and Fellows in one of our national Universities. The hon. Member for Whitehaven told them that their having to sign these tests was a merely sentimental grievance. He (Mr. Melly) was in "another place" the other evening, and heard one of the most eloquent and witty prelates on the Episcopal Bench thus describe the state of feeling known as having a sentimental grievance. He said—

> "It is a morbid sensitiveness as to some fancied wrong, which, because it has not got a real existence, is all the more difficult to remove."

It had been said that they do not exclude Nonconformists from the Universities; but upon this point his hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), than whom no Member in that House was more entitled to speak on behalf of the great Nonconformist manufacturers of the North, said, in 1865—

> "You have no right to subject Nonconformists and their children to humiliating distinctions. High education and refinement may be bought too dear, if purchased at the sacrifice of personal self-respect and personal dignity."

They—the Nonconformists—must be allowed to be the best judges of this question, which closely affected their interests. The man who wore the shoe best knew where it pinched him. Let him put this case to the right hon. and hon. Gentlemen on the other side who opposed this Bill—who would accept a seat on the County Bench of his district or the Borough Bench of his town, if there was some special legislation which precluded him from ever becoming Chairman of Quarter Sessions, Chairman of the Visiting Justices, or Chairman of the Finance Committee? He would go one step further, and ask what gentleman would accept a seat in that House if it was clogged with the condition that, however great his eloquence or conspicuous his ability, he was never to have a seat on the front Bench on either side of the House? Yet this was the position in which they placed the Nonconformists. Again, was it possible to conceive a more absurd anomaly than this—He (Mr. Melly), though an Unitarian, had been sent to that House by a majority of votes of a large and important constituency—one of the most important in England; but if he sent his son to Oxford or Cambridge, and he would not sign a paper saying that he was a *bonâ fide* member of the Church of England, he could not have the privilege of opposing the election of his hon. Friend the Member for the University. This Bill gave permissive power only to the Colleges to alter their statutes; but why not leave the Colleges the right to ask the children of Nonconformists to come among them if they wished to do so. There were already sufficient temptations in the way to prevent the *nouveaux riches* sending their sons to Oxford or Cambridge. They were afraid lest they should gain habits incompatible with the government of vast bodies of men in manufactories; lest by mixing with men of leisure they should lose those habits of business, that close attention and perfect punctuality in which they had been trained, and which had been the daily rule in their own homes. But in addition to this, they said to the sons of Nonconformists, "You shall not obtain any of our prizes or rewards, however able you may be, unless you sign a test that we know as honest men you will not sign;" and they said that even if such a man proved himself competent he should not be allowed to win any of the scholarships or the Fellowships which aptitude in learning and attendance to the daily instruction of the University would give him and everyone else a right to obtain.

In other words, and in language that will doubtless be familiar to the hon. Member for Whitehaven, they are at liberty to "bump" our competitors in the University races, but they might not win the silver sculls. The Dissenting bodies were charged with narrowness and fanaticism. He (Mr. Melly) thought independence in action and deep earnestness of thought would be the more appropriate adjectives. And with regard to what fell from the hon. Member for Cambridge University on this subject of free thought, he should like to say a few words. The hon. Member attempted to mix up the second and third parties of the promoters of the Bill, and called the hon. Member for the Elgin boroughs (Mr. Grant Duff) the leader of the party of free thought. There could be no doubt as to the sense in which he used the phrase, and that he meant to charge the promoters of the Bill with infidelity; the inference being that, if the Bill was passed, the time would come when the Dissenting congregations would not permit their ministers to go to the Universities for fear of their being contaminated by the free inquiry they would then find there. He might be allowed to say that he had always found free thought and free inquiry perfectly compatible with the highest and purest religious sentiment, and with the deepest reverence for holy things. He always conceived that the Protestant Faith was founded and justified by freedom of thought and free inquiry. He knew that its simplest and purest forms were so founded and defended. He therefore repudiated, on behalf of the Nonconformist bodies, the idea that their sons would, if sent to your Universities—he said yours now, but the time would come when they would be everybody's, the national Universities—he repudiated the idea, then, that their sons would, in consequence of the course of training and of thought through which they would pass in the Universities under the new *régime*, come to disbelieve in the fundamental doctrines of our Protestant Christianity. There was another ground upon which he should like to see these young men from the North of England sent to the Universities. He remembered a few years ago going on business to one of the largest of our northern towns. After transacting the business he was taken to the club, and afterwards, not unnaturally, to the smoking room. In this room were seven young men playing billiards, and the friend who accompanied him, pointing to these young men, said, "They and their families possess, or will inherit, £3,500,000, and not one of them has had what is called a liberal education in the widest sense of the term." [Mr. BENTINCK: Why?] Because those young men belonged to the small class spoken of by the hon. Member for Whitehaven as not being rich enough to build a chapel in Westminster, whom they had excluded from the Universities. He believed firmly that the sons of the *nouveaux riches*, if they would allow them to go on equal terms to the Universities, would raise the tone and improve not only themselves, but their companions. How came it that the great manufacturers of the country—the great employers of labour—were almost invariably found ranged on the Liberal side of politics? It did not arise from any point connected with the extension of the suffrage, as was known to everyone who had watched the course of those men during late years. They were Radicals because they were Dissenters, and as Dissenters they had felt the cruel injustice of class legislation on religious questions. It was against one branch of this class legislation that he was now complaining, and with regard to which he said that a very small amount of modification would remedy the evil. If, as the hon. Member for Whitehaven said, Churchmen were in so vast a majority on the grounds of social position, wealth, and intellect, how came it that they were afraid of a few young men who do not belong to the Church coming up to their Universities? Did they not think they would be able to convert some of these young men by impressing them with the beauty of their ritual and the reverential spirit with which the services of their Church were conducted? By this means, if his supposition were true, the Church party would be strengthening their own hands if they threw open their Universities to Dissenters for everything which tended to broaden the life of a new generation must do good. As there could be no doubt that many young men of the class to which he referred would in the course of years enter that House, the importance would be seen at once of giving them the best education this country could afford. A right hon. Gentlemen once said, "You must teach your future masters to learn their letters." How much more important still that no impediment should be allowed to prevent our future legislators from receiving the highest culture, the most liberal, and least narrow views of life. Perhaps his brief remarks might have sounded like—

> . . . . "a doleful song
> Steaming up a lamentation and an ancient tale of wrong,
> As a tale of little meaning, though the words are strong."

But of this the House may feel assured; seven-tenths of the Liberal party in the new Parliament would regard this as a general question of religious liberty; and on these questions they would win even in this Parliament. The remaining three-tenths would regard it as a personal wrong, and would compel them to admit their sons on terms of complete equality to Universities, which they assert to be national institutions, and which they would then vainly endeavour to maintain as the monopoly of a narrow majority.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY observed that this Bill was much more extensive than any that had been introduced before on the subject; and its opponents might take the credit of having prophesied that the principles laid down in the measure first brought forward by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Exeter (Mr. Coleridge) would lead to something still more serious; in proof of which the hon. and learned Gentleman had now combined his own Bill with that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie). In the course of his speech in moving the second reading of this Bill, the hon. and learned Gentleman, forgetting the gentleness he usually showed to his opponents, made some harsh and strong remarks. With reference to what he (Mr. G. Hardy) had himself said, the hon. and learned Gentleman used the terms "coarse and vulgar;" but he proceeded on an entire misconception of what had been said. What he said was that these were establishments founded for religious objects, and that those who were endeavouring to secularize them would pervert them from the original intention of the endowment. In no instance did they find any amount of secular endowments; but always in the case of education the foundation was made by individuals from religious motives and for religious objects. He perfectly understood the position of the hon. Member for the Elgin burghs (Mr. Grant Duff), for he always spoke with great candour and frankness. That hon. Member wished to change the system of our Universities altogether, and make them like the German Universities. But the hon. Member forgot the great distinction that existed between the two. In the English Universities Colleges were special institutions; but they were hardly known in other Universities. So also in the Scotch Universities, there were no Colleges as in the English Universities. In all the changes that had been proposed he could not help noticing that nothing like a settlement was looked forward to. There was an unsettlement without any resting place being given, where they might say here the Universities should take their stand and devote themselves henceforth to their teaching office without being continually interfered with by Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Louth (Mr. C. Fortescue) said the Bill did not go far enough—the powers of the visitors should be taken and handed over absolutely to the majority of a transient governing body, who should alter statutes and lay down what rules they might think fit. Then it was said this was only a permissive Bill. The view of the hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Winterbotham) was intelligible enough—he had told them that the Nonconformists hated sectarian education, and therefore he was for a purely secular system. The result would be a purely secular system. The hon. and learned Member for Exeter (Mr. Coleridge) did not deal with the question so logically as some of his supporters. The hon. Member recognized the distinction between the University and the Colleges, and admitted that in the tutorial system the connection with religion should be retained, in order that those who sent their sons to a College should have security that the teaching would be in accordance with the religion they professed. It was a novelty to lay down the principle that in Colleges, which were *quasi*-domestic institutions, there should be a combination of teachers of different religions. The greatest confusion would be the result of a system of this kind, and in the end religion would be excluded. That would be the consequence of admitting Dissenters to the governing body; they would elect others of the same opinions, excluding Churchmen, and eventually the governing body would be entirely changed. Such a change had actually occurred in the case of a charity in Nottinghamshire or Derbyshire, in a parish called, he believed, East Leake. The school of East Leake was a purely Church endowment, but from elections conducted in the manner he described, the governing body had been practically changed from Churchmen to Dissenters If, as the result of what was called free inquiry and opinion, men were now found to keep a position which they ought not to occupy with changed opinions, having bound themselves to a certain course of conduct in order to obtain it, that must be considered an abuse of the system. But if they laid down the rule that men should be bound by no religious test whatever, and be elected to those positions for their intellect alone, they would find themselves associated with others of strong religious principle and anxious to keep up religious instruction; the element of confusion and discord would thus be introduced within the College; in the end it would be necessary to exclude religion altogether. He confessed he saw no middle course between the maintenance of the present denominational system and the adoption of a purely secular system. The hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Melly) had referred to the great lack of a liberal education among the rising young men of the North of England. Now, the way he accounted for that in many cases was this. The parents of these young men had by their industry and talent raised themselves from a low position to affluence, but before they had acquired their present independence their sons had attained that age when not having had a sufficient preliminary education they were too old to acquire it, and go to the University. But there were various Dissenters' Colleges where, he believed, a very good education was given, and it was rather curious to observe that although the Dissenters professed themselves so hostile to sectarian education, they founded Colleges always in conformity with their own opinions.

MR. WINTERBOTHAM remarked that they were only theological as far as regarded the clergy.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: But did the hon. Gentleman mean to tell them that Dissenters were not particular in sending their children where certain opinions would be inculcated? His opinion was that Dissenters were as desirous to have dogmatic denominational teaching as Churchmen themselves. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) when speaking on the subject of this Bill in a former Session dwelt on the necessity of a religious test for teachers. Then it was said the whole intellect of the Universities was in favour of this Bill. The hon. and learned Member for Exeter (Mr. Coleridge) spoke of the statement laid before the Archbishop of Canterbury the other day as a wild and extravagant document; but those who had appended their names to it were not wild and extravagant men. They were calm and thoughtful men—men of deep religious conviction and great intellectual power. They never would have placed their names to that document had they not felt the deep importance of the question at issue. He might be permitted to read to the House what was said of it by one whose eminence as a preacher was becoming known to the world—he meant the Rev. Henry Liddon. This was what that gentleman said—

> "The questions raised by Mr. Coleridge's Bill are no mere continuation of the feud between Churchmen and Nonconformists. They penetrate much deeper; hence our children will understand that all such questions really resolve themselves into this—whether our Universities are to continue to be Christian or whether Chapel services and Divinity lectures are still to be kept up with a view to attracting the sons of Christian parents into lecture-rooms where the existence of God is denied."

That was a serious statement to be made deliberately in writing by one who always well weighed his words. The opinion it expressed was held by a great number of men who felt deeply upon this question, and he believed it to be founded on fact. It was said that religious teaching might be given under the system of allowing the teachers to be of any or no denomination, but he looked in vain for any instances which warranted such a belief. It was of the first importance that the tests for teachers should be retained as at present in force in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. If it were said that by retaining these tests the Dissenters were debarred from sending their children to those Universities, he should reply that the Dissenters had no ground for complaint, because, while they were perfectly free to avail themselves of the intellectual advantages the Universities afforded, they were at liberty to provide their own religious education by founding separate halls. The Fellowships of the Colleges were not to be regarded in the light of mere rewards of intellect, they were intended to secure association for a particular object among persons who should be "Fellows" one with the other, having a common interest, religion, and object. But if rewards for intellectual merit were wanted far rather would he see money taken from the endowments for the purpose of founding such rewards than assist in bringing together men of all creeds and of no creed, a course that must eventually lead to the secularization not only of the Universities but of the Colleges, which, it was admitted by the best writers, stood upon a different footing from the former. Mr. Malden, in his *Origin of Universities,* had said that the Colleges were private foundations. The Fellowships were called national because they were in communion with the national Church, and not because they belonged to the nation generally, or were maintained by the money of the nation, and yet it was now proposed to separate them from the national Church in order to make them national property. The hon. and learned Member for Exeter (Mr. Coleridge) began with his little Bill, as he termed it, but the following Session he came down to that House and spoke with exultation of that Bill, on the ground that it had for ever separated the Universities from the national Church. That instead of its introducing the thin edge of the wedge it had driven the wedge home and had created a fissure which was absolutely irreparable. Colleges and Fellowships had been founded upon the faith that they would remain in union with the national Church, and therefore it was unjust to divert those endowments from the purposes for which they were given. But, it was said, that there were pre-Reformation Colleges. He admitted that fact, but he regarded the present national Church, to which he belonged, as being a continuation of the Church which had existed prior to the Reformation. Without entering into the theological question, he contended that the Colleges belonged to the national Church for the time being. There had been a national Church in existence during the whole time of the existence of the Universities. The foundations of the Colleges were placed in connection with it. The founders relied upon their being so maintained, and that what was called the national religion should prevail in those Colleges. Therefore all the Colleges and foundations belonged to the present national Church. As to post-Reformation Colleges it was certain that those who had given money to found them had done so for the sake of the Church of England as it now existed. Had it been shown that the Universities had so ill discharged their duty that it had become necessary to take their endowments from them in order to give them to the nation generally? He denied that such was the case. He affirmed that they were doing their duty, and the fact that the Nonconformists were so anxious to participate in the advantages they offered was a certain proof that the duty had been admirably discharged. Was it true that Nonconformists were excluded from the Universities? Why at the present moment there were many Nonconformists and even Roman Catholics attending the Universities. He had spoken so frequently upon this subject that he felt he had no right to detain the House longer, but the object he had in view was to point out clearly the consequences likely to flow from the adoption of this measure, which tended to favour free thinking. If the Bill were passed, the teachers in the Universities would not be bound by any religious tests whatever, and to the care of persons who might believe anything or nothing would the sons of the English people be handed over. By passing this measure, they would be handing over their sons at the immature age of seventeen or eighteen to those who might be free-thinkers, and who might endeavour to convert them to some soulless and Godless theory, in place of their being educated in the spirit of the grand old University motto — *Dominus illuminatio mea.*

MR. E. A. LEATHAM: Sir, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hardy) has shown how this question strikes members of the Church of England. Notwithstanding what has fallen from the hon. Member for Whitehaven, I believe that fully half the nation are not members of the Church, and since this Bill is introduced mainly for their relief, it is worth while, I think, before this debate closes to show how the question strikes them. We are taunted almost as though it were an indictable offence with desiring to make the national Universities really national instead of being what they are—very little more than seminaries for the clergy and for those who are content to hang on to the skirts of the sacerdotal vesture. The hon. Member for Whitehaven told us that he would not call this Bill a Bill of confiscation, and immediately proceeded to call it so; and the right hon. Gentleman has followed the same line of argument. But, Sir, it seems to me that the true answer to the argument of the right hon. Gentleman is that the property of the Colleges and Universities is held by Parliamentary title—in trust for the nation. The real question, therefore, is—who are the nation? Now Nonconformists were so long and resolutely excluded from the exercise of all those functions which stamp a man a member of the nation, that there are still going about amongst us people who cannot bring their minds to believe that the intolerance of our forefathers is now a thing of the past, and that a Nonconformist is to all intents and purposes as thoroughly an Englishman, with all the aspirations and rights of an Englishman, as if he were able to repeat the whole Athanasian Creed from one end to the other without wincing. To this class of persons whose whole political system seems to me to be founded on an anachronism, belongs it appears my hon. Friend the Member for Buckingham (Mr. Hubbard) who opposes this Bill on the ground that we "are not of the nation." Now, my hon. Friend is perfectly candid and perfectly logical. He is well aware that on no other ground can he exclude us from benefits which are national, and so he naturally adopts this ground, although it involves him in an assumption which if he were dealing with any other question than one which appeals to what Sydney Smith would have called the irritability of his belief, he would have scorned and scouted at once. And I would say in passing that if any further proof were wanted to show how untenable has become the position of those who oppose this bill, it is to be found in the strange and gratuitous assumptions to which they are logically driven by the exigencies of an impossible defence. But the right hon. Gentleman who moved that this bill be read a second time this day six months seems to suffer from a peculiarity of vision as remarkable as that which has befallen my hon. Friend. The right hon. Gentleman is in more respects than one a far-sighted statesman. He can discern objects which are yet a very great way off, for example, dangers to his Church, which are looming, if they are looming at all, on the edge of a remote horizon—but he has no eyes for some things which are very near at hand; he cannot discern the grievances under which Dissenters labour in their relation to the Universities. On the contrary he speaks of "the indulgence" with which we are treated, and of "the perfect educational freedom" which we enjoy. "What would you have?" in effect asks the right hon. Gentleman. "Cannot you read as hard as you like at the Universities! Cannot you go into as many examinations as you please? Have we not condescended to stamp your proficiency with our degrees? Have we not surrendered everything? Everything, of course, except the crowns of genius and merit. These are ours. Toil, patience, the strenuous industry of years, these are for you. The most munificent provision ever made by patriotism for learning—this is for us. Is not this a natural and equitable distribution?" And so the Nonconformist enters the University under a cloud, remains under a cloud, emerges under a cloud. He goes in at the side door and comes out at the back. He is made to feel to the last that he is only there on sufferance—that he is an object for the indulgence of the right hon. Gentleman. Whatever may be the place which he may obtain at the examinations, he is told when they are all over that his College is no home for him. Whatever may be the interest which he may take in the educational system at the University, he is told that the Senate House is no place for such as he is. In a country the whole essence of whose institutions is comprised in the word self-government, he finds himself a member of a great self-governing corporation, from all share in the government of which he is forcibly excluded. We have heard a great deal about the love which we owe Alma Mater, but if any such feeling finds a momentary place in the breast of a Nonconformist, this Alma Mater of his takes care to nip it in the bud. To him she is hard and distrustful to the end, and the moment at which he would approach her with the feeling that at length he may claim recognition as a son—when he returns to his College perhaps the first man of his year—is precisely the moment which she selects to turn him out of doors, precisely the moment which she selects to inflict upon him that worst humiliation of genius in adversity—to see those whom you have beaten step into the honours which are yours. And right hon. Gentlemen opposite affect surprise that there are such people as political Dissenters—affect surprise that we do not thankfully acquiesce in this system of box-feeding at the Universities. Hon. Gentlemen who are pheasant breeders will understand what I mean. The box is an ingenious mechanical contrivance. It is kept filled with corn, and placed in the woods. It is furnished with a lid in the shape of a ledge, upon which the applicant for corn must perch, and which is so nicely balanced that it only opens when a bird of the orthodox weight jumps upon it. Now there is just such a box at the Universities. It is kept supplied with corn in incredible quantities. It only opens to those who perch upon the ledge with the whole weight of the Thirty-nine Articles. Sparrows, blackbirds, thrushes, all sects; even stockdoves stamp and twitter in vain. It only yields to birds of the orthodox plumage, and those, I have observed, are most of them of the ring-necked variety. [*Laughter.*] Now, this may be amusing, but is it just? Is it just thus to divorce merit from reward, and to dissociate learning from honour? But the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down argues that what he calls the religious discipline and teaching of the Colleges would be imperilled if this Bill should pass. How the right hon. Gentleman sweeps the whole horizon for danger before he dares take a single step with the view of repairing what the right hon. Gentleman who moved the rejection of this Bill calls a misfortune, what we call a shameful injury! For what is the combination of circumstances which he foresees? He foresees such a rush of Nonconformists of the highest stamp to the Colleges as absolutely to swamp in numbers and ability the candidates for Fellowships furnished by the Church, and this when, in the same breath, he tells us that the Bill, if passed, can only benefit so small a number of persons. You must either admit that the Bill will benefit many or that it will benefit few. If it will benefit few where is the danger? if many, where is the justice? But the right hon. Gentleman foresees much more than this. He foresees not only an absolute majority of Nonconformist Fellows, but that those who compose this absolute majority representing, as they must, heterogeneous and inharmonious creeds, at variance in everything else, will agree in this, the unanimous opposition which they will offer to the services and teaching of the Church. Has the history of Dissent taught us to believe in this unanimity? Is it not notorious that there are large bodies of Dissenters, the Wesleyans for example, who would be far more likely, in questions of this character, to ally themselves with the Church than with infidels, or even with Roman Catholics. But when you have got this preponderance of Dissenting Fellows, and when you have got this unanimity among them, are there no statutes in the way of this plot to oust the teaching and services of the Church? Why, the very Bill itself protects by a distinct clause the services of the Church. This House must be a party to the plot before it can succeed. The other branches of the Legislature must be accomplices. No such change could be brought about without the deliberate consent of the nation,—and surely, Sir, it is not from the nation that we are asked to save the national Church. But, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman tells us that the introduction of Nonconformist Fellows and members of Convocation will be the introduction of an element of discord, that it will disturb that repose which is essential to the Universities, and turn the Colleges into vortices of speculation and discussion—that is the phrase—and the Senate House into a Babel of conflicting sects. One would suppose, to listen to hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the Universities, instead of being great centres of intellectual activity, were great centres of intellectual slumber—that they were perfect dovecotes, where nothing was to be heard but the monotonous cooing of unquestioning uniformity, and where the names re-called by the hon. Member for Cambridge University—Newman and Pusey, Colenso and Jowitt—were never so much as mentioned. And a right rev. Prelate draws a fancy family portrait, which is positively touching in its tenderness, of the harmony, the purity, the gentle, unreasoning Church of Englandism—of the College life—a Church in which there are no cruel controversies. And he tells us that all this purity and orthodoxy, this simplicity of morals and of faith are kept together, because they are presided over by the Head of the College; the yearning father of this interesting family, who evinces his trembling paternal solicitude, by asking you twice a year to devilled kidneys! Pass this Bill, and there will be an end of this dovecot—an end of all this yearning anxiety, of this filial obedience, of this purity of morals and of faith, of this repose of the Colleges. And there will be an end, Sir, as an hon. Gentleman has told us, of the quiet confidence of Christian gentlemen in the country who entrust their darlings to the safe custody of the Church at College, knowing that where Dissent is, there is confusion and every evil work. And as though this picture were not sufficiently heart-rending, this Bill of my learned Friend's is to be the straw which breaks the back of the much-enduring camel. This great Church of England, rich in the wealth and in the faith of centuries—a Church which has already within our memory survived more fatal injuries than any member of the feline tribe—this Church not of nine but of ninety-nine lives, is to perish when the Nonconformist takes his seat at the bottom of the Fellows' table, and squeezes his way into the great throng in the Senate House. Why will hon. Gentlemen persist in arguing this question as though the Nonconformist were still shut out of the Universities and the Colleges by law? He is inside; the contamination, if it be contamination, is established by Act of Parliament. Why are not right rev. Prelates afraid of him now? There he sits with his pestilent disbelief in Bishops, poisoning the ear of the young, instilling day by day and hour by hour, perhaps in quiet river-side rambles, perhaps at pious wines, doubts possibly about the exalted Christian charity which glows through certain well-known paragraphs of the Athanasian Creed. Who is the teacher of youth? That other youth who walks with you, talks with you, lives with you; or the Professor who thunders at you afar off *ex cathedra?* There never was a time when infidelity in its worst, because its least honest shape, did not sneak into the Senate House, sneak into Fellowships, sneak into Professors' chairs, and that under all your forms. But then you had no terrors. There was nothing to alarm you in the presence of the man who denied the Almighty. Your fears awoke with the arrival of the wretch who disbelieves in Bishops. Now, it seems to me that, even taking the narrowest view of this question—one apparently taken by the hon. Member for Cambridge University—looking simply to the advantages of those who are at present receiving the benefits of an University education, but especially of the clergy, you have nothing to fear, but everything to hope from this Bill. The hon. Gentleman insists upon the great benefits which accrue to the clergy from their being educated along with the laity. He tells us that their mind is enlarged and their ideas liberalized by this association. By parity of reasoning, I contend that this clerical mind would be still more enlarged, and their ideas still farther liberalized if the clergy had the benefit of being educated along with those upon whose feelings, habits, and opinions, it will be their mission afterwards to act—the laity of all denominations. I believe that such a system would be the death of that narrow Churchism which confronts Dissenters when they approach the threshold of the Church, as it would be the death also of that narrow sectarianism of which, with equal reason, members of the Church complain in their dealings with Nonconformity; but such a system is impossible while you drive Dissenters from the Universities by disabilities which are indignities. Lastly, Sir, on the broadest public grounds I would support this Bill. You have done too much for the Nonconformist or you have done too little. You have admitted him to a seat in this House, and to a seat upon that Bench. Practically, you have declared that religious opinion is to be no bar to the highest Offices of State. One great use of the Universities is to qualify men for these great responsibilities and these high duties. In the public interest you are bound to take another step forward, and to give such men every facility for making that qualification complete. And what stands in the way? This bugbear of danger to the Church. Sir, there is no scarecrow planted in the path of just and necessary legislation which has been so frequently trodden under foot and hoisted again, or which is so thoroughly out at elbows as this. It is not the Church which is in danger, it is the intolerance of the Church. The Church is not a thing of laws and Acts of Parliament. She rests upon the profound convictions of one part of the nation, and the deliberate assent of the other part. When those convictions shall change, and that assent shall be withdrawn, then your Church will be in danger; and there is no statute in the statute book which will serve her in any stead; but you are hastening, you are precipitating, you are not postponing that day by incessantly parading the Church before the people in the light of a grasping monopolist, who not content with the prodigious privileges which she already enjoys in every parish in the kingdom, has usurped for her own purposes the control of the national Universities, and shuts the door of honour and emolument at her pleasure in the face of half the nation.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, the advocates of this Bill assumed that orthodoxy and ignorance, and Nonconformity and knowledge were convertible terms. He held that such a proposition was totally untenable. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down used an illustration respecting feeding-boxes, which he held to be ridiculous, and unworthy of the subject; but as it had been introduced he might say that the ring-necked pheasant, the old orthodox English pheasant, always weighed several pounds heavier than the imported Chinese variety, which the hon. Gentleman opposite seemed so much to favour. It was argued on the other side that the existence of tests was a sign of ignorance in faith. Now, it so happened that all the Protestant bodies, the Nonconformists included, repudiated the acceptance of an ignorant faith. They held an ignorant faith to be superstition, so that all the arguments on that score were worth less than nothing. Subscription was a test of study and attainment of knowledge in Scripture history and Scripture doctrine. He should be sorry to rest the statement he was about to make on his own authority, but it so happened that there were many eminent men, for whom this House entertained the highest respect, who held that it would be to narrow and degrade education if they did not demand from the students some knowledge of Scripture history and of theology; which would be, in effect, to shut them out in a great measure from the study of all history, with the view that the void might be supplied by the study of physical science, mechanics, and chemistry—studies, he might add, which already found their place in the teaching of the University. On this subject he wished to call the attention of the House to a letter on the Irish system of national education that the late Archbishop Whateley wrote to Dr. Arnold, and which had a strong bearing on this question. He said—

> "When Lord Stanley joined the Education Board he had no such thought—[as examinations in Scripture of the children]. And when first Mr. Carlyle proposed drawing up Scripture extracts, I partook of the same expectations with Bishop Philpots, that no selections could be introduced with the concurrence of all parties such as should be of any utility. I do not even now think my apprehensions groundless. The obstacles were incomparably greater than those to any analogous plan in England. The result, however, was complete success. All the efforts to raise jealousy in reference to the Scripture extracts have within the schools themselves totally failed. They are read with delight and profit by almost all the children, and I and other Protestants, as Lord Stanley knows, have examined the children of all denominations without knowing to which each child belonged, and found them better taught in Scripture than most gentlefolks' children."

Here he (Mr. Newdegate) must remind the House that to this statement was appended a note. In connection with this subject it might be observed that it was in 1837 that the Archbishop produced the celebrated tract, *Early Lessons and Christian Evidences*, afterwards admitted into the mixed schools by Dr. Moody, and finally objected to by Dr. Cullen in 1853. The Archbishop went on to say in reference to that plan of education—

> "But had the plan gone no further than Lord Stanley at present proposed and expected, I should not have condemned it as furnishing education but only a portion of education, and I should have been glad to furnish even a small part of that portion, if no more could have been admitted. If there had been a scruple against teaching anything beyond the alphabet I should have been glad to have even that taught. From what I have actually done, and thought, and seen, you may pretty well conjecture how I should be likely to act in respect of the London University. In the first place, I should point out, from the experience of a far, very far more difficult time, the perfect possibility of having the historical books of the Bible as a portion of the studies and examinations; and secondly, the importance of this as a portion of general education, on the ground that Christianity is the prevailing religious profession of the country. I should call for no signing of articles—no profession of faith, but I should point out that in those portions of the Empire where the Mahomedan religion prevails it is essential that those who are to reside among the Mussulmans, and hold official situations, should have some acquaintance with the Koran. To say that a man can have gone through a course of liberal education in this country totally ignorant of the outlines of Christian history is to imply not merely that the Christian religion is untrue or bad, but that it is insignificant and unworthy of serious attention, except from those who have a fancy for it, as is the case with the mythological antiquities of the Anglo-Saxons, or the dreams of astrology or alchemy. And if anyone should say you need not doubt that the students do acquire this knowledge in other ways, I should say, very well; I do not say to the contrary. I will certify, if you please, that they may for aught I know have gone through a most able and complete course of education; but I will not certify, by conferring anything in the nature of a degree, that they have done so, unless they shall have given proof before the University as such that they have. But if I may be answered that the conductors of the University despaired of the possibility of conducting any examinations or lectures on the Greek Testament so as to avoid jealousies and contests, I should consent to obtain what benefits we could—reckoning even half a loaf or half a quarter of a loaf better than no bread. But nothing would ever induce me to call it a whole loaf."

These were the opinions of Archbishop Whately, and he believed no Member of the House would maintain that the Archbishop was an illiberal man. He therefore said deliberately, on the authority of Archbishop Whately and Dr. Arnold, that the object of this Bill was to narrow and degrade education—to bring it down to the level of those Nonconformists who were complaining of their ignorance, and at the same time requiring that the education of the Universities should be brought down to their level. This was his protest against the proposition that orthodoxy and ignorance, and Nonconformity and knowledge were convertible terms, and he would give his opposition to the Bill.

MR. NEATE said, the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department had laid much stress on the Address that was presented by members of the Universities to the Archbishop of Canterbury against this Bill. He did not deny that that Address contained the names of many eminent men and men of high standing in the University. But he believed the youth and strength of the Universities to be favourable to the Bill, although the senior Fellows and Heads of Houses were against it; and he would point out that some of the most distinguished Colleges in Oxford were but weakly represented in the signatures to that Address, from which he drew the inference that, although all the intellect of the University had not yet passed, it was fast passing into the ranks of those who were in favour of this Bill.

MR. COLERIDGE said, he would not attempt to answer a good many of the objections urged against this measure by hon. Gentlemen opposite, because those objections were urged rather against some creatures of their own imagination than against this Bill, with which they could have no more to do than with the Bill for the alteration of weights and measures which the House had that day been discussing. It had been said that those who supported the measure did not agree on the grounds on which they should support it. That was perfectly true. They were endeavouring to make an advance in a particular direction, but some went further than others in the path of progress, though all were prepared to go the length of this Bill. Though there was only one way of saying "No," there were 500 ways of saying "Yes," and it was natural that those who approached the subject from a Liberal point of view should approach it with different motives; but, as a party, they were generally content with the measure. The real question was, whether the Bill before the House was one the principle of which the House ought to affirm? The question had been argued as if it was proposed to take from persons who were entitled to keep, and give to those who were not entitled to receive. That argument was not tenable with respect to the Bill, because all that was proposed to be done was simply to remove restrictions which had been imposed by the authority of Parliament itself, and the earliest of these was a clause in the Act of Uniformity of the time of Charles II. If the Colleges had suffered grievously from the state of things which previously existed, and were without protection up to the time of the passing of the Act of Uniformity, there might be some force in the argument; but he could not understand how it could be contended with fairness, or by recollection of history, that the repeal of a clause in a statute passed in the time of Charles II. could imperil the religion of Colleges which had existed for centuries before. The Bill would leave the Colleges in precisely the same state as before that period. It would not affect the statutes of the Colleges. The Colleges would be allowed to exercise their own discretion, and maintain or repeal such restrictions as they chose. He desired to correct an impression which his speech on a former occasion had conveyed to the mind of his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary. He had not, as had been imputed to him, said that his right hon. Friend had resorted to coarse and vulgar arguments. He could not have used that expression, because he always took care to give as much preparation to any remarks which he had the honour of addressing to the House as his time would allow. He certainly did think that one of his right hon. Friend's arguments did appeal to coarse and vulgar prejudice; but that was a very different thing from saying that the arguments themselves were coarse and vulgar; and as he had not yet been, and he trusted never would be, guilty of such a breach of manners as to apply such words to any hon. Member of the House, so there was no one to whom he should be less inclined to say anything disrespectful than his right hon. Friend the Secretary for the Home Department. He candidly confessed that there were certain difficulties, and perhaps dangers, which would arise both in the Universities and in the Colleges after the passing of the Bill, and which he was not prepared to meet. But that was not the way to argue the question. What ought to be done was to examine both systems as a whole—to take the existing system with its disadvantages—to take the system proposed with its supposed disadvantages—and to see which was best for the interests of the country. It was impossible to meddle or alter an existing system without in so doing committing some positive mischief; but the question really was, whether the advantages were not so greatly in favour of the course proposed that, in spite of certain evils and difficulties which were likely to ensue, it was the proper and statesmanlike course to pursue? That was a broad and intelligible footing on which to place the question, and if that were done in this instance he, for one, had no fear of the result.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 198; Noes 140: Majority 58.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Wednesday* 22nd July.

LIBEL BILL—[Bill 3.]

(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Baines.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN, in moving the discharge of the Order for going into Committee on this Bill, said, he had introduced it on the 22nd of November last, and had taken every opportunity of forwarding it through its various stages, but was now compelled most reluctantly to withdraw it. The present position of the Bill showed the difficulties which attended the attempt on the part of a private Member to pass an opposed Bill through Parliament. The Bill had been substantially talked to death, but if he had the honour of a seat in the next Parliament he should certainly bring it forward again.

Order *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

LIBEL (IRELAND) BILL—[Bill 199.]

(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Pim.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN, in moving "that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," said, the object of the present Bill was to assimilate the law in Ireland to the law in England, and to deprive a plaintiff in an action for libel of costs unless he got 40*s.* damages. In Ireland at present a verdict in an action for libel for one farthing carried costs, and that law had worked great hardship in several recent cases.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee).

Mr. AYRTON said, he was glad to find that his hon. Friend the Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) had directed his efforts to endeavouring to remove the defects which existed in the law of libel in Ireland, and that he had abandoned the crude attempt which had been made at the commencement of the Session with regard to the law of libel in this country. As soon as the latter Bill had been thoroughly understood it was evident that such a measure would not receive the assent of the House, and many hon. Members who laboured under a misapprehension with regard to it, and who at the outset intended to support his hon. Friend, felt bound, on becoming alive to its effect, to give the measure all the opposition in their power. He regretted, however, to say that Members of that House had been so worried by circulars sent to them by a body calling itself the Provincial Press Association, that it had become very difficult for them, in the presence of an impending election, to perform their duty. For his own part, he had resisted all attempts at intimidation by an association of tradesmen who were intent on benefiting themselves at the expense of the public.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that his hon. Friend, having omitted to make a speech when he withdrew the former Bill, had apparently disburdened himself on the present measure of the speech he had intended to have made on the last. He would not now reply to the remarks of his hon. Friend, but would, if he had the opportunity, answer the objections both of his hon. Friend and of other hon. Members in the course of next Session.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

GENERAL POLICE AND IMPROVEMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of The Lord Advocate, Bill to alter the qualifications of the Electors in places in Scotland, under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," and to amend the said Act in certain other respects, *ordered* to be brought in by The Lord Advocate and Sir James Fergusson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 206.]

INDORSING OF WARRANTS BILL.

On Motion of Sir James Fergusson, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Indorsing of Warrants in Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir James Fergusson and Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 208.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, July 2, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Medway Regulation Act Continuance* (199); University Elections (Voting Papers)* (201); Curragh of Kildare* (195); Bank of Bombay* (196); New Zealand (Legislative Council)* (197); Consular Marriages* (198); Bank Holidays and Bills of Exchange* (200); Local Government Supplemental (No. 3)* (194); Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts (Lanarkshire) Amendment* (202).

Committee — Boundary (170); Judgments Extension* (160).

Report — Salmon Fisheries (Scotland)* (203); Judgments Extension* (160).

Third Reading — Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* (158); Inclosure (No. 2)* (159); Local Government Supplemental (No. 4)* (165); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* (166), and *passed.*

ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION—VOTE OF THANKS TO HER MAJESTY'S FORCES.

Moved, That the Vote of Thanks to the Army of Abyssinia take Precedence of the Orders of the Day: *Agreed to.* — (*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

The Earl of MALMESBURY: My Lords, if on the one hand I feel both pride and pleasure at finding it my duty to make to your Lordships a proposition so honourable alike to your Lordships' House and to those to whom it is addressed, on the other hand I know that the task has fallen into hands hardly worthy of the great occasion, and that it ought to have fallen to some other of your Lordships more competent to deal with it as it deserves. Therefore I must ask your indulgence while I shortly put before you the great events to which this Motion refers, and ask your Lordships to consider how fair and just it is to do honour to the Army of England and also to the Navy who have been employed by Her Majesty's Government on this occasion. My Lords, Sir Robert Napier himself says at the end of his despatch that "it is difficult to find words that can do justice to every arm of the service which has been employed;" and if he finds it hard to do so, far more difficult must it be for me—who have not been present during the operations, and can only judge of them by what I read in his despatches—to do full justice to the forces on this occasion. And here in passing I may remark that the despatches of Sir Robert shew that the use of the pen is as inseparable from the name of Napier as the use of the sword. My Lords, it is now five years since I was one of the first—if not the first—to direct your Lordships' attention to what was passing in Abyssinia. That is a long period for Englishmen to suffer under the cruelties of a barbarous savage; but, if anyone is ready to find fault with our forbearance during that long time, he must recollect that it is always the duty of the strong man to bear patiently with the weak, and, until his insolence becomes intolerable, to refrain from any violent measures. But, my Lords, at last this conduct on the part of King Theodore did become intolerable—intolerable to the feelings of humanity, and intolerable to our feelings of honour as an independent country; and in the year 1867 my noble Friend (the Earl of Derby), being then Premier, determined to chastise this half-educated savage. My Lords, in this he was supported by public opinion; and although no doubt there were some hesitation and some apprehension entertained both in Parliament and out of Parliament as to the difficulties that would have to be encountered, and as to the success of the Expedition; yet on the whole the country received with indulgence all that the Government intended to do, and displayed the same spirit and confidence in British energy which it has always shown on like occasions. And, my Lords, no confidence of that sort was ever justified more completely and rapidly than by the results of this Expedition. Sir Robert Napier, if he had within him—which he has not—the epigrammatic bombast of Italian conquerors, might quote the three Latin words which Cæsar used to describe his own victory "*Veni, vidi, vici.*" He might have done so had his nature been the same; but I need only allude to his despatches to show how modest and how simple that nature is. Well, my Lords, it is remarkable that this Expedition was crowned with a rapidity of success of which I think there is hardly another instance. Lord Stanley's despatch to the Emperor Theodore informing him that war would be declared against him was written on the 16th of April, 1867, and on the 13th of April, 1868, Magdala was taken and the Emperor was no more. Exactly one year passed between the despatch of the Foreign Secretary of State, threatening Theodore with the vengeance of England, and the execution of that vengeance. Sir Robert Napier landed on the 3rd of January at Zoulla, and in exactly 100 days finished the war. My Lords, I need hardly say more in favour of the Commander-in-Chief than by putting that simple fact before your Lordships. When this Expedition was determined upon by Her Majesty's Government your Lordships are aware that the Bombay Government was intrusted with the management of the whole matter; and, taking it in the historical order of affairs, I must say that great credit is due to Sir Seymour Fitzgerald, who, under the advice of Sir Robert Napier, organized the Expedition in Bombay. Nothing could have been done with more sagacity, with more promptitude, or with greater judgment than the whole arrangement and organization of this Expedition under these two able men. Many of your Lordships have known Sir Seymour Fitzgerald in this country, and I for one can testify to his ability and industry when he was under me in the Foreign Office. I am, therefore, not at all surprised at the credit he has gained by the management of the arrangements and the organization of the Expedition. My Lords, Her Majesty's Government gave full powers to Sir Robert Napier to act in every respect as he thought fit, to determine as he pleased, and to act entirely upon his own judgment; and, my Lords, I think the event has proved how very important it is on such occasions, when you find a competent man, that you should give him as much liberty of action as possible. My Lords, the composition of the army was very remarkable. It consisted of men of different nations and of different creeds. There were Mahomedan and there were Christian troops; there were Christian Sepoys, there were Beloochees and Hindoostanees; but this army, though of such different materials, was bound together by so solid a chain of discipline that throughout the whole campaign the utmost cordiality prevailed in every part of the force. Doubtless, my Lords, we owe much of this cordiality and good feeling to the character of Sir Robert Napier, who commanded them. It may not be out of place to mention some general facts respecting the organization of the Expedition, independently of the troops. There were 23,600 animals, exclusively of forty-two elephants, employed. The ships of various sorts numbered 231, with a tonnage that amounted altogether to 209,600 tons. And when we speak of the forty-two elephants that were employed, we cannot help observing that no such use has been made of those intelligent and magnificent animals since the days of Hannibal. In India they are used in a champagne country, and more for draught than carriage; but in this instance, when mortars and artillery of 18cwt. were put upon their backs, they showed an activity in climbing those dangerous and slippery paths over the mountains that astonished even the Indian officers who had seen them at work in their own country.

My Lords, I now come to the Resolutions which I have to move, and I think it better to read them at once. My Lords, I propose to your Lordships to resolve—

> "That the Thanks of this House be given to Lieut.-General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., for the exemplary Skill with which he planned and the distinguished Energy, Courage, and Perseverance with which he conducted the recent Expedition into Abyssinia, resulting in the Defeat by Her Majesty's Forces of the Army of King Theodore and the Vindication of the Honour of the Country by the Rescue from Captivity of Her Majesty's Envoy and other British Subjects, and by the Capture and Destruction of the strong Fortress of Magdala.
>
> "That the Thanks of this House be given to Commodore Heath, R.N., C.B., for the indefatigable Zeal and great Ability with which he conducted the Naval Operations connected with the Transport of the Troops and Stores upon which the Success of the Expedition materially depended.
>
> "That the Thanks of this House be given to Major-General Sir Charles Staveley, K.C.B., Major-General G. Malcolm, C.B., Major-General E. L. Russell, Brigadier-General W. Merewether, C.B., and the other Officers of the Navy and Army for the Energy, Gallantry, and Ability with which they have executed the various Services which they have been called on to perform throughout these arduous Operations.
>
> "That this House doth highly acknowledge and approve the Discipline, Gallantry, and Endurance displayed by the Petty Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, and Men of the Navy and Army, both European and Native, during these Operations; and that the same be signified to them by their respective Commanding Officers."

My Lords, I think no further tribute of praise need be paid by me to Sir Robert Napier than is embodied in these Resolutions; but, passing for a moment the other officers engaged, I will ask your Lordships to recollect that General Staveley was the officer who first arranged a base of operations at Zoulla, and being afterwards sent to the front, commanded the troops that fought the battle in front of Magdala, and was present at its capture. Let me also remind your Lordships that General Malcolm had command of the chain of communication between Zoulla and the most advanced posts of the army, and though he and the officers under him were not present at the taking of Magdala, yet their services were equally important; for the communication here was like the chain attached to the anchor of a ship—if one link were broken, the army, like the ship, would be destroyed or at least be in the greatest danger. This communication was maintained with the utmost possible energy and intelligence, and was of the greatest importance in securing the safety of the advance. And now I would also mention the name of Major General Russell. Sir Robert Napier was most anxious that he should receive by name the Thanks of Parliament for his services, and Her Majesty's Government have thought proper to yield to that desire. Major General Russell was taken from his post at Aden at the request of Sir Robert Napier, who speaks of his services in maintaining the base of operations at Zoulla as of the greatest value. The name of Brigadier General Merewether is more familiar to your Lordships. From the very beginning, and, indeed, before the Expedition landed, he showed the greatest intelligence in maintaining what are called "political relations" with the various tribes and chiefs, first upon the coast and afterwards inland; and Sir Robert Napier speaks of his services also in the highest terms. Nor ought we to omit the great services of the navy on this occasion. The services of Commodore Heath and the other officers employed are spoken of by Sir Robert Napier in these words—

> "I am very happy in this opportunity of saying how cordially Commodore Heath has conducted the naval duties of the Expedition in connection with the army. The spirit of their commander has been emulated by the officers and men of the Royal Navy under his orders. The labour under a hot sun of landing supplies and water, and re-embarking troops, followers, and cattle has never, for a single day, ceased since the arrival of the first transport in Annesley Bay. . . . Greatly, too, are we indebted to Captain Tryon, R.N., the able Director of Transports."

I may also mention the name of Captain Edye, of Her Majesty's ship *Satellite*, who rendered most useful assistance in superintending the distillation of water for the army. In that country it is impossible in the dry season to find a sufficient quantity of water for the troops, and the distillation of water, therefore, became a point of vast importance. Not the least agreeable part of my task is to ask your Lordships to acknowledge the discipline and gallantry of the Petty Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, and Men of the Army and Navy. No campaign ever showed more conspicuously the energy of British troops, and their constancy in enduring the privations and overcoming the natural difficulties of the country. Their labours were immense. Sir Robert Napier in his despatch describes them as all working with the spade, every regiment being furnished with tools; and I think we shall never again hear, as we have so often heard before, that the English soldier can only fight, but cannot dig, and is incapable of throwing up intrenchments like the soldiers of other armies. Again, the march of the 45th Regiment is one of the most extraordinary on record. Having been detained in the rear, and being anxious to come as soon as possible to the front, they marched 300 miles in twenty-four days, and accomplished seventy miles in four days over a pass 10,500 feet high. The exploits of the cavalry appear to be equally admirable. We can easily understand what a difficult country Abyssinia is for horses; and yet Sir Robert Napier described the manner in which the cavalry behaved as most extraordinary considering the obstacles they had to encounter in such a mountainous country. I have mentioned the names of the gallant Generals who have led our troops to victory; and I should now like to mention two names of another class in our force—the names of Drummer M'Guire, and Private Bergin of the 33rd Regiment, who were the first two men at the storming of Magdala. Nor was the humanity and good conduct of the troops throughout the Expedition inferior to their courage and endurance. Sir Robert Napier says—

> "Not a single complaint has been made against a soldier of having injured or wilfully molested either property or person."

My Lords, I do not believe that of any army in Europe or in any other part of the world could the same be said. As your Lordships are aware, Magdala was taken, and finding himself in a desperate condition—believing, perhaps, that the same cruelty which he had inflicted on others would be exercised towards him — this savage King put an end to his life with his own hand. The atrocities he had perpetrated were such that I think there cannot be a single person who would extend to him the slightest compassion. The cruelties he committed within three days of his death are too horrible to be repeated; but, if anybody doubts that the monster was unfit to live, he has only to study the first part of the Papers laid on your Lordships' Table, and

I would refer more particularly to page 693 for a description of horrors almost incredible. I believe that, here and there, it has been objected that, when once King Theodore had given up the captives, an attack on Magdala was unnecessary. It has been suggested, no doubt from kindly motives of humanity, that Sir Robert Napier might have accepted the submission of Theodore instead of deciding to storm his fortress, and in this way put an end to his existence. But there can be no greater mistake than to suppose that such a course would have been pursued without risk of very great misfortune. In the first place, it is almost certain that if he had been left there with the whole or with any considerable part of his army still under his command, when we had begun our retreat in that very difficult country —a retreat almost as arduous as the advance, except that we then had to make no roads—the King, with the little faith to be found in barbarian rulers, would have attacked or have harrassed our troops as long as he could have done so. There was another reason why Sir Robert Napier could not adopt such a course—namely, that in his advance he had obtained the support of the chiefs of the country on the understanding, and a thorough confidence on their side, that he would put an end to the tyranny of King Theodore, who was as hateful to them as he was to ourselves. We should, therefore, have broken faith with those chiefs who supported us in our advance to Magdala if we had not destroyed the power of Theodore. One more criticism has been made very often during the progress of the Expedition by amateur soldiers, and that is that it was extravagantly large. Now, I think, that even if you had not received the statement of Sir Robert Napiér himself to the effect that he had not one man too many, it would still have been evident that, looking at the long chain of communication, extending over 400 miles through that difficult country, from the coast to Magdala, it would have been impossible to have employed a smaller force with a fair prospect of success, or to listen to suggestions made that the prisoners might have been rescued with a couple of flying squadrons of cavalry. That has now been shown to have been wholly impracticable. I will allude to one point more, and that is the very small loss of life which has occurred during these operations. In other wars, we know how heavy has been what is called "the butcher's bill," and we know what numbers have generally perished by the sword and by disease. But there seems to have been a special Providence over this army, and it is not unbecoming to say that the justice of our cause and the crimes which called for punishment from us may have brought upon our army the Divine blessing, without which no science and no gallantry will avail. The army feels, and justly feels, that a debt of gratitude is due to the illustrious Duke who sits upon the cross-Benches. All are aware of the assistance he rendered, and the zeal he showed in prosecuting this Expedition to a successful end; and I have myself heard the strongest expressions of the value of his co-operation. It is with pride and pleasure I hand these Resolutions to the Lord Chancellor; and I am assured they will be accepted by your Lordships with the same readiness and satisfaction that I feel in proposing them.

The Resolutions having been read by The LORD CHANCELLOR,

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, it gives me great pleasure to second the Motion which the noble Earl has proposed, and to express my concurrence in all the remarks he has made. The noble Earl has stated that on the 16th of April, 1867, the Expedition was resolved upon, and that on the 13th of April last Magdala was taken; and I may add that on the 2nd of July we have the Expedition wholly completed, and we have welcomed on his return the gallant General by whom it was so ably commanded and have now only to vote our thanks to our officers and troops for their successful conduct of the enterprize. My Lords, I quite agree with the noble Earl that it was right to show forbearance before we resorted to the dreadful issue of war and the uncertainty of military operations in an unknown and inhospitable country. I, therefore, think it was right to postpone until the time when the Resolution was taken the determination to undertake this Expedition: and I also think that determination was come to exactly at the right time, when forbearance had reached its utmost limits, and there was nothing left for us to do but to vindicate the honour of the country. We can all rejoice now that that honour has been vindicated in so triumphant manner. The noble Earl referred, in the next place, to the preparations that were made for the Expedition;

and I think that to all the Departments of the Government that were concerned—to the Foreign Office, which carried on the communications with the Emperor Theodore; to the Indian Department, which was charged with the necessary preparations; to the War Department, and to the Department of the Commander-in-Chief— the Thanks of this House and of the whole country are due for the manner in which they performed the duties that devolved upon them. Then, again, when the Commander-in-Chief was to be named, the Government acted at once with prudence and justice; for, having ascertained from authentic sources the character of Sir Robert Napier, they selected him and confided to his discretion the details of the manner in which the Expedition was to be carried out. Next we have to admire, through the period over which the Expedition has extended, the harmony that has prevailed among all the Departments of the Army concerned in carrying on the operations. The infantry, the cavalry, the artillery, the transport corps, and the pioneers all acted in harmony, and performed their duties in such a manner as to contribute to the achievement of the great result. And what is it which brought to bear upon bodies of men of this kind of many different nations, and trained in very different schools, distributed over a long tract of country—some of them Natives of it—makes them all act in harmony, and with that common purpose which conduces to success? It is due to the influence of the single mind which commands; and in this case it was the character of the man at the head of the Expedition which produced harmony, inspired confidence in all who followed him, and made them confide at once in his decisions, and do all in their power to carry out his purposes. I need not enter into any of the details of the Expedition, because Sir Robert Napier has narrated in the most simple, the most modest, and, at the same time, in the clearest language all the operations which he directed. I will only say that to all the brilliant achievements of the British Army in times past, I am glad that we have in our times added one other not less brilliant; that we have added another to the roll of those names which carry our military fame over the world. There might have been greater difficulties to overcome; there might have been greater obstacles to be surmounted; there may be some gallant officers and some brave men who may lament that the resistance was not greater, that there were not more military exploits to be performed, and that there was no long siege to be undertaken; but, for my own part, when I consider the purpose for which this Expedition was undertaken, I think it a merciful interposition of Providence that no cruel act was committed against the prisoners to induce us to prolong the campaign, which was undertaken with the desire to carry it no further than was necessary to effect their release. I feel quite sure—and every man in this country feels quite sure—that, whatever number of assailants had come against the British Army, whatever difficulties of marching they had had to surmount, their courage and their endurance would have overcome them all. I must say we ought to be most thankful that this Army, without having had such obstacles to surmount, has succeeded in rescuing the unfortunate men and women who had been so long kept in captivity, and that it has returned to this country without great loss of life by climate or by war. With regard to the last catastrophe of the war, it is a happy thing the Emperor Theodore did not attempt any further retreat; and, as for the loss of his life, I must say it is a benefit to mankind that such an odious monster should be removed from the world. I therefore beg permission most cordially and heartily to second the Motion of the noble Earl. This Motion concerns only the military and naval authorities, who were engaged in the war, all of whom deserve the Thanks proposed to be given to them; and although it does not come within the scope of the Vote of Thanks, I may add that I think the Government—for the determination they took, for the time at which they took it, and for the preparations they made for the Expedition, deserve the acknowledgments of the House and the country.

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE: My Lords, your Lordships may naturally and reasonably expect that I should address some observations to the House on this subject, and I do so with a satisfaction which is rarely experienced, because I believe I may say, without fear of contradiction, that in the whole course of this Expedition there has not been a single military step taken, which may not be considered a success and a triumph. I admit that these are strong terms, which may be thought to have a more appropriate application to those stirring and brilliant military exploits which have often illustrated our history; but the triumph which has been achieved in the case of this Expedition is the result of sustained energy and unremitting endurance, as well as of courage; and may, therefore, claim its own special distinction. From the gallant General, who commanded, down to the youngest drummer, there has not been one man in the Army, who, from the day he landed to the day he re-embarked, did not devote his whole energies, physical and mental, to the service of his country. Success has been achieved in a most remarkable degree; and that success has been achieved by overcoming difficulties, and by contending with dangers, which nobody foresaw to the extent which were afterwards encountered. I have observed it has been occasionally said that the General might have been more rapid in his movements, and more pressing in his attack; but, so far from that being a charge against him, it is a proof of his talent and capacity, that he did not listen to advice — the very natural advice — of those who were not so cognizant as he was of the nature of what he had to do; and that he was not to be so far carried away as to attempt that which he was not assured he could accomplish, but would wait until the moment arrived when he knew he could attain his object, and then strike a blow with vigour. It is to the exercise of this discretion we owe the happy result of the Expedition. Such, in few words, are the qualities that have given distinction to the General who carried on these operations, whose anxiety of mind must have been great. At various stages of his advance he found himself called upon to diminish the comforts of the troops, to diminish their rations, to dispense with camp followers, and to leave behind various stores and necessaries ordinarily carried by an Army; and these sacrifices were made in order to attain the object in view; and I hope your Lordships will think he has attained it with no more bloodshed than in the performance of strict duty he was called upon to incur. I know it has been said he ought not to have done more than rescue the prisoners, and that having obtained them, he ought to have retired, without making any further demand. But I venture to think your Lordships will agree with me in saying that as a General, he could not have done that. As it was, even after the death of Theodore, and the destruction of Magdala, and the dispersion of the followers of Theodore, there was considerable difficulty in protecting the return of the Army from the dangerous and wild tribes of the country through which it had to pass. If therefore, Sir Robert Napier had not struck the blow home—if I may use the expression—if he had not entirely broken up the nest of robbers who had recognized the authority of Theodore, it is to be supposed that the forces might have been exposed to very serious dangers, which might have resulted in the General returning with a shattered, instead of a perfect army. It was, therefore, necessary that Sir Robert Napier should do what he did before he retraced his steps. It has been commented upon as singular that the force sent to Abyssinia was not under the immediate control of the Government Departments of this country, but was placed under the Indian Government. When Her Majesty's Government did me the honour to consult me as to how the war should be conducted, and asked me for my opinion on the subject, I could not for a moment hesitate to say that one thing was quite clear—namely, that the Government must allow the Expedition to be planned by one authority and one authority only. The question then arose as to what that authority should be—whether it should be at home or in India. My Lords, I ventured to suggest that it should be in India, and for the simple reason that an expedition of that kind could not be undertaken without employing a very large proportion of Indian troops. It was, therefore, much more reasonable and wise that the whole conduct of this war should be in the hands of an Indian authority, instead of being confided to anyone at home. Moreover—and perhaps this is the most important point of all—it had been decided by Her Majesty's Government that Sir Robert Napier was to have the supreme command of the Expedition; and it therefore appeared to me that there could be no doubt that the General officer who was to command the Expedition was the proper person to have the sole and undivided responsibility of making all the requisite arrangements. I think the result of this experiment—if I may so term it—should be a lesson to us. It is quite evident that when any great operation of war is being planned you must place the greatest reliance in the officer upon whom you intend to confer the honour of commanding the troops. Of

The Duke of Cambridge

course, it is natural, and, indeed, essential, that he should act in cordial co-operation with the authorities; but it is above all essential that he should be the ruling and directing spirit of the operations—that they should take their impress from him, and he will be stimulated to the exercise of his best energies by the knowledge that in the event of failure the responsibility will be his, Depend upon it that is the proper way to conduct such a military operation, and I do hope that the lesson which we have learnt upon this occasion will not be lost upon us should it hereafter become necessary to undertake an expedition of a similar kind. I wish also to point out that the Expedition has shown us how necessary it is to keep in a state of efficiency certain establishments, without which the Army cannot act. It is a very remarkable circumstance that at the beginning of this contest we were all of us —including, I believe, Her Majesty's Government, and certainly myself—considerably alarmed that the delay consequent upon our want of transport would render it doubtful whether the Expedition could be brought to a close with safety. There was no transport corps in India at all, and therefore everything had to be improvised. I may, perhaps, be allowed to mention that at a more distant period I experienced the same inconvenience; and it is evident that if we do not keep up at least the nucleus of a transport establishment in time of peace we shall find it very difficult suddenly to improvise one in time of war. The zeal, however, with which the officers of the Indian Army worked in order to form an efficient transport corps was quite remarkable. Sir Robert Napier told me this morning, when I had the pleasure of shaking hands with him, how zealously the officers of the transport corps, brought together from every part of India, worked to produce those results on which we are now able to congratulate ourselves. He told me of one officer, whom he met at Zoulla, wearing a "wide-awake," and looking extremely tattered and shattered, but whose only object was to get his forty or fifty mules to the proper place. Any officer of the British Army would, I am sure, be willing, in order to promote the success of an expedition, to enter into services which were somewhat different from the duties of the special corps to which they may happen to belong. I am certain that every officer, from the highest to the lowest, has worked very hard in this Abyssinian Expedition. To add anything to what has been already said of the conduct of Sir Robert Napier would be quite superfluous on my part; but I cannot refrain from saying that this distinguished man, who has shown himself so competent to command and to express in suitable terms the exploits of the force under his orders, is at the same time one of the most simple, modest, and unassuming men I ever met. After seeing him this morning, the impression left on my mind is that he is an officer who thought nothing of himself, and everything of the troops under his command. I hope I may be also permitted to say that while I share in the feeling of your Lordships with regard to the ability of Sir Robert Napier, and the high merits of Commodore Heath, Major General Sir Charles Staveley, Major General Malcolm, Major General Russell, Brigadier General Merewether, and the other Officers, I cannot but express my admiration of the extraordinary determination, endurance, and vigour displayed by the Non-commissioned Officers and Men, many of whom were Natives. It should be borne in mind that these Native troops really vied with the European troops in the performance of their duty. They performed their duty as conscientiously and as well as the Europeans, and I am sure that both Natives and Europeans richly deserve their share of that praise and commendation which your Lordships, the House of Commons and the country have bestowed upon the Officers. In reference to the very slight assistance which I may have given to the Expedition, I can only say that I certainly did my best to give it every support in my power, and that in doing so I received the cordial support and assistance of all the Departments with which I had occasion to communicate.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD: My Lords, though this Expedition was planned and the troops were supplied by the authorities in India, yet there were certain supplementary services which were rendered by the Departments under the control of the War Office, and which have been recognized by Sir Robert Napier in his despatches. For instance, there was the Topographical Department, which has constructed from very scanty materials an excellent map of the country. The Royal Engineers also sent out a body of instructed men—telegraphers, signallers, photographers, and well sinkers, whose services were of the utmost value, while the Arsenal at Woolwich designed and constructed two small batteries of artillery. An order was likewise received at Woolwich to provide 8,000 baggage animals for delivery at Suez in the short space of three months. From our experience in the Crimea it was at least doubtful whether they could be supplied in the specified time; but, nevertheless, the task was undertaken, and in consequence of the zeal of the various officers, successfully accomplished. I regret to say, however, that one valuable life was lost. Colonel Clark Kennedy, who was sent to Egypt to superintend the arrangements, died of a disease which was caused, or, at any rate, greatly aggravated by the anxiety consequent upon the duties which he had to perform. He was an officer of high reputation, and had served with distinction in India and China, and was as much distinguished by his energy and activity in peace as in war, and was doubtless known to many of your Lordships on account of the active part he had taken in the Volunteer movement. As the representative in this House of the Department with which I am connected, I beg to add my cordial congratulations to the gallant General and to the forces under his orders, and I will add the expression of my sympathy for the relations of those — fortunately few in number—who have lost their lives in the Expedition. In India, when it was reported that the troops would be furnished from one Presidency, the troops in the other Presidencies also at once remonstrated and claimed to have a share in the glory and the danger of the undertaking. In this country also, the moment the Expedition was announced, the public Departments were besieged by eager applicants who wished to join the Expedition in different capacities. A force animated with such a spirit could hardly fail to succeed. To ourselves—the Members of Parliament — it has been suggested that such an occasion as this has also its moral. The incidents of a military campaign, the calculation of forces, the preparation for attack and defence, the sagacity of the leader who foresees success, and the endurance of the rank and file, which enable him to retrieve a disaster are re-produced in the circumstances of political life—namely, in the discussion and the conduct of public affairs in a powerful and free State; and when we assemble here to pay such honour as we can pay to those who have been mighty in war, and to offer the thanks of Parliament to the General and those under his command who have successfully conducted a difficult enterprize, we may bear in mind that men will follow us who will inquire with a keen scrutiny how we have conducted ourselves in the campaign of the national life.

THE EARL OF ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I beg leave to say a few words on this Motion. I desire to be allowed to offer the tribute of my congratulations to the Commander of this Expedition, the English troops acting under him, and also —the more particularly because of the interest I have always taken in the Indian Army—to the soldiers of the Indian Army who took so prominent a part in this achievement. My Lords, you will recollect that I expressed an opinion that this Expedition ought not to have been undertaken. I did so because I thought the risks greatly exceeded the chances of success. I pointed out that the troops engaged in the Expedition would have to maintain a line of communication nearly 400 miles in length, between the point of basis on the coast from which their supplies were to be received and the point of actual attack; and that there would be great difficulties arising from the character of the population and the nature of the country generally. Every danger that I anticipated has been encountered by our troops. Indeed, my Lords, the country has proved to be more difficult, the obstacles to the advance of our troops have been more serious, the embarrassments in respect of transport have been greater, and the supply of water has been more scanty thanI had ventured to suggest. In fact, no one can read the despatches without seeing that sometimes—even up to almost the last moment—the Army was in the greatest peril. It is because I was more keenly alive to the difficulties of the campaign, that I can now regard the result of the Expedition with feelings of perhaps greater satisfaction than those entertained by your Lordships who did not share in my apprehensions; and that I feel, and am entitled to feel, greater pride and satisfaction at the triumphant success achieved by our arms. I think, my Lords, this Abyssinian Expedition has no parallel in history. In all previous campaigns the contest was between man and man; with, perhaps, frequent difficulties arising from the nature of the country, but difficulties which had to be surmounted by both parties. But this was a contest, not with man, but with Nature—a contest waged for 400 miles. I know nothing in history to be compared with the difficulties which the troops in this campaign overcame with such spirit and determination. I believe that this campaign entitles those engaged in it to the highest praise which can be given to soldiers. My Lords, I remember the Duke of Wellington telling me on one occasion that the British Indian Army when he knew it came nearer to his idea of what the Roman Legion was than any army he had ever seen. I am glad that on this occasion the British Indian Army has maintained its reputation of those days. I recollect that in one of those accounts which from time to time were furnished by private hands and published in the newspapers this fact particularly struck me—that in the attack on Magdala the Belochees behaved so well that they received loud cheers from the British Army. My Lords, in those cheers I hear the death knell of the memory of the Indian mutiny; because I believe that henceforth in the recollection of common services and common efforts the British soldier and the Indian soldier will once more feel for each other those feelings of brotherhood which made the two armies, when formerly thus united, invincible. I trust, my Lords, that everything will be done to improve the organization of the Native Army, and that they will not be left to want the means of transport, without which an army is useless. I trust the greatest care will be taken to establish an *esprit de corps*, so that the soldiers and the officers may know one another and grow old together. I hope, also, that in the treatment of the Native troops every consideration will be given to their religious feelings and their laws of caste. We ought, I think, to still act on the principles which guided us in the early days of our connection with India. I remember reading the opinion of a philosophic historian, that it is easy to rule our Empire by the means through which it was acquired. I trust that principle will influence us hereafter in our legislation for British India; that we shall endeavour on all occasions to conciliate the Natives and to obtain their confidence; and that, above all, our rule shall be characterized by that which produces the greatest effect in an Eastern country—the principles of justice. If we follow these principles, I believe the British Empire in India will be secure, that for centuries we may extend the blessings of our rule to a constantly increasing population, and that British India may last, endure, and be eternal.

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, I do not apprehend that in your Lordships' House there will be any probability of a difference of opinion on this occasion; and though I am conscious that I am not entitled to speak on military matters with the authority of the illustrious Duke on the cross-Benches, or with that of my noble Friend who has just sat down, yet I trust that, considering the post I had the honour to hold when this Expedition was determined upon, I may be permitted to add my voice to the chorus of approbation which has been raised in Parliament and throughout the country to greet the victorious General and Army who have just completed an Expedition that will ever be memorable in the annals of our country. My Lords, perhaps I may be allowed also to congratulate my noble Friends in the Government on the success of an Expedition which I can assure your Lordships was, at the time we resolved upon it, a matter of deep anxiety to all the Members of the Administration. When entering upon this Expedition in a distant and unknown country, at a period of the year—and it could not have been undertaken sooner—which left only scanty time for preparation—we had to encounter all the difficulties alluded to by my noble Friend—difficulties some of which were exaggerated, others the anticipation of which fell short of the reality, and others which were not anticipated at all. We had also to encounter the doubts and obstacles of those who objected to the Expedition altogether, of those who thought the preparations too large, and of those who thought them too small. Some persons thought that the work to be done was absolutely insignificant as compared with the amount of power which we proposed to employ in its accomplishment. My noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Carnarvon) for instance, believed that the Expedition was on a scale of too great magnitude. He thought that the proper mode of action would be to make a dash with 1,000 men over a distance of 400 miles.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: I beg pardon. I never made any such suggestion.

THE EARL OF DERBY: Then I must have lost my sense of hearing. I had indulged in the hope that my noble Friend, seeing how fallacious were his original apprehensions, would have come forward and joined willingly and heartily in the general congratulations on the success of the Expedition. [The Earl of CARNARVON: Hear, hear!] On the other hand, my noble Friend who has just sat down (the Earl of Ellenborough) stated, and I admit most frankly, that he thought our provisions for the Expedition were insufficient. He pointed out with the greatest force the difficulties in our path—the difficulties of landing, the difficulties which might arise from the want of a sufficient supply of water, and the difficulty of keeping up in a possibly hostile, and, at all events, in an unknown country, communications extending a length of 400 miles. But my noble Friend has now come forward in the handsomest manner and acknowledged that the difficulties he had anticipated have been overcome, and that the strength of the Expedition was sufficient, though not more than sufficient, to enable General Napier to bring the operations to a completely successful termination. My Lords, what was the inducement to us to enter on an undertaking so fraught with peril and uncertainty to our Army, and so fraught with danger to ourselves—I mean to our personal and political reputation—if by chance it had ended in signal failure? I will venture to say that never was a war undertaken more unwillingly by any Government, more with a sense of its inevitable necessity, or with purer motives—motives more entirely devoid of all feeling of ambition and all desire of political or military aggrandizement. The object for which we undertook the Expedition was, in the first place, to vindicate the honour of the country, which would have been sullied for ever if we had not adopted such a course. In the second place we undertook it because of that feeling of humanity which was naturally excited by the sufferings of our countrymen and other Europeans who were kept in prison by the Emperor of Abyssinia. No men can be more ready than the Government, which has just been crowned with success in this Expedition, to acknowledge that there are some circumstances attending it for which special thanks are due to a superintending Providence. It is obvious that the population of the country might have fallen upon our force, have continually plundered and interrupted it, cut off the supplies, and in various ways have offered opposition, annoying to a stronger force, but which would have been destruction to a weak one. No one, again, could have failed to remark the special direction which was given by Almighty God to the mind of Theodore at the very last moment, leading that capricious tyrant to abstain from exercising his brutality in putting to death the men we were anxious to deliver. The country, certainly, would have been deeply disappointed, and heavy blame would have fallen upon the organizers of the Expedition, if, instead of being able to rescue the captives from that imprisonment in which they had languished so long, the result of the Expedition had failed to accomplish the great object in view, and had only exposed them to a cruel death. I must say that whatever the merits of Sir Robert Napier—signally great as all your Lordships will admit them to be—I know of no point in the conduct of this Expedition that reflects more honour on his moral courage than the trial to which it was subjected at the very close of the Expedition, when he had to refuse the final offer of Theodore and to return to captivity those who had just been sent to his camp as envoys—being well aware, moreover, that his reply might lead to the destruction of those whom he desired to save. But the gallant officer exhibited the moral courage which was necessary to encounter so fearful a responsibility, and judged sagaciously of the demoralization of the enemy and of the effect which the previous success of our arms had produced on the mind of Theodore. Happily, his expectations were verified by the event, and the two officers who returned, as it appeared at the time, certainly to captivity, and possibly to death, had the satisfaction of meeting the whole of their fellow-prisoners on their way back, and of returning with them in triumph to the camp. With regard to the Expedition itself, the only merit to which the Government can lay claim is that of having, by the advice of the illustrious Duke the Commander-in-Chief, selected the officer the most experienced and the best qualified for the service that his Royal Highness could point out, and intrusted to that General the absolute command and responsibility of the Expedition, merely saying to him — "What supplies you require that can be obtained from India you had better obtain them, and what cannot be had there shall be sent out from this country. Remember that you have only to ask and have; we tell you the object which we have in view, and we leave you entire control of the means by which it is to be effected." I will not attempt to occupy the time of your Lordships with details, but I will ask whether, from first to last, it was not evident that over the Expedition presided a master-mind who was not to be diverted by any remarks to the detriment of his judgment, or by the pressure of unwise advisers, from the well-considered course to which he had addressed his energies, and by means of which he anticipated—and, as the event proved, correctly anticipated—that at the right time he should accomplish his purpose. There are some circumstances which rendered this Expedition one of a very peculiar character. The force under the command of Sir Robert Napier consisted, as has been already pointed out, both of British and Indian troops, the whole of which vied with each other as to the manner in which they should best perform the duties devolving upon them. And it is no light matter that troops raised in the centre of Asia should, under the conduct of a British General, obtain a triumphal success in the heart of Africa, in a region which the boldest travellers had hardly ever penetrated. Then, with regard to discipline, it is, I believe, unheard of that an Expedition over such a country should have been conducted not only without breach of discipline among, but with almost entire friendliness towards, the barbarous tribes with whom they were brought into frequent contact. From the time of disembarkation till the re-embarkation of the Expedition there was not, I believe, a single complaint that any injury had been gratuitously inflicted by any soldier upon the inhabitants of the country through which they moved. Everything was paid for, and not a single instance of injustice or oppression occurred during the march. Hardly a soldier, in fact, was sentenced to any punishment during the Expedition. The difficulties which had to be encountered—not, indeed, from the enemy, but from the nature of the country—were enormous, and might have appalled men less eager and determined to do their duty; but they were faced with excellent spirit. I refer especially to the extraordinary march of the 45th Regiment, accomplishing a distance of seventy miles in four days, over a pass 10,500 feet high, and across a country which justified the forcible, if somewhat homely description of the soldier who, being told that they were marching over the table-land of Abyssinia, observed that "the table must have been turned upside down, and that they were now marching over the legs." Although the march was aggravated by thirst, and laborious in the extreme, not a single murmur or falling off from duty was heard; on the contrary, it was the earnest desire of everybody to press forward to the front. And upon the last day, when the troops, exhausted by their weary march, and almost fainting from thirst, found themselves in the presence of the enemy, and heard that he really meant to fight, those fatigued and way-worn men went with loud cheers into the conflict, which terminated with such glorious results. It has been said that the British soldier is very good at fighting, but knows nothing of the other business of war. All I can say is, that not only did Sir Robert Napier show entire oblivion of himself in his regard for others, but his despatches bear emphatic testimony on this point—that the different portions of the Army, while performing their own duties thoroughly, were, at the same time, ready to assist their comrades in the discharge of duties specially belonging to them. My Lords, I must not forget the services of the Naval Brigade. We are not accustomed to consider sailors particularly at home in managing animals of draught; but among the various subjects of praise distinct mention is made of the fact that the Naval Brigade, with regard to the handling and breaking of mules, proved themselves superior to the rest of the army: there were no persons by whom those animals were more carefully tended, or, owing probably to the kindly nature of seamen, by whom they were more successfully and prudently handled. I ought, perhaps, to apologize for having ventured to say anything upon a subject of this extraordinary character. But, at the same time, knowing the difficulties which had to be encountered in the first instance in preparing for the Expedition, and the difficulties, likewise, which had to be surmounted by the General, and those under his command, in conducting the Expedition to a triumphant success, I could not resist allowing myself the pleasure of bearing my testimony, however humble and unimportant, to the great services rendered by General Sir Robert Napier. And I am perfectly satisfied that he will receive every mark of approval, not only from Her Majesty's Government, but also the grateful thanks of the country, for the deeds which he has performed.

Resolved, Nemine Dissentiente, That the Thanks of this House be given to Lieut.-General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., for the exemplary Skill with which he planned and the distinguished Energy, Courage, and Perseverance with which he conducted the recent Expedition into Abyssinia, resulting in the Defeat by Her Majesty's Forces of the Army of King Theodore and the Vindication of the Honour of the Country by the Rescue from Captivity of Her Majesty's Envoy and other British Subjects, and by the Capture and Destruction of the strong Fortress of Magdala:

Resolved, Nemine Dissentiente, That the Thanks of this House be given to Commodore Heath, R.N., C.B., for the indefatigable Zeal and great Ability with which he conducted the Naval Operations connected with the Transport of the Troops and Stores upon which the Success of the Expedition materially depended:

Resolved, Nemine Dissentiente, That the Thanks of this House be given to Major-General Sir Charles Staveley, K.C.B., Major-General G. Malcolm, C.B., Major-General E. L. Russell, Brigadier-General W. Merewether, C.B., and the other Officers of the Navy and Army for the Energy, Gallantry, and Ability with which they have executed the various Services which they have been called on to perform throughout these arduous Operations:

Resolved, Nemine Dissentiente, That this House doth highly acknowledge and approve the Discipline, Gallantry, and Endurance displayed by the Petty Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, and Men of the Navy and Army, both European and Native, during these Operations; and that the same be signified to them by their respective Commanding Officers.

Ordered, That the Lord Chancellor do communicate the said Resolutions to Lieut.-General Sir Robert Napier; and that he be requested by The Lord Chancellor to signify the same to Commodore Heath, Major-General Sir Charles Staveley, Major-General G. Malcolm, Major-General E. L. Russell, Brigadier-General W. Merewether, and to the several Officers of the Navy and Army referred to therein.

BOUNDARY BILL.—(No. 170.)

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Alteration of Boundaries of old Boroughs).

Earl BEAUCHAMP said, that, in moving an Amendment to the clause, he desired to submit some suggestions for their Lordships' consideration. It was within the Committee's recollection that a Royal Commission had been appointed to arrange the boundaries of certain counties and boroughs in England and Wales; and he believed he gave expression to a unanimous feeling when he said that the ability and impartiality of those who formed the Commission were unquestionable. They were men of sound judgment and great political experience. Two of them were Members of the House of Commons, two had formerly been Members of that House; and the Chairman, though he now adorned their Lordships' House, presided for a long time over the other House, his eminent impartiality being but one of the many qualifications which recommended him for that position. Such Gentlemen might be expected to bring a great amount of ability and impartiality to their task, and he believed their voluminous Report had amply justified their selection for it. Now, their Instructions were to inquire into the boundaries of certain boroughs with a view to ascertain whether they should be enlarged so as to include within their limits districts which, due regard being had to situation and other local circumstances, ought to be included, for the purpose of conferring on the people residing therein the Parliamentary franchise. Those Instructions had been criticized as imperfect; but from that opinion he differed, for he thought it was a wise course to lay down a broad principle and leave the Commissioners unfettered to act according to the best of their judgment. It might, perhaps, be an obvious arrangement that the Parliamentary should, in all cases, be made conterminous with the municipal boundary; but last year Parliament decided against that idea, but when the Report of the Commission came before the House of Commons it did not give satisfaction. In a large number of cases the Commissioners recommended no change, and in a large number they recommended changes which had been adopted without opposition. Twenty-nine cases were referred by the House of Commons to a Select Committee, and that Committee approved the recommendations of the Commissioners with regard to fourteen of them. Now, he (Earl Beauchamp) thought that the other House, having appointed a Committee to revise the decisions of the Commissioners, it would be competent for their Lordships to revise the decisions of the Committee. He did not think, indeed, it would be respectful to send down to the House of Commons the whole of the proposals which they had already negatived, and he proposed to distinguish between some of the cases. The metropolitan boroughs of Marylebone and Lambeth were so exceptional, and so much might be said on both sides with regard to them, that he did not ask their Lordships to revert to the recommendations of the Commissioners, although personally he agreed with them. Warwick and Portsmouth were also peculiarly circumstanced. The Commissioners proposed to unite Leamington with Warwick; but this would practically swamp Warwick and convert it into a suburb of Leamington. they also proposed to unite Gosport to Portsmouth. Now, the boundary of Portsmouth, through mere accident, was at present the high-water mark, not of the Portsmouth but of the Gosport side of the harbour. But the population of Gosport was so large that it would be a measure of grouping rather than a revision of boundaries if that place was added to Portsmouth; and as the House of Commons last year decided against the principle of grouping, he did not propose to interfere with the decision of the Committee in those cases. Reading he would also pass by, on the principle *de minimis non curat lex.* The other cases were very different, and raised an important question. Among these boroughs were the important towns of Birkenhead, Birmingham, Bristol, Gateshead, Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, and South Shields. The only objection to the Commissioners' recommendations appeared to be the fear entertained by the inhabitants of the outlying districts that they would hereafter be obliged to share the municipal burdens, while the people within the present boundaries thought the importance of their boroughs would be diminished, and their splendour tarnished by the enlargement proposed. If, however, the wishes of the people concerned were to be conclusive, the principle was capable of a much wider application, and would be attended with such difficulties that he was sure it could never be adopted by Parliament. Since he had given Notice of his Amendments he had had the advantage of studying the Reports of the Assistant Commissioners, who seemed to him to have done their work with great fairness and impartiality. In every case they visited the localities, they gave ample notice to all parties concerned, they heard all who went before them, and entered fully into all the circumstances of each case. But the Select Committee of the House of Commons, though they examined the Assistant Commissioners and the Members for the boroughs and counties affected, were unable to make such minute inquiries. The Assistant Commissioners were instructed to take into consideration the nearness of the borough to the districts proposed to be added to it; how many of the houses had been built since 1832, and whether the inhabitants of the new districts had any community of interest with those in the boroughs. These, it appeared to him, were considerations dictated by common sense, and they could only be arrived at by a knowledge of local details. The Commissioners acted upon these principles, and they did not recommend extension unless there was a mass of houses and not a mere fringe joining the existing boundaries. He saw no reason to doubt their ability and impartiality, or the general wisdom of their recommendations. He would briefly refer to a few of the cases in which the Select Committee had departed from those recommendations. The first on the list was the borough of Birmingham, which happened to be one with which he had some little acquaintance. That borough was in the county of Warwick, and abutted on the counties of Worcester and Stafford. One of the recommendations of the Commission was that the manor of Aston and the district of Balsall Heath should be taken within the Parliamentary boundary, one of which was in Worcestershire and the other in Stafford. It was impossible for anyone who was not well acquainted with the town to say where Birmingham ended or began; and there was no reason whatever, if they were making an alteration of boundaries, why an exception should be made in the case of Birmingham. It was said, indeed, that the constituency would be made too large; but it was determined last year to augment very considerably the constituencies of the country, and therefore it would not now be proper to leave their handiwork undone. He believed it would be impossible for any person to come to any other conclusion than this—that if any borough was to have its boundaries altered it would be the greatest injustice to omit Aston Manor and the district of Balsall Heath from the borough of Birmingham. The case of Birkenhead was also one in which they ought not lightly to pass over the recommendations of the Commissioners. They recommended the addition of Wallaby Pool to Birkenhead; and it was beyond doubt that that district was an essential part of the town. If the Commissioners had in any way misconstrued their Instructions that would be a reason for setting their recommendations aside; but if they had acted up to their Instructions it was not right for anyone to come down with an *ex post facto* rule, and tell their Lordships that they ought to shrink from increasing the constituencies of the country. He begged to propose, therefore, in Clause 4, line 7, after the word "Bewdley," to insert "Birkenhead and Birmingham."

EARL GRANVILLE said, he was perfectly satisfied that the Commission which had sat during the autumn had given very great and impartial consideration to the subject on which they were employed. But the Commissioners were fettered by the terms of their Instructions—and for that he blamed the Government; they had not sufficient power—and the result was that their Report had created great dissatisfaction both in the House of Commons and in the large constituencies with which they had dealt. The question of accepting the recommendations of the Commissioners with respect to those constituencies was raised in the House of Commons, objections were made and divisions taken with very large majorities against the proposition. The Government themselves proposed to refer the question to a Select Committee of the House of Commons, which made certain recommendations in which they were perfectly unanimous. On the 15th of June that great political General, of whose praises they had heard much that night—a little out of place he thought—who usually foresaw success when others despaired of it, and achieved the success which he had foreseen—he trusted, however, he would never resort to what, though fair in war, would not be fair in party politics, the free use of stratagems—that great political General had said with reference to the order and conduct of Business—

> "Now I adhere to the statement I originally made on the subject of Public Business—namely, that my first object was to carry the three supplementary Reform measures. Now, the Scotch Reform Bill and the Boundary Bill, though they have not yet left this House, may be considered as virtually settled; but we have still a third measure of Reform before us."

Well, the Scotch Reform Bill was read a third time and passed on the 18th of June; and on the same day Mr. Disraeli, in answer to Mr. Milner Gibson, on the Business of the House, and referring to a former statement that they should proceed with the supplementary Reform Bills with as much despatch as possible, said—

> "And I must add that we have proceeded with considerable despatch, that we have made such great advances with those Bills, and I do not anticipate that any great delay is now possible with respect to any of them."

He did not intend to say that these words of the Prime Minister ought to bind their Lordships' House, but they ought to bind Her Majesty's Government. If the matter was virtually settled, how was it possible that they could re-open it by means of Amendments which had been placed in their hands only two days ago? They had heard a good deal the other day about that House being made the copy and the slave of the other House of Parliament. He entirely concurred in the justice of the observation; but he held it to be still worse that their Lordships should be made the copies and the slaves of small minorities of the other House. He could not conceive anything more injurious than that the Government should make use of their Lordships as instruments in carrying out the views of their minority in the other House; moreover nothing could be more injurious to the harmony of the two Houses than that the Government should make use of their majority in that House to over-ride the decisions of the House of Commons in a matter that peculiarly belonged to them.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, he was quite sure that none of his Colleagues "elsewhere," whatever their position, would think of pledging the House of Lords to follow the decision of the House of Commons. There was not the slightest ground for saying that any unfair advantage had been taken. The opinion of the Government was well-known, and it was notorious that their desire was to support the recommendations of the Boundary Commissioners, and he had never heard that the opinion of any one of his Colleagues had changed upon this point. The question was now before the House, and it was the duty of the Government to listen to the opinions of the House upon it. The sentiments of the Government had not altered in any way, and he did not believe that any one of his Colleagues in the other House had maintained that the decision of the House of Commons was final and could not be discussed or even upset in this House.

EARL RUSSELL: This is altogether a new way of carrying on the administration of the country. The Boundary Commission, over which my noble Friend (Viscount Eversley) presided, made a very elaborate Report; and when this was questioned in the House of Commons no difficulty was made in appointing a Committee, at the head of which was a person of the highest character — Mr. Walpole. They came to a unanimous decision, and Mr. Walpole gave excellent reasons for adopting the Report of the Committee. There was a division, and a very considerable majority decided in favour of the Report of the Committee. The Government might thereupon have said, "We differ from this decision, and we shall fight against it on every point." We might then have been prepared to find a similar opposition in this House; but instead of that the Prime Minister said, "the question is settled." When, after this, the Government in this House dispute the decision so arrived at, we have a right to say that such a course is inconsistent with good faith; it is impossible to feel any confidence in any of the promises of the Government. In my opinion, if the Members of the Government mean to agree at all with the First Lord of the Treasury and to maintain his pledges, they must vote in favour of the decision of the Committee.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I think the energy of the noble Earl is somewhat misplaced, and that upon considering what has passed your Lordships will be far from adopting his opinion. The facts of the case are as simple as possible, and there can be no dispute about them. A Commission was issued for the purpose of inquiring into the Parliamentary boundaries of boroughs in England. That Commission was the Commission of Parliament, because the names of the Commissioners were inserted in the Act, which also specified the duty which they were to perform. They were directed to inquire into the boundaries of boroughs—

> "With a view to ascertain whether the boundaries should be enlarged so as to include within the limits of the borough all premises which ought —due regard being had to situation or other local circumstances—to be included therein, for the purpose of conferring upon the occupiers thereof the Parliamentary franchise for such borough."

These Instructions, I repeat, were not issued by the Executive Government, but were imposed by Parliament, and, of course, concurred in by your Lordships, as a guide to the Commissioners in the execution of the duty intrusted to them. The Commissioners made their Report. I will not say a word now upon the merits of it; but it showed, at least, that the cases of all these boroughs had received the greatest care and attention. What happened then? The Government introduced a Bill for the purpose of giving effect to the Report of the Commissioners. The Government have always said that they were perfectly content with the recommendations of the Commissioners. But it was said that the principles which the House of Commons wished to adopt in fixing the boundaries of boroughs had not been sufficiently indicated by the House for the Instruction given to the Commissioners; and ultimately, in the course of conversation in the other House, a proposal was made, to which the Government assented, to refer, not the Boundary Bill, but the Report of the Commissioners, to a Select Committee. At the time of the appointment of the Select Committee—I am speaking off book, but I do not think I am mistaken—the question was asked whether the Report of the Committee was to be considered as final? and according to my recollection the Government would give no such pledge and no such undertaking. The Committee made their Report. It was a unanimous Report, I admit, and I speak with great respect of the Members of the Committee. So far, however, from that Report being acceded to by the Government, they proceeded with the Bill in the shape in which it was brought in. Thereupon a Resolution was proposed by a Member of the House of Commons to accept the Report of the Committee *in cumulo*, substituting the conclusions of the Committee with regard to fifteen boroughs, where they recommended that there should be no alteration, in lieu of the new and enlarged boundaries proposed in the Bill. Was that proposition assented to by the Government? Certainly not. The Government resisted it, maintaining strongly that the views of the Commissioners were right and those of the Committee were erroneous. The House divided on the question; the Report of the Committee was carried; but the proposition made was really one which took the House of Commons at a great disadvantage, because, instead of taking up the case of each borough, the Resolution embraced the whole fifteen boroughs; so that the House of Commons had no opportunity, as your Lordships might now have, of considering in each instance whether the Report of the Commission or of the Committee set forth the sounder view. The majority of the House of Commons having been in favour of the Report of the Select Committee, on a subsequent day when the Business of the House of Commons and the prospects of the Business came under discussion, the Prime Minister said that those prospects might be considered with reference to that which had occurred — namely, that the House of Commons had at that time got rid of the question of the Boundary Bill. In that sense no doubt the Bill was settled. My right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli) did not mean that the Government had entered into any compromise or had altered their opinion, but that the subject no longer occupied the time of the House, and therefore the House of Commons might proceed to consider the other Business on the Paper. I am sure that nothing was further from the mind of any Member of the Government in the House of Commons than to abandon their opinion. The case now comes before your Lordships, and the question is, are you satisfied with the Report of the Commission appointed by you in conjunction with the House of Commons, or will you affirm the Report of the Select Committee? As I understand the noble Lord who proposes the Amendment, (Earl Beauchamp) he says, "The Committee of the House of Commons made a Report differing from that of the Commission as to the boundaries of fifteen boroughs. I will be satisfied with the Report of the Commission as to all; but as to five a question is raised of a peculiar kind—that of grouping, and to this there may be objections which may very possibly have influenced a good many Members of the House of Commons while dealing with the matter *en bloc,* because unions were proposed which were not acceptable." This is a question upon which the Government is perfectly free to re-assert the opinion it asserted in the House of Commons, and it is one for your Lordships' determination. Bear in mind that no extension of the Parliamentary boundary of any borough to the municipal boundary will in the slightest degree interfere with any question of taxation or municipal government. Any alteration of a municipal boundary must be a subject of separate legislation, upon which those concerned will have every opportunity of being heard. The Committee of the House of Commons, in six cases, extended Parliamentary beyond municipal boundaries. [A noble Lord: Because nobody objected!] We do not know that. The Commission do not tell us whether it is so or not. They have made a Report in which they mention eleven different considerations that have a material bearing upon the Parliamentary boundaries of boroughs; but they do not tell us which consideration or what considerations influenced their decision in any one case. As regards the wishes of the inhabitants, compare the course taken by the Commissioners with that taken by the Committee. The Commissioners sent Assistant Commissioners to hold local inquiries of the character of public meetings, where any one might be heard. The Committee of the House of Commons held private conferences and consulted with Members, who would sometimes represent sections of their constituencies, and with the Assistant Commissioners. If local wishes are to be studied it is much more likely the local inquiry would elicit them than that the private deliberations of the Committee would do so. If you consider the merits of the question it by no means follows that persons living outside a Parliamentary boundary are to object to its extension because they fear increased rates, if their inclusion is desirable on other grounds; and the proposal to adhere to the Report of the Commission involves the enfranchisement, as the Report of the Committee and the Bill involve the disfranchisement of 18,610 persons. On that ground I think your Lordships will pause before you say that the decision of the Commission was not wiser than that of the Committee.

Viscount HALIFAX said, that the noble and learned Lord had not answered the observation of his noble Friend (Earl Granville). No one denied the competency of the House to entertain the question or to reverse a decision of the other House upon it; but what his noble Friend said was that in the other House the Government said the question had been settled by the decision arrived at. He believed in the impartiality of the Commission and of the Committee; but the Committee had before it documents which the Commission had not, and it heard Members from both sides of the House. As to the Commission not giving the grounds of its decision in each case, neither did the Committee. Their Lordships were now called upon to reverse not the decision of the Commission nor the decision of the Committee, but the solemn determination of the House of Commons, without the slightest grounds being assigned for doing so. He had understood that the Government accepted that decision, and it seemed to him something like a breach of faith for the Upper House to reverse that decision. Their

Lordships had only just received the Reports of the Assistant Commissioners, and had not time to peruse them. It was desired to expedite the dissolution of Parliament, with a view to which it was absolutely essential that this Bill should be passed without delay; and yet, in the teeth of declarations made by the First Lord of the Treasury, Members of the Government were now adopting a course which would defeat the object they professed to have in view. He trusted their Lordships would not go into the merits until they had ascertained on what footing the matter stood after the declarations which had been made by the Government. If the government of the country was to be carried on in that way very great evils must result.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: My Lords, I think that if your Lordships had to consider, as the noble Viscount states, a solemn decision of the other House of Parliament, your Lordships would not feel yourselves in any way fettered in coming to a conclusion. But that is not the point which we have under discussion. The noble Lords opposite have challenged the conduct of the Government and their good faith in dealing with this question. The noble Viscount seems to think that some statement has been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister in the other House of Parliament to the effect that your Lordships must consider this question as settled, and not re-open it again. Now, I do not believe that any such statement was ever made. I am not aware of the precise passage to which the noble Viscount referred, but I know that no such intention was ever entertained by Her Majesty's Government. Indeed, the whole of their conduct previously to the appointment of the Commission tends to disprove the accusation. If the right hon. Gentleman used the term "settled" in any way whatever, he must have meant simply that the matter was concluded as far as the Business of the House of Commons was concerned; and he certainly did not intend to fetter the action of the Government or of this House on the subject. I will just state what was the intention of Her Majesty's Government, and of the right hon. Gentleman who conducts the Business of the other House of Parliament. When the subject was first brought before Parliament a question arose how far the recommendations of the Commissioners were to be accepted. Great opposition was raised in the other House, and the final result was that one of the Commissioners moved that a Committee should be appointed. The Government accepted that proposal, and accordingly, on the Motion of the Home Secretary, a Committee was appointed to whom all the questions at issue were referred. The Government, however, at that time expressly precluded themselves by the words used by the Secretary of State for the Home Department and the Prime Minister from being bound by the decision of that Committee. Now, what took place? The Committee finished their labours and reported to the House; and the very first day the Report came on for consideration a question arose as to how the Government proposed to deal with it. I trust that as the conduct and good faith of the Government have been called in question your Lordships will allow me to depart from the ordinary rules of procedure, and to quote from the recognized channels of information the exact words made use of by the Prime Minister. According to the report in *The Times* he used the following words on the 9th of June, when the decision of the Committee was first brought under the notice of the House:—

> "The hon. Member for Birmingham made an appeal to me to announce the part which the Government would take, and argued that of course we could not oppose the Report of the Committee. That view is founded on an assumption which I think a most singular one—namely, that my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State had announced to this House that Her Majesty's Government were prepared to receive the Report of the Committee as conclusive. Now, such an arrangement was never made by my right hon. Friend."

The Prime Minister went on to state—

> "But I will tell the Committee what we are prepared to do. We are prepared to give to the Report of the Committee the same consideration and respect as we have given to the Report of the Commission."

Having reminded the House that the Report of the Commission had been referred to a Select Committee, the right hon. Gentleman proceeded to say—

> "What I propose is indicated by the order of Business that has been prepared for this evening. The moment we concluded the Scotch Bill we proposed to go into Committee on the Boundary Bill. We shall have before us as we proceed the Schedule, with the conflicting recommendations of the Commission and the Committee, and the good sense of the House will come to a conclusion. I know no other mode by which we can arrive at a result more speedily or satisfactorily."

Now, what was the course adopted by the House of Commons? The Committee reported Progress that evening, and an hon. Member gave Notice of his intention to move that the whole Report of the Committee should be accepted in a lump. That was fairly objected to by the Government, who were, however, put in a minority. Now, I maintain that under these circumstances the Government have a right to raise the question again in your Lordships' House.

EARL RUSSELL: I think the remarks of the noble Duke have entirely altered the question. It is said that the Home Secretary has been misunderstood, and that the First Lord of the Treasury was of opinion that the Government were not bound to accept the Report of the Committee. When the Report of the Committee was brought up the Government wished to deal with it in one way and the Opposition in another. As the noble Duke remarked, the Government were defeated on a division, and certain boroughs were, in accordance with the Report of the Committee, left out of the Boundary Bill. Well, after that, what happened? The right hon. Gentleman at the Head of the Ministry, said on the 16th of June—

> "Now, the Scotch Reform Bill and the Boundary Bill, though they have not yet left this House, may be regarded as virtually settled."

During the progress of the Reform Bill last year there were many points on which the Government were defeated, but in regard to which they accepted the decision of the House of Commons. Every one accordingly thought that the Government would accept the decision of the House of Commons in the present instance. The noble Earl (Earl Beauchamp) now proposes to move an Amendment, the effect of which, if carried, would be to bring back the Bill into conformity with the Report of the Boundary Commissioners. Now, I confess that when I saw that Notice on the Paper I thought, indeed, that it was perfectly competent for any Member of your Lordships' House to disagree with the Bill, and to propose any alteration he might deem necessary; but, at the same time, I certainly was of opinion that the Government were pledged to abide by the decision of the House of Commons, and that, consequently, as the noble Earl would not receive the support of the Government, there would be a considerable majority against his proposal. All I can say now is that, as the Government have broken faith on this subject, I cannot be a party to admitting that any decision which your Lordships may arrive at on this question is a fair decision. We have been taken by surprise and circumvented in this matter. All that I can say, therefore, is that I will be no party to such a breach of faith, and that I will leave rather than be a party to it.

[The noble Earl then left the House, followed by Earl GRANVILLE, Viscount HALIFAX, the Earl of CLARENDON, and other noble Lords.]

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: Unquestionably an intimation was given to the House that the Boundary Bill was virtually settled—

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: I say no!

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: I say yes! The Prime Minister said—

> "Now, the Scotch Reform Bill and the Boundary Bill, though they have not yet left this House, may be regarded as virtually settled."

I would, however, venture to suggest to the House that the duty of the Government does not altogether depend upon the words of the Prime Minister. The present Government are in a peculiar position. They are the Government of a minority, and under these circumstances special obligations lie upon them; for had it not been understood by the majority of the House of Commons that the decisions come to by that House would be accepted by the Government, and that Ministers would not use their superior influence in the House of Lords to upset the decisions agreed to in the Commons, it is more than probable that that Vote of Want of Confidence of which we have heard would have been proposed long ago. I think it a breach of faith even if no promise had been given, that a Government in a minority should use its influence in the House of Lords in order to upset a decision to which they had assented in the House of Commons.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, the obvious and only meaning to be extracted from the words of the Prime Minister, under the circumstances in which they were used, is that after the decision come to by the House of Commons, the Boundary Bill might be considered settled so far as that House was concerned, and that it had been removed from the Business of the House requiring discussion. The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) spoke as if what your Lordships do now in respect of this Bill will be conclusive as against the House of Commons; but I must remind your Lordships—and I should have thought it unnecessary to remind even the noble Duke—that the Bill must go down to the House of Commons again. The House of Commons did not consider the case of each of those boroughs, but considered the whole of them in a mass. They will, however, have an opportunity of considering each case. What occurred last year as to the lodger franchise was this—There had been two propositions in the House of Commons, one for fixing a higher and the other for fixing a lower figure; but an arrangement was made, in the way things are sometimes arranged in that House, in consequence of which a figure between the two originally proposed was actually introduced. In ignorance of the arrangement come to in the House of Commons, your Lordships altered that figure when the Bill came before you; but, subsequently, on learning how matters really stood, your Lordships restored the figure which had been agreed to by the Commons. But that is not the case here. There was no compromise and no arrangement. The views of the House were tested by a formal decision.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: My Lords, the accusations made against the Government are very serious, and calculated to give rise to bitter feelings; and although my Parliamentary experience is not a very long one, I venture to think that the conduct of the noble Lords who made them in leaving the House after having done so is without precedent. A most erroneous interpretation has been put upon the words of my right hon. Friend at the head of the Government. Noble Lords opposite have referred to an extract from the remarks of my right hon. Friend without paying any regard to the context; but this should be borne in mind, for it has a most material effect upon the point at issue. The occasion on which those expressions were used was one on which questions were put as to the course of Public Business in the House of Commons. Questions were asked of the Prime Minister as to the arrangement of the days to be devoted to particular measures, and in replying to them he said, "The Scotch Reform Bill and the Boundary Bill, though they have not yet left this House, may be regarded as virtually settled." What did that mean but settled by this House—"the House of Commons?" The intention and meaning of these words are clear and apparent. They simply meant that neither of the Bills to which he referred would occupy any more of the time of the House of Commons. No other meaning can properly be attached to his words, and that sought to be attached to them by noble Lords opposite is not warranted by the expressions themselves.

EARL BEAUCHAMP observed that there never was a greater mare's nest than that discovered this evening by noble Lords on the Opposition side. One thing was clear—that the Premier spoke of the Scotch Reform Bill and the Boundary Bill in the same terms. Why, then, had not his supposed undertaking been set up when Amendments were being made on the former Bill on Tuesday evening?

THE EARL OF AIRLIE said, the Amendments made by their Lordships in the Scotch Reform Bill were merely verbal Amendments.

VISCOUNT EVERSLEY: My Lords, I think I may assume from what has fallen from both sides that your Lordships' House is altogether satisfied with the conduct of the Commission. ["Hear!"] You seem to consider that its Reports were fully justified by the Instructions which they received from Parliament. It should not, my Lords, be forgotten that the Commission was one appointed by Parliament and instructed by Parliament. Therefore, we were as responsible to your Lordships' House as to the other House of Parliament. The way in which we proceeded was this—We obtained the services of the best scientific men and the best legal men we could find to act as Assistant Commissioners. We sent those gentlemen to different parts of the country. The greatest publicity attended their proceedings. Their coming to a borough or town was notified previously; they always sat in public, and invited information and suggestions from all sides. Having, as far as possible, made themselves masters of the case, they reported to the Commissioners in London. We read their Reports and their recommendations; but we did not confine ourselves to those Reports. Whenever we thought it advisable we sent for the Assistant Commissioner, and had the benefit of his assistance before coming to a decision with reference to the particular borough. It is well known to your Lordships that many of our decisions were challenged in the House of Commons, and that a Committee was appointed by that House. I think the noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough) was not quite correct when he said that the Committee was appointed at the suggestion of the Commission. I remember being consulted by one of my brother Commissioners, and I said that I did not think we could object to the appointment of a Committee. Now, my Lords, nothing can be further from my intention than to wish to say anything in disparagement of the Gentlemen who composed that Committee; but I am bound to say that I differ altogether from the conclusions at which they have arrived. When their Report came out I was most anxious to see in what way the information we received from the Assistant Commissioners had been used; but I find nothing in the Report to show me that. I observed that the Committee conferred with the Members for the place, or, with more than one of the Members for the place, and memorials were presented to the Committee; but the book which contains the account of their proceedings does not appear to me to contain any evidence whatever. I believe that in ten out of fifteen of the boroughs referred to by the noble Earl (Earl Beauchamp) the Parliamentary and the municipal boundaries are conterminous. In fifty-three boroughs, exclusive of the Welsh boroughs, the municipal and the Parliamentary boundaries do not coincide. Several boroughs have had municipal privileges conferred upon them since the Reform Bill. What the particular objection may have been which governed the decision of the Committee we do not discover from their Report; but plainly this objection, that the municipal boundary and the Parliamentary boundary were not the same, vanishes the moment it is examined; for it has not been the practice of the country to make them conterminous. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Beauchamp) has very fairly stated the case of Birmingham. I this day presented a Petition upon the subject, which confirmed the view taken by the Commissioners, that the suburb of Aston was as much part of the town of Birmingham as Piccadilly was part of London. In the Petition which I had the honour to present it is stated that if the district of Aston were added to Birmingham, 5,000 or 6,000 persons would be added to the voters for that borough; whereas, if it continued to be excluded, and were left in the county, only 1,850 persons would obtain the franchise—being a difference of upwards of 3,000 votes. There is another borough in which the case is still stronger, and that is Nottingham, one of the boroughs mentioned by the noble Earl. It happens, curiously enough, that in the year 1837, some time after the passing of the Reform Bill, I was appointed Chairman of the Municipal Boundary Commission. I told my noble Friend who made the proposition that I was very reluctant to undertake the duty, because I knew well that it was most difficult, except the Government of the day was a very strong Government, to carry any changes of the kind; they always excite opposition, and in some respects have to be carried against the wishes of friends of the Government itself. And what I predicted occurred. The Government then happened to be an exceedingly weak Government; pressure was put upon them, and they never attempted to carry out our recommendations. Our Report contained a passage with regard to the borough of Nottingham, with which I will trouble your Lordships—

> "The increasing population, unable to find room within the limits of the town, has resorted to the neighbouring parishes of Radford, Lenton, and Sneinton, and in these three parishes upwards of 20,000 people closely connected with the town of Nottingham are now congregated. New Sneinton forms actually a portion of the town of Nottingham. New Radford may be said to form a portion of the town, although not quite so close as Sneinton. The extra-parochial district of Poole is nearly surrounded by the parish of Lenton."

The House will scarcely credit it when I state that in the late Report of the Boundary Commission we hardly proposed any addition to the limits indicated in that Report of the Municipal Commissioners in 1837; yet this is one of the proposals which has been rejected and set aside. The case of Nottingham is less remarkable than the borough of East Retford, which occupies an entire hundred. For my part I have always been astonished that the Reform Bill of last Session, and, indeed, that any Reform Bill did not deal with those peculiar boroughs — East Retford, Cricklade, Shoreham, Much Wenlock, and Aylesbury — by reducing them to one Member each, and throwing them into the county. As matters stand, they are nothing more nor less than electoral districts, and I am satisfied that their continued existence will ultimately have a tendency to lower the county franchise. For when you find what are absolutely elective districts, with persons on one side of the hedge having a borough qualification, and persons on the other requiring a £12 rating, some day or other this will create great discontent and a desire for the reduction of the county franchise. Great alarm has been expressed as to the number of votes which will be lost by a transfer; to show that this alarm is not warranted by the facts I will take a case that I happen to be well acquainted with. In South Hampshire the total number of electors is 5,677, of whom 2,858, or just one-half, derive their qualification from the represented towns within the county. Therefore, it does not at all follow that by the suggested transfer of the population you reduce the number of votes for the county to the extent that has been anticipated. I mention this because it is a point which attracted considerable attention, and is believed to have had much influence both with the Committee and subsequently with the House. Speaking of my Colleagues in the Royal Commission, I can assure you that nothing could exceed the industry, the honesty of purpose, and the perfect absence of all party feeling which marked their conduct during the whole course of the inquiry committed to them. I am sure, therefore, that their finding merits the confidence of the country.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said, a noble Lord opposite (Earl Russell) had said something about his Motion being a surprise, and he thought that a charge so put forward ought to be met, as it deserved, with a distinct denial. Complaint had been also made as to shortness of Notice of the Amendments. What were the facts? The Boundary Bill was brought up from the other House on the 23rd of June, but was not delivered to Members till the 25th of June. That was on Thursday. He had not time to read the Bill and consider what course he should take until Saturday, the 27th; and Notice of his present Motion was given upon Monday. On Wednesday their Lordships did not sit; but after the Notice had lain before them for two days he now brought it forward. Hence it would be seen that he had acted with all proper caution. Had he given Notice sooner he should have been charged with precipitancy. To remove, however, any excuse for complaint, he now proposed to move the adjournment of the debate. He regretted that noble Lords opposed to this matter should so far have forgotten themselves and the dignity of that House as to bring forward a groundless and nonsensical charge, and then retire from the House without either supporting or discussing it.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY thought his noble Friend acted very wisely in the course which he proposed to take. He had certainly been surprised at the grave charges brought on the authority of a forced construction put upon the words of the Prime Minister. Noble Lords on the other side of the House have with great ingenuity mis-stated the tenour of the Prime Minister's remarks when simply alluding to the course of Business in the House of Commons; it is perfectly impossible that the right hon. Gentleman could have intended to say anything with a view to fetter your Lordships; and I state positively from my own knowledge, in the most solemn manner, that the Government never meant at the time the Prime Minister spoke to regard the Scotch Reform Bill or the Boundary Bill as settled; it is monstrous to charge his words with so incongruous a meaning, because no one knows better than he that, whatever influence he may have with your Lordships from his position, he has no absolute control over the actions of this House. I am very glad my noble Friend has taken the course he has, because no one could be more annoyed than myself at the suspicion of surprise; and perhaps when the noble Lords who should be opposite have returned to their places they will be prepared to admit that the observations of the Prime Minister applied alone to the House of Commons.

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD thought the only course open to their Lordships was to agree to an adjournment of the debate; for whatever had been done amiss, and whoever was blamable or free from blame, it would be most undesirable that the question should turn entirely upon an alleged breach of faith on the part of the Government. He could not help adding that if noble Lords on his side of the House had remained in their places, they would have better studied the dignity of the House than by running away.

House *resumed;* to be again in Committee on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at Nine o'clock,
till To-morrow, half past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 2, 1868.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —NAVY ESTIMATES.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland)* [183]; Fairs (Metropolis)* [205].

Committee — Registration (*re-comm.*) [190]; Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland)* [194]; Assignees of Marine Policies (*re-comm.*)* [203].

Report — Registration (*re-comm.*) [190]; Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland)* [194]; Assignees of Marine Policies (*re-comm.*)* [203].

Considered as amended — Land Writs Registration (Scotland)* [111]; Burials (Ireland)* [204].

Third Reading — Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances* [177]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2)* [195]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* [200]; Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal* [76]; Bankruptcy Act (1861) Amendment* [145]; Libel (Ireland)* [199], and *passed*.

Withdrawn—Sea Fisheries (Ireland)* [101].

HIGH SHERIFF FOR THE EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE.—QUESTION.

ADMIRAL DUNCOMBE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he sees any objection to the appointment of a separate High Sheriff for the East Riding of the County of York; and, if he will take the subject into his consideration, with the view of remedying some of the inconveniences arising from there being one High Sheriff for the whole County?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that there was no doubt considerable objection to the present state of things in that respect in the county of York. The High Sheriff had very onerous duties cast upon him, and perhaps there ought to be two High Sheriffs; but the matter would be considered by the Government.

TREATY OF COMMERCE WITH AUSTRIA.—QUESTION.

MR. LAYARD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Treaty of Commerce recently in negotiation with Austria has been signed; and, if not, why not; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, the Reports of Mr. Morier and Mr. Mallet, and any other Correspondence relating to the negotiation for the Treaty?

MR. E. C. EGERTON said, in the absence of his noble Friend (Lord Stanley), he could state that a telegram was on the previous day received at the Foreign Office from the British Ambassador at Vienna, stating that the Treaty had been signed on that very day. There would be no objection to lay on the table, not only the valuable Reports of Mr. Morier and Mr. Mallet, but also any other Correspondence relating to the subject.

MILITARY KNIGHTS OF WINDSOR. QUESTION.

MR. EYKYN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he objects to lay upon the Table of the House, a Return of the Military Knights of Windsor deceased since the appointment of the late and the present Governor, the date of their decease, the dates from which their successors received their pay, the amount of their deductions in pay, the mode in which the deductions were disposed of; also, a Return of all sums applied to the use of the late and present Governors of the Military Knights?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, it was difficult to deal with a Question such as this, as he did not know what were the reasons given for the production of the Returns. He was not prepared to lay them upon the table, as he did not know for what purpose they were required. He had that day received a document from the Knights of Windsor deprecating any interference with them, and stating they were perfectly content with the mode in which the funds were administered.

PARISH MORTUARIES.—QUESTION.

MR. GODDARD said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether his attention has been directed to a paragraph emanating from the *British Medical Journal*, headed "The Dead among the Living," and to inquire whether it is in their power to enforce upon the London vestries the fulfilment of that Clause in the Sanitary Act with reference to providing Parish Mortuaries for the use of the poor inhabitants of the metropolis, which both the interests of the public health as well as the cause of suffering humanity, so urgently demands?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, in reply, that no doubt the *British Medical Journal* was a publication of considerable influence and authority; but his attention had not been directed to the paragraph or article in question. It was, however, perfectly optional with the London vestries whether they enforced the clauses of the Sanitary Act or not, for the Government had, under the Act of 1866, no power over them.

WORKSHOP REGULATION ACT (1867).

QUESTION.

Mr. POWELL said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has reason to believe, from representations made to him by Factory Inspectors or otherwise, that local authorities fail to discharge the duty imposed upon them by Section 18 and other provisions of the Workshop Regulation Act, 1867, under which they are bound to enforce the Act; whether difficulties have arisen in cases where the local authority as described by the Act is "the Vestry or Select Vestry," and whether modifications of the Law are, in his judgment, there necessary, in order to invest the local authority with powers to carry out the Act and to raise the funds requisite for that purpose; and, if so, whether it be the intention of the Government to amend the Law during the present Session, with a view to render the local authority more efficient in these cases?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he had not had any such applications made to him as his hon. Friend alluded to, nor had he received any notice of the existence of those difficulties, except from the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), who had been kind enough to send him a letter that he had received on the subject. His attention had not been called to any defects in the present law; but the Inspectors in their next Reports would probably take notice of the matter.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he wished to know whether the Inspectors were instructed to report upon it?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that one of the Inspectors having been in town that day he had inquired of him, and he thought there would be Reports on the subject.

ARMY—ARTILLERY PRACTICE AT PORTSMOUTH.—QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been called to the following paragraph in the *Hants Telegraph*:—

> "The steamer *Princess of Wales*, belonging to the Port of Portsmouth and Ryde Steam Packet Company, left Southsea Pier on Thursday morning, at half-past nine o'clock, on her passage to Ryde. When opposite Fort Monckton a shot passed between the foremast and the jib stay, causing considerable consternation among the passengers, many of whom were so frightened that they laid down upon the deck. This occurrence will serve to show the immense amount of danger resulting from the shot practice at this fort, for if the shots had struck the vessel beneath the water line, the probability is that she would have been sunk, and that many lives would have been sacrificed;"

and, if that statement be true, whether measures have been taken to prevent the recurrence of a practice so dangerous to the lives of Her Majesty's subjects?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that as soon as the statement to which the question referred appeared in the newspapers, a communication was sent to the Assistant Adjutant General at Portsmouth, desiring him to inquire into and report upon the facts; and he now held in his hand the answer returned by Lieutenant Colonel Peel, which was as follows:—

> "Portsmouth, July 1.
>
> "Sir,—In accordance with instructions received in your telegram of this day's date, I have the honour to forward for the information of his Royal Highness Commanding-in-Chief the accompanying statements of Lieutenant Colonel Lovell, R.A., and Captain Girardot, R.A., the officers under whom the artillery practice from Fort Monckton was conducted on Thursday morning, the 25th of June, 1868. These officers both state most positively that no shot fired from Fort Monckton passed within 500 yards of any steamer during the practice. In consequence of the hour at which the telegram was received (5.20 p.m.) I have not been able to procure from the editor of the *Hants Telegraph* any information as to the source of the report contained in his newspaper, the office being closed. I understand that practice was also being carried on that morning from Her Majesty's ship *Terrible*, now laying at Spithead."

Lieutenant Colonel Lovell wrote—

> "Fort Monckton, July 1, 1868.
>
> "Sir,—In reply to your memorandum of this day's date, requesting a full report upon a statement contained in the *Hants Telegraph* that on Thursday, the 25th of June, that a shot from Fort Monckton passed between the foremast and jib-stay of a Ryde steamer, I have the honour to state that I was superintending the practice carried on by Captain Girardot, R.A.'s battery on that date, and no shot fired on that morning passed within 800 yards of a Ryde steamer or any other steamer, and I am at a loss to understand what could have caused any report to such effect. I beg to forward a statement of Captain Girardot, R.A., commanding the battery."

Captain Girardot's statement was to this effect—

> "I was in command of No. 7 Battery, 6th Brigade, Royal Artillery, during the hours of gun practice, from 9.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m. on Thursday last, the 25th of June. The firing was conducted under the superintendence of Lieutenant Colonel Lovell, R.A. The greatest precautions were taken to observe the orders regarding the distance of vessels passing from the range, and I most confidently state that no shot was fired when any steamer was within 500 yards of the range."

He could not allow that question to rest where it was. If the statement in the *Hants Telegraph* was a true one it was quite intolerable that the public should be exposed to such a danger. He should therefore make further inquiries in order to have the matter thoroughly sifted.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he wished to say that he had a letter in his pocket from a passenger in the steamer— ["Order!"]

POST OFFICE—MAILS TO THE WEST INDIES.—QUESTION.

Mr. GRAVES said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, The cause of the delay in presenting the Correspondence [ordered 12th May] between the West India and Pacific Company and the Treasury and Post Office, relative to the conveyance of Mails to the West Indies?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, in reply, that the cause of the delay had been that parts of the Correspondence had to be furnished by the Treasury and other parts by the Post Office. The whole of it was now in the hands of the printer, and it would be distributed to hon. Members in a few days.

EJECTMENTS SUSPENSION (IRELAND) BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. KENNEDY said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Not to displace the Ejectments Suspension (Ireland) Bill, which stands No. 1 on the Orders of the Day for the Evening Sitting of Tuesday the 7th instant?

Mr. DISRAELI said, he would not be unmindful of the hon. Gentleman's wish, but must frankly tell him that, desiring to bring the Business of the House forward at a reasonable time, he could not really pledge himself to comply with the hon. Gentleman's request.

ARMY—EMPLOYMENT OF OLD SOLDIERS.—QUESTION.

Sir HARRY VERNEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether, referring to his opinion that it is desirable to give Government employment to deserving old soldiers, it is true that the custody of the Parks, hitherto under the park keepers, almost all old soldiers, is about to be taken from them and placed under the Metropolitan Police; and whether, if this alteration is considered necessary in Hyde Park, it must be carried out in the other Parks, where the park keepers have hitherto done their duty perfectly well, and the custody of which afforded employment, with a small remuneration, to many meritorious old soldiers?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that his hon. Friend had quite correctly expressed the views he had expressed with respect to the employment of old soldiers; but his regard for old soldiers did not give him any authority over the Parks. He must refer his hon. Friend to the First Commissioner of Works for any information as to the future custody of the Parks.

Sir HARRY VERNEY said, he would therefore put his Question to the First Commissioner of Works.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, it had been thought highly expedient for the public service that old soldiers should no longer be appointed as park keepers, and he hoped that before long every Royal Park would be placed in the custody of the Metropolitan Police.

CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, considering the repeated personal pledges he has given to the House and the Country to take every means to pass a Bill for the repression of Corrupt Practices at Elections, he does not think it desirable so to arrange the Business of the House as to give precedence to that Bill over others of an ordinary character, if he wishes to redeem the pledges he has made on the subject?

Mr. DISRAELI: Sir, the hon. Gentleman has placed an argumentative Question on the Paper, which is a very inconvenient course, and one that might lead to discussion. He wishes to know if we intend to carry out our intentions. All I can say is, that if we had not intended to carry out our intentions we should not have placed the Bill on the Paper in the position we have done.

ARMY ESTIMATES.—QUESTION.

MR. CHILDERS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Army Estimates on Monday, considering that the Papers connected with the Controller's Department have not been printed?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that he had promised the noble Lord the Member for North Lancashire (the Marquess of Hartington) that the Papers in question would be laid on the table in good time before Vote 18 was moved. The Papers had been laid on the table on Tuesday, but he was sorry to say it had been found impossible to complete the printing in time to allow them to be distributed to Members before Saturday next. He could not, therefore, bring on the Vote on Monday consistently with his promise to the noble Lord. Although, therefore, the Army Estimates might stand on the Paper for Monday, he should not, if it was the wish of the hon. Gentleman, proceed with them on that day.

NAVY—CAPTAINS ON THE RESERVED LIST.—QUESTION.

MR. O'BEIRNE said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will place upon the Table of the House the Case submitted in 1862 to the Law Officers of the Crown, with their Opinion thereon, upon the Claims of the Captains on the Reserved List?

SIR JOHN HAY said, that, in the unavoidable absence of his right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, he would reply to the Question. He had to inform the hon. Gentleman that it would be contrary to all precedent to lay on the table Copies of the confidential communications which might have passed between the Law Officers of the Crown and the Heads of Public Departments. The case of those Reserved Captains had been carefully considered, as soon as the present Government came into Office. Nearly half of them, thirty-seven, had served one year at sea and so fulfilled the conditions which enabled the Board of Admiralty to grant the advantages for which they asked; but the rest of them had not served a year at sea, and the Admiralty were therefore unable to pursue a similar course in their case.

ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION—VOTE OF THANKS TO HER MAJESTY'S FORCES.

MR. DISRAELI: Mr. Speaker—I rise to move that the Thanks of this House be given to those who planned and accomplished one of the most remarkable military enterprizes of this century. When the invasion of Abyssinia was first mooted it was denounced as a rash enterprize, pregnant with certain peril and probable disaster. It was described, indeed, as one of the most rash undertakings which had ever been recommended by a Government to Parliament. The country was almost unknown to us, or known only as one difficult of access and very deficient in all those supplies which are necessary for an army. Indeed, the Commander of this Expedition had to commence his operations by forming his base on a desolate shore, and by a creating a road to the land he was invading through a wall of mountains. Availing himself for this purpose of the beds of exhausted torrents, he gradually reached a lofty table-land—wild and for the most part barren—frequently intersected with mountain ranges of great elevation, occasionally breaking into ravines and gorges that were apparently unfathomable. Yet, over this country, for more than 300 miles, the Commander-in-Chief guided and sustained a numerous host, composed of many thousands of fighting men, as many camp followers, and vast caravans of animals, bearing supplies, more numerous than both. Over this land he guided cavalry and infantry, and—what is perhaps the most remarkable part of the Expedition—he led the elephants of Asia, bearing the artillery of Europe, over African passes which might have startled the trapper and appalled the hunter of the Alps. When he arrived at the base of this critical rendezvous, he encountered no inglorious foe; and if the manly qualities of the Abyssinians sank before the resources of our warlike science, our troops, even after that combat, had to scale a mountain fortress, of which the intrinsic strength was such that it may be fairly said it would have been impregnable to the whole world had it been defended by the man by whom it was assailed. But all these obstacles and all these difficulties and dangers were overcome by Sir

Robert Napier, and that came to pass which ten years ago not one of us could have imagined even in his dreams, and which must, under all the circumstances, be an event of peculiar interest to an Englishman—the standard of St. George was hoisted on the mountains of Rasselas. If we turn from the conduct of the Expedition to the character of the person who commanded it, I think it must be acknowledged that rarely has an Expedition been planned with more providence and executed with more precision. In connection with it everything seems to have been foreseen and everything supplied. It would be presumptuous in me to dwell on the military qualities of the Commander; but all must recognize, and all may admire, the sagacity and the patience, the temper and the resource, invariably exhibited. I shall, however, perhaps be justified in calling attention to the rare union of diplomatic ability and military skill in the conduct of Sir Robert Napier. Indeed, I do not think a public man has ever shown more discretion than he has done. Had it not been for his management of men—not merely in the skilful handling of his troops on an exhausting march, but in the way in which he moulded the dispositions of the Native Princes—the result might have been different. And he moulded them to his purpose without involving his country in any perilous contract or engagement. Under these circumstances, I am sure the House will heartily offer and vote its Thanks to this distinguished man. It has been said by the greatest soldier who ever flourished—at least in modern times—that the Thanks of the House of Commons were a compliment the most appreciated by military men, and that, next to the favour of their Sovereign, the acknowledgment of their services by Parliament was the reward which they most valued. I have no doubt that Sir Robert Napier is influenced by those feelings; but the House of Commons at this moment will remember that this is not the first time, nor even the second, that it has offered to him its thanks. Happy is the man who has been thrice thanked by his country! By his splendid achievements in Abyssinia, Sir Robert Napier has only fulfilled the promise of the plains of India, and consummated his exploits on the Chinese field. It is, I may add, not the least interesting part of our business this evening to recognize the merits of another great branch of Her Majesty's forces. The army and navy have rarely acted together in the history of this country without successful results; but there have been, I think, few instances in which they have mutually assisted each other more effectually, and in which their combined exertions have been attended with greater success than in the Abyssinian Expedition. I need not remind the House how much depends on the skill and efficiency with which the transport of troops and stores is conducted in such an undertaking. But I may recall to the recollection of the House, in order that they may clearly understand them, the very great difficulties attending the Expedition in that respect, and the admirable manner in which those difficulties were surmounted. The number of vessels employed amounted to no fewer than 300, some of great tonnage, collected from all parts of Her Majesty's dominions, yet all brought at the right moment to the right place, under the superintendence of Commodore Heath. The exertions of the Navy were not, however, limited merely to this important branch of the public service. The unknown waters of Abyssinia were buoyed and lighted with a promptitude and certainty which cannot be too highly praised, and which were of the utmost importance; and it was mainly owing to the great exertions of the Navy that water, on which the success of the Expedition greatly depended, and the want of which for a moment threatened the successful accomplishment of the Expedition, was supplied. The building of the piers and the establishing of condensing machines were mainly owing to the exertions of the Navy, who on all occasions showed the utmost willingness to devote their labours to the success of this great enterprize. But it was not to the mere transport of troops, not to the mere buoying and lighting of Annesley Bay, nor the mere condensing of water that the duties and labours of the Navy were limited. They equipped and manned a most efficient corps, which took a very active part in the invasion of Abyssinia — the Rocket Brigade. They were present on that great march during which Sir Robert Napier handled his troops with so much dexterity—a march requiring so much endurance on the part of our forces — and they joined in that critical operation the scaling of the fortress of Magdala. Therefore, under these circumstances, the House will offer its most cordial and grateful Thanks to Commodore Heath, who commanded the naval force. In acknowledging the great services of the distinguished man who was the chief Commander of the Expedition, and of the eminent officer who commanded the Navy, we must not be unmindful of the conduct of the men, both in the Army and the Navy. I think we may fairly say that the conduct of the troops and sailors was alike complete and admirable. There have been instances, no doubt, of rapid marches and triumphant fields, which have occasioned greater sensation at the moment, in the history of modern times; but if you look to the exhibition of military virtue, I doubt whether the qualities of patience, endurance, and good temper, manifested under the most trying circumstances, have ever been more fully exemplified. I doubt whether the force of disciplined man was ever more successfully asserted. There was shown that gallantry on which we can always count, and which enables our forces to meet any dangers and difficulties; but what was most admirable was the endurance and docility which were exemplified by the troops, and which enhanced the glorious result of the operations. The House therefore will, I am sure, acknowledge in a manner most grateful to the men both of the Army and Navy its sense of their services, and will take means by which that sense shall be made known to them through their respective commanding officers, making mention to each regiment the opinion of the House with reference to their services and conduct. There are many distinguished officers whose services they must also shortly acknowledge, and whose names were inserted in the Resolution. Before concluding, I would venture also to congratulate the House, not on the conduct of the Expedition, of which I have already treated, but on its character. When it was first announced that England was about to embark on a most costly and perilous Expedition merely to vindicate the honour of our Sovereign and to rescue from an unjust but remote captivity a few of our fellow-subjects, the announcement was received in more than one country with something like mocking incredulity. But we have asserted the purity of our purpose. In an age accused, and perhaps not unjustly, of selfishness and a too great regard for material interests, it is something, in so striking and significant a manner, for a great nation to have vindicated the higher principles of humanity. It is a privilege to belong to a country which has done such deeds. They will add lustre to the name of this nation, and will beneficially influence the future history of the world. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by proposing the Resolutions.

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I believe it is my duty to second the Motion which has been made by the right hon. Gentleman; and this is certainly an occasion on which the performance of such a duty must be regarded in the light also of a rare privilege. Indeed, Sir, if it were the custom of this House, as it is not, on any occasion to dispense with forms, and to give effect to its feelings, in the manner of some assemblies, by the method of acclamation, I believe that acclamation is perhaps the mode in which it would be most gratifying to us all to make known our decision on the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman has described with great felicity of expression, and, so far as I can judge, without the smallest exaggeration, the general character of this Expedition, from which it derives its title to a place of no very common order in military history. I do not, of course, mean to claim for it—nor would it be wise to claim for those who have been engaged in it—precisely the same kind of fame as attaches to occasions in which desperate conflicts have been waged with equal or nearly equal force between nations or between armies alike possessed of all the resources of modern warfare. But we have lived into a time in which, if it cannot be said of the soldier, it must be said of the commander, that mere fighting, however arduous the task, mere tactics, and mere strategy have become, perhaps though still vital and essential, yet almost secondary parts of the qualities required to make a successful general. And it is in this department, which relates to the conflict that had to be carried on by Sir Robert Napier, with Nature, with distance, with climate, with all the diversities and difficulties presented by one of the most peculiar portions of the earth, with the civil government of the Army, with the provision made for every want, that this Expedition presents to our view a history alike complete and satisfactory. There is, indeed, something tame and feeble in the language of uniform and unbroken eulogy, and yet the occasion does not permit us to adopt any other language. We may look at what has occurred with reference to the Commander, with reference to the officers by whom he was so ably seconded, with reference to the soldiers who moved and acted under their orders, and lastly with reference to the Government at home. The right hon. Gentleman has abstained from claiming any peculiar praise for the Government at home; but I am bound to say that we are indebted to them for the wise choice of the Commander. We are indebted to them, and we are indebted to those with whom they may have taken counsel, for the unbounded confidence they reposed in the abilities of the object of their choice; for the unsparing liberality with which, on deciding the difficult question of facing these great risks, they made the whole resources of the country available for the purposes that were in view; for the care and forethought with which, so far at least as I am able to judge, all the necessary provisions were made. Here it would not be more than justice, I think, to distinguish among the Members of the Government that Minister who necessarily must have been charged with the chief share of the responsibility and labours of the Expedition—I mean the Secretary of State for India; and lastly, we are indebted to the Government for the firmness and decision with which, from first to last, they persisted—acting therein, I must say, in accordance with public opinion and the enlightened mind of the nation—in confining the operations of this Expedition to its legitimate purpose, and in refusing to be led beyond the line of duty and wisdom by any visions, however flattering and seductive. We have been permitted to gain on this occasion what may be called an almost tearless victory. Perhaps I shall not be going too far from this subject if I uttter a word of regret for the fate of Colonel Dunne, the only field officer who lost his life, though not by direct military operations, and who proved in the deadly charge at Balaclava the courage with which he was endowed, who received from the hands of his Sovereign the Victoria Cross, who sought active service as commander of his gallant regiment, the 33rd, which made the assault on Magdala; and who found a grave in the country to which he accompanied the Expedition, and a place of honour in the recollections of his fellow-citizens. But, though we know that all have done their duty well from first to last, it is impossible not to dwell with a peculiar interest on this special occasion on the character of the man whose name first appears and most prominently in the Motion now made. Without him it might have been possible that great things might have been achieved; but there is a completeness in the work achieved that we cannot do otherwise than connect in a special manner with the special qualities of his mind and his capacity. Without him we scarcely could have hoped that this Expedition would stand upon record among those occasions when nations resort to the bloody arbitrament of war, as one in which not one drop was added to the cup of human suffering which any humane forethought could spare, and in which the severest critic, in reviewing the proceedings, will find nothing to except to in regard to the military, political, and moral aspect of the proceedings. No man can read the despatches of Sir Robert Napier, and especially the despatch circulated for our information to-day, without seeing that, after we have given him the praise of being a Commander apparently consummate in meeting every demand made on him for military qualities, there is something which remains beyond—there is the mind, firm of purpose, never losing for one moment its thorough balance, and among all anxiety and excitement, keeping an eye steadily fixed on moral aims, and remembering, under all circumstances, the duty of keeping and maintaining, untainted and in virgin purity, the honour and character of his country. Nor can anyone become acquainted with Sir Robert Napier—and we must all feel we become acquainted with him when we read his interesting, his manly, his simple, and his modest account—without feeling that we part from the consideration of the subject not only with gratitude and admiration of the General, but with respect, with regret—I would almost say, with affection—for the man. Sir, I re-echo the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman, and I value highly the privilege that falls to me of seconding the Motion he has made.

Resolved, *Nemine Contradicente*, That the Thanks of this House be given to Lieutenant General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., for the exemplary skill with which he planned, and the distinguished energy, courage, and perseverance with which he conducted the recent Expedition into Abyssinia, resulting in the defeat, by Her Majesty's Forces, of the Army of King Theodore, and the vindication of the honour of the Country, by the rescue from Captivity of Her Majesty's Envoy and other British Subjects, and by the capture and destruction of the strong Fortress of Magdala.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That the Thanks of this House be given to Commodore Heath, R.N., C.B., for the indefatigable zeal and great ability with which he conducted the Naval Operations connected with the Transport of the Troops and Stores, upon which the success of the Expedition materially depended.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That the Thanks of this House be given to Major General Sir Charles Staveley, K.C.B., Major General G. Malcolm, C.B., Major General E. L. Russell, Brigadier General W. Merewether, C.B., and the other Officers of the Navy and Army, for the energy, gallantry, and ability with which they have executed the various Services which they have been called on to perform throughout these arduous operations.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That this House doth highly acknowledge and approve the discipline, gallantry, and endurance displayed by the Petty Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, and Men of the Navy and Army, both European and Native, during these operations; and that the same be signified to them by their respective Commanding Officers.

Ordered, That Mr. Speaker do communicate the said Resolutions to Lieutenant General Sir Robert Napier, and that he be requested by Mr. Speaker to signify the same to Commodore Heath, R.N., C.B., Major General Sir Charles Staveley, K.C.B., Major General G. Malcolm, C.B., Major General E. L. Russell, Brigadier General W. Merewether, C.B., and to the several Officers of the Navy and Army who served in the said Expedition.—(*Mr. Disraeli.*)

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

IRRIGATION WORKS IN INDIA.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

MR. BOUVERIE rose to move for Copy of any further Despatches, Telegrams, and Letters between the Secretary of State in Council and the Government of India, respecting the proposed purchase of the works of the East India Irrigation Company, or the advance of funds for the works thereof since July 16, 1867. There were two Bills of an important character before the House relating to the Government of India, affecting the relations between the Home Government and the Indian Government, and the relations between the Secretary of State for India and the Council. The Papers he wished to obtain would, he anticipated, throw an important light upon these questions, and assist them materially in arriving at a sound conclusion, as to the proper mode in which these relations should be established. The House would remember that about two years ago there was a most fearful famine in the province of Bengal—one of the most frightful famines ever recorded in history. He was not about to dilate on the famine in Orissa; but it was necessary, in order to lay the ground for what he was going to urge, that he should state one or two circumstances connected with it; and he could not do better than read two extracts from papers now in the Library. There had been an inquiry in the province as to the nature and extent of the famine, and a great number of witnesses had been examined, from whose evidence he would select two passages almost at random:—The Rev. A. Miller, Balasore, said—

> "I think the mortality was greater than was reported. Hundreds died in the fields and out-of the-way places, where no one knew them. If one chanced to cross the country one saw the bodies lying about, and the jackals eating them. I should say, to be within bounds, that about one quarter of the population of Orissa has died. In this neighbourhood, I think the mortality has been about one-third, but I believe in other parts of the province it has not been so severe. But, as respects the general misery and suffering, I do not think it has ever been fully described; it would almost be impossible to exaggerate it. The people bore their misery with extraordinary quiet and submission. Nothing that I have ever read has enabled me to conceive anything equal to this famine. I have known no instance of Hindoos eating dogs, or cats, or cows. But they did eat their own children, when they were dead. I heard a well-authenticated instance, in which a mother and son were found eating a dead child."

Abdool Ghunnee, zemindar, Balasore, said--

> "There were 18,000 people on my estates; of these 4,700 have died during the famine."

He believed that the mortality occasioned by that great calamity was little short of 1,000,000. The inference he wished to draw from this deplorable state of things was that no effort they could make of an indirect kind should be spared, in order to avoid the recurrence of such a calamity as this. They were bound to do their best for the people they had undertaken to govern. Now, there was but one remedy that had ever been suggested, and which was admitted to be perfect against the recurrence of such calamities, and that was irrigation works. These calamities arose from the failure of water, owing to the great prevalence of drought, which would have been almost entirely obviated if those means of irrigation had been provided which engineers were perfectly able to supply, if they were furnished with the necessary funds. This was a matter of great importance to India, and the Papers he asked for would show that the present Government had not acted as they should have done in regard to it. A private company of adventurers, encouraged by Lord Canning, when he was Governor General of India, did undertake to provide irrigation works for the province. They made great progress with the works, and laid out a large amount of capital in forming dams, canals, and other engineering arrangements, with the object of providing the means of irrigating a large portion of this very province — arrangements which, if they had been completed, would have obviated this dreadful famine. There were two sets of opinions with regard to the construction of public works in India; there was one set that believed that these great undertakings should be carried on by private enterprize; and there was another, more associated with the old notions of Indian government, which imagined that the less private capital and enterprize had to do with India the better for India, and that works of this kind had better be executed by Government officers, and with public revenue. Lord Canning was in favour of private enterprize, whilst Sir John Lawrence belonged to the school that believed that such works should be executed by Government. There was upon the table of the House a Paper presented this Session, signed by the Queen in Council, and by the Council, in which it was recommended that the Indian Government should purchase the works of this great Company at a certain stated price. That despatch was withheld by the Secretary of State for India for a considerable time from the House, and in doing no doubt what he considered his duty he committed an act not becoming the head of a great public Department. The right hon. Baronet adopted the policy recommended by the Governor General and his Council, but he kept back the despatch containing the terms which were proposed as just and fair by them, while he endeavoured to drive a hard bargain with the Company. It was not in his opinion consistent with the dignity of a great Department of the State to endeavour to make a very good bargain out of the special necessities of a private company; neither was it within the duty of the Secretary of State for India to dispute the authority of the Governor and Council in a matter which they were peculiarly fitted to determine. The right hon. Baronet having offered far less terms than Sir John Lawrence and his Council thought just, his offer was refused by the Company. and then the despatch was laid upon the table of the House, when the Company at once perceived that the Government had offered them less than the terms proposed by Sir John Lawrence. The Company, taking what appeared to him to be a reasonable step, offered the works to the Government on the terms mentioned in the despatch, but their offer was declined by the right hon. Baronet, no doubt for what he deemed very good reasons. It appeared to him essential that these great and beneficial works should be completed as early as possible, in order to prevent the recurrence of these dreadful famines, and if the right hon. Baronet refused to purchase them on the terms offered, he should lend all the assistance in his power, consistently with his public duty, to facilitate their completion, by which water, that great blessing and source of wealth in India, would be diffused throughout the province in question. This was not merely a question between a private company on the one hand and the Indian Government on the other, it was an illustration of the difficulties which beset all Indian financial questions. The Secretary of State had told them that in all matters of finance he was dependent upon his Council, who, by Act of Parliament, possessed the entire control of all matters relating to the expenditure of money in India; and that was the system which the right hon. Baronet proposed to continue. Instead of there being a Secretary of State in that House who was responsible for these matters, there was an irresponsible Council behind whom the Secretary of State could, if he were so inclined, always shelter himself. It had been his object to draw attention to that point, and having done so he begged to make the Motion of which he had given Notice.

MR. BAZLEY, in seconding the Motion, recommended that large basins or reservoirs, connected by canals, should be made in India for the purpose of storing the water and affording water communications throughout the country. Such works would be of immense importance to the development of the resources of the country, and would prevent a recurrence of that frightful calamity under which the district in question had recently suffered.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy of any further Despatches, Telegrams, and Letters between the Secretary of State in Council and the Government of India respecting the proposed purchase of the works of the East India Irrigation Company, or the advance of funds for the works thereof since July 16, 1867,"—(*Mr. Bouverie,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he had not expected that the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman, which was at the bottom of the list of Motions upon going into Committee of Supply, would have been reached at such an early hour, and therefore he had not obtained any special information upon the subject. He, however, was prepared to give a general answer to the observations of the right hon. Gentleman. In the first place, he had no objection to the production of all despatches and telegrams which had passed upon the subject. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman should have thought it necessary to comment in the terms which he had employed on the fact that it had not been deemed right to communicate to the Directors of the Irrigation Company the despatch of the Governor General proposing certain terms for the purchase of the works of the Company. He believed the right hon. Gentleman would acknowledge that if it was the duty of the Council for India to offer less liberal terms than those mentioned in that despatch, it would certainly not have been their duty to have accompanied that proposal with a communication in which higher terms were mentioned, for the effect of such a course would simply have been to throw dirt on their own offer. The question really resolved itself into this—whether they ought to have at once acted upon the judgment of the Indian Government, or have exercised the right of judging for themselves? Now, Parliament had distinctly imposed upon the Secretary of State for India in Council the duty of superintending the expenditure of the revenue and finances of India, and as there was a difference of upwards of £100,000 in the terms mentioned in the despatch and the offer actually made, he did not think that he would have been justified in offering so large a sum above what he believed to be the real value of the works. But the Government of India not only suggested those terms as the extreme point to which the offer should be carried, but contemplated moreover their exercising their own discretion in the matter. But he must take exception to one of the statements made by the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman had said that an offer below the real value of the works had been made in order to gain an advantage over the Company, and to force them to enter into a bargain which would be advantageous for the Government, and that therefore the Company were purposely kept in the dark as to the recommendation which had been made by the Government of India. That was not the case. The Government of India were not at all anxious to purchase these works, but they were desirous of purchasing the Behar scheme, which the Company would scarcely at present have the means of completing with reference to the Orissa scheme, however, it was not thought advisable to deviate from the policy which had been adopted from the days of Lord Canning and even earlier—of allowing works of this nature to be undertaken by private individuals, and though the Orissa Company had for some little time been in difficulties, they could not blind their eyes to the fact that the Company had made great efforts to raise money, and had actually succeeded in raising something like £800,000, which had been expended in carrying on the work in a very creditable manner. In case the offer made should not prove acceptable, the Government further offered to assist the Company with a loan on terms which, they thought, were fair, and on the condition that the Company would hand over the Behar scheme to the Government, but that offer was also rejected by the Company. The view of the Council for India—a view in which he entirely concurred—was this. They did not think it right to give anything in the nature of a guarantee for the capital required to carry on these works, or that the Government of India should in any way identify themselves with the scheme as shareholders. They were prepared to abide by the offer they had made, or to aid the Company by a loan on the security of the works. Upon the latter point there had been a difference of opinion between the Directors and the

Government. The Directors stated that they were willing to accept the loan on the security of the works on this understanding, that when the Government had entered upon the works, in case of failure of payments, they should only retain possession until the advance with reasonable interest had been repaid. But to this plan—a plan which would give rise to vast and endless complications, and would be attended by very great inconvenience—the Government did not think that they could consent. As far as he was personally concerned, he had no ill-will towards the Company. He believed that they had done good service to the public, and he trusted that their labours would ultimately prove remunerative. He believed, however, that it would be for the advantage of the Company themselves as well as for that of the public that they should give up the Behar scheme. The Government had no *arrière pensèe* in this matter, and had not the slightest desire to get possession of these works by a sidewind. All they wished was to have a good security for their money. He was perfectly prepared to produce the documents for which the right hon. Gentleman asked, and would lay them upon the Table of the House.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—NAVY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee).

LORD HENRY LENNOX took the opportunity of expressing his great regret that he was compelled to appear in the place of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Corry), who was laid up by a serious indisposition, which rendered it quite impossible for him to be in his place and to go on with the Estimates. It was thought better that the House should go into Supply, and that the Navy Estimates should be intrusted to him, and he should desire to give the same information to the Committee which his right hon. Friend would have done had he been present.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £182,364, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Salaries of the Officers and the Contingent Expenses of the Admiralty Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869."

MR. HANBURY-TRACY asked a question respecting the appointment of the Director General of the Ordnance, and also wished for information as to the enormous increase of the expenditure, especially in the Accountant General's Department? He trusted that the First Lord would endeavour to find situations at the Admiralty as messengers and porters for seamen who were discharged from the service with good characters. Some of the petty officers would be found quite fit for the smaller clerkships. The Secretary of State for War stated the other night that the experiment of employing non-commissioned officers and men whose terms of service had expired had succeeded very well in the army, and he believed it might be tried in a still greater degree for the navy.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, the expenses of the Admiralty Office had gone on increasing ever since the year 1858, when they stood at £149,000. They had now reached the sum of £182,364, the net increase for the present year being £6,346. He objected to the large number of persons employed in the Admiralty Office, not to the amount of pay of each. Surely it was quite unnecessary that 489 persons should be employed in this Office. The noble Lord had stated that we should now require fewer ships, and consequently 2,500 fewer men. If they were decreasing their ships and men, how could they need a greater number of clerks? The Press, the public, and the House agreed in declaring that the navy cost too much for the results; and he did not see why the expenses of the Admiralty Office should go on increasing to this extent. If the naval expenditure became more and more in this way the burden would soon become intolerable. He moved that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £6,300.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £176,064, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Salaries of the Officers and the Contingent Expenses of the Admiralty Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869."—(*Mr. Lusk.*)

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, he regretted to be obliged to oppose the reduction of the Vote, which had certainly increased during the last few years, nor could he see that that increase was likely to come to a close. The clerical labour connected with rendering the accounts of the Admiralty had more than quadrupled of late years. The staff at Somerset House was quite inadequate to meet the requirements of the service, and it was constantly necessary to employ the clerks for many extra hours in order to prevent the accounts from falling greatly into arrear. The correspondence connected with the Admiralty had also vastly increased. The proposed reduction of the Vote would therefore tend to diminish the clerical efficiency of the Department, and he trusted that it would not be pressed. The hon. Gentleman had done good service by calling attention to the progressive increase of the Vote, and it was to be hoped the clerks would be induced to write faster, so as to enable them to do with less staff. But the Amendment, if carried, would be most detrimental to the public service.

Sir JOHN HAY, in answer to the Question of the hon. and gallant Member for Montgomeryshire (Mr. Hanbury-Tracy) respecting the appointment of the Director General of Naval Ordnance, said, that in consequence of the great change that was taking place in our naval ordnance, the labours of the Director of Stores were so great that it was impossible for him to perform the duties of Director General of Naval Ordnance in addition to his own duties, and therefore it was found necessary to appoint Admiral Cooper Key to that Department. It was found necessary to continue the services of the gallant officer for another year ; but it was hoped the day would come when our ordnance would all be of one pattern, and our ships have uniform armaments. He confessed he was afraid that day was distant, and in the meantime this additional labour must be discharged by some efficient officer.

Mr. DU CANE explained, that an enormous increase had arisen in the work thrown on the Accountant General's Department by the Greenwich Hospital Act and by various other causes, and that it had been found necessary to divide that Department into two branches, with a deputy Accountant General to each.

Admiral ERSKINE commented on the increased charge for temporary clerks and writers this year as compared with previous years.

Mr. CHILDERS hoped the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. Alderman Lusk) would not press his Motion to a division. The whole subject of the Admiralty accounts had been under the consideration of a Select Committee, presided over by the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely), and it would be certain that their labours would result in changes which would improve the efficiency and at the same time reduce the expenditure of the central administration. This would be the last year of the present system, and it would, therefore, be inexpedient to incommode the Admiralty unnecessarily by cutting down the Vote in the manner now proposed. Nobody could believe that the existing division of business at the Admiralty could stand on its present basis; and with respect to the lower class of clerks and copyists he thought it would be possible to effect by degrees a great saving to the public in the number and character of the staff employed by substituting, in the performance of work of a merely mechanical description, persons of the class of writers for persons in the class of clerks. A change of that kind had been adopted in the Revenue Departments with satisfactory results.

Mr. GRAVES said, that as several of the small dockyards must be reduced in a few years it must lead to a corresponding reduction of work at head-quarters. He had given notice of a Motion that would raise the question.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, he should be prepared at the proper time to defend the continuance of some of these dockyards, and especially Sheerness.

Lord HENRY LENNOX said, a saving had already been effected in substituting writers for paymasters at one-fifth less the usual cost. The appointment of messengers was in the patronage of the First Lord of the Admiralty, and he would convey the hon. and gallant Member's (Mr. Hanbury-Tracy's) wishes to him. Every precaution was taken that proper persons were appointed, for they had to undergo a Civil Service examination of so strict a character as officers in the army some years ago would have been hardly able to meet.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he considered that the examination referred to by the noble Lord, which the messengers had to undergo, went far beyond what such an examination should be. There was a tendency to increase the severity of the examinations beyond the position of those who had to undergo them.

Lord HENRY LENNOX said, what he meant to say was that the requirements of the present day would have puzzled gentlemen who entered the army before the days when Civil Service examinations were instituted. The examinations were of a character to ensure the efficiency of the persons who were appointed messengers to the Admiralty.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE took exception to the word "patronage," as used by the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty. It was an odious word, and there should be no such thing. He also complained that the Civil Lord was the only official of his grade who was not provided with a house.

Lord HENRY LENNOX said, that if the hon. and learned Gentleman would move an increase in the Vote for the purpose, the Civil Lord would support him.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he understood that it was not competent for any Member to increase a Vote.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, the expenses went on from year to year increasing, and he did not understand why it should be so, considering the small number of ships which were in commission. He would not press his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £163,926, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Salaries and Expenses of the Coast Guard Service, the Charges for the Royal Naval Coast Volunteers, and for the Royal Naval Reserve, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869."

Admiral ERSKINE said, that the sum for the Naval Reserve was in excess of what was required, and the Vote was going on gradually increasing. In this year there was an increase of £2,958 over the Vote of last year for nominally the same number of men. He observed that more deputy registrars and clerks were employed than during the previous year at a cost of £2,000, and the result was that only thirteen additional men were obtained. During the last three years £80,000 had been expended in matters analogous to this Vote which the House has not assented to. The Vote was not for the Naval Reserve at all. It was a kind of sponge, from which to squeeze money for purposes of which no one knew anything. He moved that the Vote be reduced by £20,000

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £143,926, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Salaries and Expenses of the Coast Guard Service, the Charges for the Royal Naval Coast Volunteers, and for the Royal Naval Reserve, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869,"—(*Admiral Erskine,*)

Sir JOHN HAY said, he thought it right to explain that the excess referred to by the hon. and gallant Member had arisen in consequence of the system adopted ever since the institution of the Royal Naval Reserve. At first it was considered that the number of 16,000 men might reasonably be anticipated from the Mercantile Marine to form the Royal Naval Reserve; and the Estimate was always framed on the assumption that that number would be completed. At present the number was 15,156. The number enrolled had been 24,704; but 9,548 had to be deducted for discharges and failures to re-enlist. The official Return on the 30th June was, as he had stated, 15,156 men available for the public service, if at any moment hostilities should break out. There was a sudden reduction in the number in 1866, 3,000 men being found not fit for re-enlistment; but since then, by very great care in enlistment and judicious selection, the force had again been increased to 15,156. As he had stated, an excess of £20,000 had been taken on the assumption that the number of 16,000 men would be enlisted and drilled; but that number had not risen to that amount, and he was free to confess there had always been a considerable balance on the Vote. This arose from the great desire not to check enlistment or drill. But if the House thought it undesirable that the extra £20,000 should be voted, the Government would have no objection to the reduction proposed. Of course, it would still be their duty not to check enlistment or drill, and he felt assured if the Vote were exceeded, the House would make it good. He was glad to assure the House that in the Royal Naval Reserve the country had a most admirable force, which might be entirely relied on in case their services were required—a most valuable class of men, who had shown their readiness to serve, as well as their zeal and energy, on the occasion of the *Trent* affair.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he was glad the hon. and gallant Member had expressed his readiness to accept the reduction. This was a simple matter of account, and he believed, after looking into the figures at the Public Accounts Committee, there would be a surplus of £10,000 after the reduction.

MR. GRAVES said, he believed the reduction would not interfere with the efficiency of the force. The commanders of the various drill ships bore the highest testimony to the intelligence and efficiency of the Reserve. They were considered the superiors of the same class of men in the navy. They had broken down the prejudice that formerly existed, and now formed a connecting link between the navy and the Mercantile Marine. If they had done nothing more than this they must be considered to have rendered valuable service to the country. The Reserve had been taken as the cream of the Mercantile Marine, and were highly-skilled men. He thought from ordinary seamen and those under the age and standard of efficiency, especially from the deep-sea fishery men, a second-class Reserve might be formed. The latter consisted of the finest class of men around our coasts, who would be ready to join the Reserve at perhaps £1 a head per annum, and he strongly advised that both of these classes should be utilized. After the *Trent* affair the seamen of the North volunteered into the service, without waiting for the Royal Proclamation inviting them to do so. These were facts which tended to show that the force, as a rule, could be relied upon in the event of emergencies arising. It must not be supposed that the force was inefficient because it did not fill up the Navy, the force was instituted for a totally different object—namely, to man our ships in cases of emergency—the very constitution of the force was in itself a sufficient guarantee that it should not interfere with the manning of the Mercantile Marine unless in cases of absolute necessity.

MR. CARDWELL said, he was glad that the efficiency of the force had not been impugned. The question before the House was one merely of account, and the Government had assented to the reduction asked for. Owing to the judicious course which successive Governments had adopted, the feeling of distrust that formerly existed between the men in the Mercantile Marine had given place to one of cordiality. It was no small advantage to have a body of 15,000 or 16,000 men ready to turn out in defence of the country. The Act had passed only in 1859. At the time of the affair of the *Trent* the men enrolled in the Royal Naval Reserve, which at that time was scarcely formed, so far from standing on their strict rights, and refusing to serve except for the immediate defence of the coast, came forward and said that, knowing they were not bound to serve, they earnestly intreated that, nevertheless, they might be permitted to volunteer. So far they had provided for the defence of the country by sea, but the time was not distant when they would have to provide for its defence by land, and he hoped to see men enlisted who, following other trades, were neither exclusively soldiers nor sailors, but who might yet be made available for the defence of the country. He should have been sorry if anything had been said to discourage the disposition of men to join this force. The hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves) had truly stated that the force as it was at present constituted was imperfect, because the plan of the Committee upon which it was based recommended that there should be two classes of Reserve, one receiving higher pay than the other, and that, out of the saving to be effected in the Navy Estimates, training ships should be established for the purpose of training boys from the beginning for the Navy and the merchant service. He trusted that the present or some succeeding Government would be enabled to effect such a saving upon these Estimates as would permit of funds being provided for this most useful purpose. The time was approaching when it would be necessary that a large proportion of the men, not only in the Navy, but also in the Army, should earn their own livelihood, and, nevertheless, be trained so as to be available when emergencies arose.

MR. LIDDELL inquired whether the Admiralty had determined upon the amount of remuneration which the shipping masters were to receive for enrolling and watching the movements of the men of this force, seeing that upon their assistance the efficiency of the body greatly depended?

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he objected to the time of the House being wasted and hon. Members being kept out of their beds in consequence of certain hon. Gentlemen persisting in delivering lectures to the House on this question after the Government had intimated their willingness to assent to the proposed reduction in the Vote.

MR. HANBURY-TRACY asked whether any means existed for identifying the men enrolled in the force?

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, he was desirous that the Estimates should be prepared in greater detail.

COLONEL SYKES held it to be highly unconstitutional to vote more than is superficially wanted.

SIR JOHN HAY said, he had to inform the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. Liddell) that there was one item of £2,000 for the purpose of remunerating the gentlemen to whom he had referred. The distribution of it was in the hands of the Board of Trade, and he had no doubt it would be distributed with justice. The officers selected for the coast batteries were supposed to thoroughly understand their duties, and the drilling of the men had been reported as very satisfactory. The men were most anxious to make themselves efficient, and as they were, doubtless, well known at their place of joining, it was not, he thought, at all necessary to watch them with policeman-like vigilance, because he believed that their patriotism might safely be relied upon when their services were required by the State.

MR. STEPHEN CAVE, in reference to the question of the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. Liddell) said, that the payment by the Board of Trade was made according to the work done. This was, as he had explained the year before, represented by marks bearing a money value. At the end of the year a Return was made by each registrar—the number of marks was then calculated, and payment made accordingly. If there was any surplus, it was distributed as an extra gratuity among those registrars who had shown most zeal in the service.

MR. OTWAY complained that the answers which had been given were based upon Returns which appeared to be fallacious, and which, he thought, betrayed great irregularities on the part of the public Departments with regard to the arrangement of the accounts.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £63,565, Scientific Departments.

(4.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £823,562, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Salaries of the Officers and the Contingent Expenses of Her Majesty's Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869."

Mr. Hanbury-Tracy

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, that before asking the Committee to agree to this Vote, he thought it would be desirable for him to state the changes which had been made, and they were very few, since the introduction of the Estimates a few weeks since. At that time it had been pointed out that the programme anticipated last year had very nearly been carried out. The Estimate for iron-clad shipbuilding was 6,845 tons, the number of tons actually built were 6,829, and for unarmoured shipbuilding 16,699 tons, as against 16,427. During the Recess, the Government had come to the determination to reduce the amount for wages in the dockyards, and it appeared that there had been a reduction of £157,775 in wages, and 3,049 in the number of men. The Government were justified in making that reduction; but they had learned with regret that a great amount of distress existed in the dockyards in consequence of the reduction. By the regulations made at the Treasury under which the hired men were employed, those who had served for twenty years were entitled to a gratuity on their discharge; but many of those thrown out of employment in consequence of the reduction had not served the prescribed time, and thus while oftentimes unable to obtain other employment, they also received nothing in the shape of a gratuity from the Government. He felt bound to state this circumstance, inasmuch as the Admiralty had received numerous applications on the subject. The Admiralty had reduced this item in consequence of the large amount of unarmoured ships which were not intended to be laid down this year. When the First Lord of the Admiralty moved the Estimates he stated that there would be built at Chatham two iron-clads—one of the *Invincible* class, and another of the *Hercules* class; and two other ships—one of the *Monitor* class, and another of the ram class, which were to be built by contract. The Government had so far altered their programme on the suggestion of the hon. Member (Mr. Childers) as to build the *Monitor* ship in the Government dockyard, and the ship of the *Invincible* class by contract. The *Osborne*, that had been doing good service for twenty-six years, came to a sudden breakdown on her return from conveying the Prince and Princess of Wales to Germany. It was hoped that she might be patched up; but she had been found to be entirely rotten, and was obliged to be broken up. The vessel that would take the place of the *Osborne* would be ready in two years, by which time the *Black Eagle* would be worn out. It was not intended to re-place her, and there would thus be a saving of one ship in commission. When the Estimates were moved, his right hon. Friend stated that the present as well as the late Government had the matter of river dockyards under their consideration. When a sloop, which was now in course of construction, and which would be launched within the year, was finished, it was decided that Deptford as a building yard, should be closed. A Committee had been appointed on his Motion to consider the subject of reducing the dockyard craft. The Chairman, Sir Thomas Symonds, had consented to place himself in communication with the officers at Devonport, and he and the Admiralty Superintendent had come to an agreement by which all the recommendations of the Committee would be carried into effect. The remaining yards would be visited in turn, and he trusted that the valuable suggestions of the Committee would be carried out with an important saving of expense. When the Navy Estimates were moved, many criticisms were expended on the Constructive Department of the Admiralty, and the iron-clad ships designed by that Department, and the Notice Paper of to-night promised other hostile criticisms on the same subject. These Notices, however, referred to ships now afloat, and of which a trial had taken place. These criticisms had, he thought, taken the shape of an attack upon the Department rather than a criticism of the designs that had issued from it. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Rye (Captain Mackinnon) had been profuse in such criticism ; but it should be remembered that we were in a transition state as regarded shipbuilding, and that every new ship built must be more or less the result of a series of compromises. Usually they heard nothing of the good points that had been gained ; but of all the daring pieces of criticism he had ever heard that of the hon. and gallant Gentleman was the most daring. He had instituted a comparison between the *Bellerophon* and the *Achilles*, and stated that as an engine of war the latter was superior. The hon. and gallant Member said that while the *Bellerophon* required more power, the engines of the *Achilles* cost £69,117, and those of the *Bellerophon*, which he said was the smaller vessel, £88,612, being an excess of £19,000 in the cost of the engines of the smaller ship. But his hon. and gallant Friend forgot that while the hull of the *Bellerophon* cost £256,114, the hull of the *Achilles* cost £375,473, being a difference of £119,359. On the whole there was a balance of cheapness of cost of £100,000 in favour of the *Bellerophon*. The late Board of Admiralty charged the Chief Constructor of the Navy to solve the problem whether they could build a smaller and less costly ship, that should be more handy, and should carry armour-plates of greater thickness and an armament of greater power. The Chief Constructor obeyed those instructions, and the *Bellerophon* was the result. The armour of the *Bellerophon* was 6 inches thick, while the armour spread over the long lines of the *Achilles* was only 4½ inches. But his hon. and gallant Friend said, "Oh, but the *Bellerophon* is not a fast sailer." Now, the result of recent cruizes proved that she had always held a good position in the squadron in that respect. His hon. and gallant Friend said, "True, she went 14 knots, but that was all done with a favourable tide." There again he was obliged to contradict his hon. and gallant Friend. The *Bellerophon* kept up her speed at the second trial at the measured mile, and during six hours in the open sea she kept up that very high rate of speed. Again, he could refer his hon. and gallant Friend to the opinion of distinguished officers as to whether the *Bellerophon* was or was not likely to turn out a dangerous customer, even in comparison with the *Achilles*. The officers of the Construction Department were subjected to such constant criticism, and, from the very nature of their position, were denied the opportunity of explaining matters, that it was only an act of justice to them that he should state the case fairly before the Committee. Another of the complaints made against the *Bellerophon* certainly much astonished him. The Committee was aware that the balanced rudder, as fitted in the *Bellerophon*, was one of the novel inventions of science, and his hon. and gallant Friend made it a reproach to the Chief Constructor of the Navy that the reason why she turned so much quicker and handier than the *Achilles* was because these latest inventions were introduced in building her. Let him mention what occurred in the Channel squadron last year. The *Minotaur* and the *Lord Warden*, the first of which was 400 feet long and the second 280, had rudders alike; and yet at 10 knots the full circle was turned by the shorter ship in three minutes and forty-nine seconds, while the *Minotaur* required seven minutes and forty-five seconds to make a similar circle. That occurred during the cruize of the experimental squadron last year. The very name of the Constructor's Department seemed to act on his hon. and gallant Friend's nervous system as a sort of blister; and, not content with all those charges against the *Bellerophon*, he wound up with one which at first sight looked very formidable. His hon. and gallant Friend said she was deficient in coal supply. Now, the *Minotaur* carried 650 tons of coal, the *Achilles* 620, the *Hercules* 600, and the *Bellerophon* 520; but it should be remembered that the *Hercules*' engines, with superheaters and surface condensers for economizing fuel, weighed nearly 300 tons more than ordinary engines of like nominal power; and the *Bellerophon's* nearly 200 tons more; so that their coal should really enable them to steam much further than either the *Minotaur* or the *Achilles*. There had therefore been an increase, not a decrease, of steaming power in the *Bellerophon* and the *Hercules*. Before passing from that subject he might mention, in reference to the opinions of certain critics of Admiralty ships, that when the same hand designed iron-clad ships for other Powers it was astonishing what a chorus of approbation rewarded the efforts of the Chief Constructor in that very same organ of public opinion which, perhaps, a very few days before had strongly decried him. The great leviathan of the Press hardly allowed a week to pass without giving the Admiralty a dressing. Now, it so happened that a very fine broadside ship was designed by the Chief Constructor of the British Navy, which was at first intended for the Government of Turkey; but she afterwards changed hands and became the property of the King of Prussia and was launched in the Thames. Her name was the *König Wilhelm*. That ship, being the design and handiwork of Mr. Reed, was thus spoken of on the 27th of April last—

> "And when she rode securely on the Thames with her vast hull and beautiful lines, dwarfing to mere pigmies the vessels around, there was none who saw her, except the Prussian visitors themselves, who did not regret that the Admiralty had allowed such a vessel to pass into the hands of any foreign Power."

He was commissioned by two of his gallant Colleagues, one of whom had the command of the Channel squadron in 1865, when he had two iron-clads under his control, to state that in their opinion iron-clads were excellent ships, and that the *Bellerophon* was one of the most powerful and useful sea-going ships of war that any country ever possessed. But, further, Admiral Yelverton, when Admiral of the Channel cruize, thus spoke of those two ships, a comparison between which had been made by his hon. and gallant Friend, and much to the detriment of the *Bellerophon*. Referring to the *Achilles*, Admiral Yelverton said—

> "We must not lose sight of the fact that from the great length of the *Achilles*, with all her good qualities, she is most difficult to handle, and in action this defect might prove her ruin. I feel certain this ship might, and probably would, have to go out of action to turn round, thus exposing herself in almost a defenceless position to the fire of more than one of the enemy's ships."

Next, with regard to the *Bellerophon*, Admiral Yelverton said—

> "I consider this ship to be a very successful specimen of our new ships."

And, comparing her with the *Achilles*, he added—

> "I feel bound to award the first place to the *Achilles*. I am, however, of opinion that her great length is an insurmountable objection, and I have no hesitation in saying that ships of the *Bellerophon* class, from their size and general handiness, particularly under steam, will prove more efficient and serviceable for war purposes."

What was the testimony of Captain Macdonald? Writing to his right hon. Friend (Mr. Corry) from on board the *Bellerophon*, in the Sound, on February 21, 1868, Captain Macdonald said—

> "I hear various reports that this ship is a bad roller in a sea way; this I can with the greatest confidence contradict. I consider her a remarkably steady ship—so much so, indeed, as quite to surprise me after the *Arethusa* and other vessels I have served in. When she does roll, which in an Atlantic swell must be the case, she goes so easy as rarely to upset furniture, &c., or to render it necessary to secure such. Coming home from Lisbon in December, with a heavy westerly swell, we undoubtedly rolled heavily—heavier than I ever saw her; but we were quite light, out of coals, provisions, and water. The *Achilles* is certainly steadier; but the difference between us and the *Warrior*, *Lord Clyde*, and *Lord Warden* is remarkable. I mentioned this to Mr. Reed the other day, and he thought you might like to have my opinion direct on the subject."

The next evidence which he would lay before the Committee was somewhat remarkable, because it was that of the captain of the *Achilles* himself, Captain Vansittart, who said—

> "The *Bellerophon* joined yesterday, as ever, the most sightly among us, and of a right powerful battery, too. If she keeps up 14 (or 14½?) knots, the *Achilles'* wings will be clipped; but even at 12 or 13 knots she will always prove a precious awkward customer."

In about a month or six weeks the Channel squadron left their quarters, and the Report of the gallant Admiral who was second in command was, to his mind, quite conclusive as to the excellence of the design of the *Bellerophon*. Admiral Ryder said—

> "I was most agreeably surprised, therefore, to find that she had not only made good a speed of 13·8 knots on her late six hours' trial, but is a remarkably steady ship, as the recorded angles of the squadron will show. She is also a very handy ship under steam alone, and for her small sail power a very handy ship under sail alone. This comparative handiness when she is compared with long ships—*Minotaur*, 400 feet; *Achilles*, 380 feet; *Bellerophon* being only 300 feet—is no doubt due partly to her comparative shortness, and partly to her balanced rudder with its large surface, The *Bellerophon's* magnificent battery of ten 12-ton guns, protected, as is also the case with three-fourths of the water-line, by 6 inches—only a quarter of the belt being tapered to a less thickness—makes her, in my opinion, as far as I can judge at present, the most successful plated sea-going cruizing line-of-battle ship that I have visited; and, as far as I know, she possesses, taking all difficulties and clashing qualifications into consideration, in a larger degree than any such ship that has yet been on active service, the greatest possible development of the greatest number of the numerous qualities required to make an efficient man-of-war, with one exception—namely, the quantity of coals she can carry in her bunkers—600 tons, but restricted at present by the Admiralty Orders to 500 tons. I should here observe that this limited quantity is made the most of by the use of surface-condensers and superheating apparatus, which now works satisfactorily, and in the opinion of the chief engineer effects a saving of 8 per cent, making 600 tons equal to about 650. After giving this question the closest consideration, I am driven irresistibly to the conclusion that the *Bellerophon* is of all the ships here present the only type to be followed; and in saying this I purposely throw aside all consideration of her comparative economy in first cost. The *Bellerophon's* handiness under steam, arising from the combined effects of comparative shortness and the large-surfaced balanced rudder, is so invaluable a quality that I have not recommended any material increase in her length, although the great importance of the 700 tons of coal weighs much with me."

The next point to which he wished to draw the attention of the Committee was the very graphic language which had on a former occasion been urged by his hon. and gallant Friend, who said he thanked his stars that broadsides had come to an end. That was language which he was sure the hon. and gallant Gentleman would be disposed to recall when he informed him that the voyage of the *Ocean* was made from the Mediterranean to Batavia, touching at Rio, and thence shaping the course for Tristan d'Acunha. When within 150 miles of the latter place the ship was turned southward for some time, in consequence of the wind having shifted to the eastward. In a letter which was written on the 9th of October last one of the officers on the *Ocean*, wrote of her as follows:—

> "I am sure, when we left the Mediterranean and it was known that our route was to be down to the southward of the Cape, among all the strong westerly gales that prevail there, that there were few on that fine-weather station who would have cared to belong to her, and perhaps not a few who thought we should not get there without going through loss of spars, accidents, and battening down of every sort; in fact, everyone seemed to think that every sea must wash clean over her — that she could never rise to them. Experience, however, has taught us that in both theories we are wrong, and from my own experience I can safely say, and so can 'all of us,' that if all iron-clads are like the *Ocean* there never could be better sea boats in heavy weather than they are. . . We have gone under sail alone 12 knots. . . We have been in three gales, the last one being a cyclone or circular storm of most terrific force, which we were obliged to run before under close-reefed fore and main topsails, and steaming, to make her steer easily. The other two gales, fortunately, both sprung up dead aft, so we were enabled to keep our course, merely steering to keep the sea from dead aft. . . It has always been our admiration in bad weather to see her so very buoyant and raising her stern so easily out of the water. . . Almost directly afterwards the wind sprung up foul from the eastward, so we made sail, standing to the southward, barometer falling rapidly, and every appearance of bad weather. Reef after reef followed in the night watches (I had all night in and the forenoon and first the next day), and at six the hands were turned up to reef, close reef topsails, and reef courses, at the same time steam being got up to make her steer easily."

Again—

> "The sea, of course, was very heavy, and stove every boat we had at the davits; but, on the whole, I think we may congratulate ourselves that we made such excessively good weather as we did. No wooden ship could have gone through it better, and a good many worse."

His hon. and gallant Friend went on to condemn the new class of sloops as utterly unseaworthy. That statement could, however, hardly be reconciled with the facts of the case, for the trials of the new sloops, such as the *Danaë* and the *Blanche*, which had left, or were about to leave for foreign climes, had fulfilled, he believed, to the full the expectations of the Board of Admiralty. He was well aware that in that House whatever fell from the responsible Chief of a Department carried with it far greater weight than could attach to the words of one holding a subordinate position like himself; but his right hon. Friend at the head of the Admiralty was very anxious that it should be stated on behalf of his Department that, in their opinion, the *Bellerophon* fully carried out the requirements which had been laid down. The Admiralty, in short, were anxious to endorse the Minute which was made by the late First Lord before he retired from Office, which, he thought, bore the best testimony to the skill displayed in the Constructive Department. In that Minute the Admiralty expressed their high approval of the ability which Mr. Reed had displayed in the construction of the *Bellerophon.* On the same occasion to which he had just been referring another hon. Gentleman, the hon. Member for Tavistock (Mr. Samuda), made one or two remarks to which he wished briefly to advert. He stated that the Indian troop-ships had been a failure; but upon the part of the Admiralty and the India Office he must answer that statement by expressing it to be their opinion that they had been a great success. He was sure that the Committee would feel quite as much as the Admiralty for the misery which had fallen on many persons by the large reductions in the dockyards; but having determined to lay down no wooden ships this year, the Admiralty were bound to discharge those men, and to devote whatever money might be at their disposal in building iron-clads by contract.

Mr. PEMBERTON wished to ask whether it was the intention of the Admiralty to continue the system of selling the old and useless ships by private tender with their rigging and stores complete, instead of having them broken up in the Dockyard at Sheerness? The loss upon these sales by private tender is very great. By a Return which had recently been printed, it appeared that thirteen ships were sold in the lump, and their estimated value to be broken up was £144,000. They were, in point of fact, sold by private tender for £87,000, and in re-purchasing stores out of these ships the Government paid £38,000; so that all they received for the ships was £49,000, making a loss of £94,000 on the estimated value of the ships. The same Return showed that no less than twenty ships had been re-sold by the Government, and afterwards the purchasers re-sold the stores to the Government at a loss that appeared perfectly astounding. The *Raven* was a ship of 180 tons, and the gross amount paid for her was £160; whilst the amount paid to the purchaser who re-sold stores to the Government was £214, so that the loss to the country was £54. The next ship was the *Arrow,* on which the loss by the same calculation was £75. He thought that it was very desirable that this mode of disposing of ships should be altered, and that the dockyards should be put to the use of breaking up these ships. He was informed that the cost of breaking up ships was about 6*s.* 6*d.* a ton, and therefore the cost of breaking up the *Raven* would have been about £35, and deducting this sum from the £214 there would have been a balance of £179 in favour of the Government, if they had broken her up, instead of a loss of £54. With regard to the *Arrow* also, there would, upon the same calculation, have been a gain to the Government, instead of a loss of £70. It is desirable that the men still engaged at the dockyards should be employed in this work, which would be a great saving to the country.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, that he very much agreed with the observations just made by his hon. and learned Friend. As he understood the complaint made, it was not that the ships referred to were sold for "breaking up" with rigging and stores complete, but that they were sold for other service, and sold for considerably less than might be realized by breaking them up in our own dockyards. He would not occupy the time of the Committee by quoting instances in which these disadvantageous sales have been effected; but, if his information was correct, the sale of the timber alone would pay for the cost of breaking up these ships in the dockyards, and the engines would still be available for the purposes of the Government. He might add that at the dockyard into which he had specially enquired (Sheerness), there were ample means for disposing both of timber and metal, and if ships were there broken up, under the eye of responsible officers, much of the old material might be found available for re-use. He would also say, though he could not pretend to speak with authority upon the subject, that it would be a popular, as well as a wise movement, if the Admiralty would contract with the dockyard workmen for some of this work, whereby the men would be able to earn more, and the dockyard would be placed on a better footing in competing with private yards. The speech of his noble Friend (Lord Henry Lennox) had opened up a wider question, and there were two points to which he would allude—the reduction of the number of hired men, and the question of closing the smaller dockyards. He knew that there were some gentlemen, both in and out of that House, who looked with no favourable eye upon the Royal Establishments. He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) could not concur in such a view—although it is quite possible that there might be room for improvement in the internal arrangements of some of these dockyards, he confessed that it appeared to him that if the time should ever come when the Navy of England was entirely or mainly dependent upon private yards, great mischief would follow; these Royal Establishments, affording constant employment and the advantage of superannuation, must be able to command a certain regular supply of labour, not exposed to those different agencies—strikes, trades' unions, &c., &c.—which from time to time affected the operations of private yards, and it was most essential that the country should not be without that supply. But his immediate object was to elicit from Government an opinion favourable to the dockyard at Sheerness. He did so especially because there appeared to be some discrepancy between the words and the acts of Government, and, indeed, between their words at one time and at another. A short time ago, when the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves) attacked the smaller dockyards, he spoke out with characteristic boldness, and said that, in in his opinion, "Sheerness, from its proximity to Chatham, was almost useless." The First Lord of the Admiralty, at that time, could say no more than this—that—

> "The proposal to abandon Sheerness was rather premature;" that "at present he thought it would be unwise, but that they would be able to form a sound opinion when the Chatham extension was completed."

But very shortly after this debate came the East Kent Election. Certain words of his hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract were made a great deal of, and the partizans of the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Pemberton) declared that the Liberals were agreed to abolish, and the present Government to preserve the smaller dockyards. Anxious to serve his Friends, the First Lord of the Admiralty thought it consistent with his high position to write a letter to the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Pemberton) during that contest, which he might read to a public meeting at Sheerness. On that occasion the candidate said, speaking evidently with authority—

> "He could only tell them that there was no intention on the part of the present Government of giving up or abandoning Sheerness Dockyard."

He then read an extract from a letter written to him by the present First Lord of the Admiralty, in which he said that—

> "He had expressed it as his opinion in the House of Commons, that Sheerness Dockyard ought not to be given up, and that it would be very advantageous to the country in case of war."

He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) thought that the House would at once see the discrepancy between these two statements. The First Lord of the Admiralty had said that Sheerness would be very advantageous to the country in case of war. He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) had thought that the only argument against Sheerness was its exposed situation in case of war. But for that, without wishing to disparage Chatham, he believed that the vast expenditure there would never have been incurred whilst we had Sheerness eleven miles nearer the sea, with much greater depth of water, and in every way more convenient for dockyard purposes. But it was always said that if an enemy had command of the Channel, all your works at Sheerness would be destroyed with the greatest facility. He did not speak without knowing that he was supported by authority when he answered that if an enemy once had command of the mouth of the Thames and Medway, other things besides Sheerness would be destroyed with the greatest facility. Chatham would stand a bad chance, and the mischief would not stop there. The true policy of England was to make the Channel her main line of defence, and never allow an enemy to obtain such a position. He, (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) was not urging the claims of Sheerness as against Chatham. The expenditure at Chatham had been commenced and must continue; but he argued that if Chatham was to be our great building yard, there was all the more reason why Sheerness should be maintained in full efficiency—and extended—as a fitting and repairing yard. If everything was done in one yard the mischief that might be caused by fire or other accident was incalculable, and the position of Sheerness pointed it out for every reason as the proper place for a large fitting and repairing yard in connection with Chatham. He (Mr. Knatchbull Hugessen) hoped that he should elicit from the Government an authoritative statement that they shared that opinion, that they had no intention of abandoning the dockyard; but that by maintaining and extending it, and further developing the advantages of the locality, they would be taking that course which would best add to the efficiency of the navy, and would be most conducive to the public interest.

Mr. PEMBERTON said, the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) had committed two errors. No letter had been addressed by him to the First Lord of the Admiralty with reference to the dockyard at Sheerness, nor did the First Lord of the Admiralty make any communication whatever to him on the subject. But during the course of the election various statements were made as to the intentions of different Governments, and some gentleman, whose name he did not recollect, wrote to the First Lord, asking what the intention was. His recollection of that letter was simply this—it repeated what the First Lord had stated in the House, and that he thought it would be a very great advantage to have a dockyard in the neighbourhood of the town for the re-fitting of ships. The gentleman to whom the letter was addressed was told that he was at liberty to make what use of it he pleased, and it had been placed in his hands. He had accordingly stated that he believed there was no intention of abandoning the dockyard of Sheerness. If the hon. Member had given him any intimation of his intention to refer to this matter, he would have endeavoured to obtain a copy of the letter; but he very much feared it was not now in existence. The other error which the hon. Member had committed was as to the question which most agitated the minds of electors at the last election; it was no doubt a question of disestablishment, but it was the disestablishment of the Irish Church, not of the dockyard.

Mr. KNATCHBULL - HUGESSEN explained that he had quoted from a local newspaper, which stated that the letter of the First Lord of the Admiralty had been addressed to his hon. and learned Friend; of course, after the statement of his hon. and learned Friend, he had no difficulty in admitting that it was not so.

Mr. SHAW-LEFEVRE said, the noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox) had stated that there was a reduction on this Vote of £157,000 this year upon the corresponding Vote of last year. If this had been an absolute saving, no one would have rejoiced at the announcement more than he should have done; but, unfortunately, what was saved on one Vote was more than balanced by the increase of expenditure on other Votes. For instance, Vote 10 showed an increase of £250,000 over the corresponding Vote of last year, and thus upon shipbuilding and repairing there was a total increase of £100,000 over the expenditure of last year. The truth was, that the work, instead of being performed in the dockyards, was transferred to the yards of private contractors on the Tyne or at Liverpool. There was great hardship experienced in consequence of the reduction of the number of men usually employed in Portsmouth, because it was by no means easy for the men thus thrown out of employment to transfer themselves and their families to another part of the country. The Government had now adopted the policy urged upon them last year by the Opposition. The Government commenced last year to build fifty cut-and-run vessels, at a cost of about £1,000,000; they were to be used in cruizing, and not for the purposes of war. Of that number, thirty-seven were to be built in the dockyards, and thirteen by contract. He regretted the work was decided to be done in one year instead of two, because, instead of rendering the cession of these men's labour less sudden, the sudden change had fallen upon them with considerable hardship. At Portsmouth the number of shipwrights was 1,575 in March last, having been considerably increased during the winter, and it had since been gradually reduced, the contemplated number being only 938. A change of policy such as that which had been adopted in having vessels built in private yards ought to have been carried out gradually and with some consideration to the men employed in the dockyards. He thought also that so considerable a reduction having been made in the wages of artificers, the expenses of management and establishment charges should have been likewise reduced, but these had undergone little or no alteration. In 1858 artificers' wages in the dockyards amounted to £986,000, and this year they were £918,000, while the management charges were in 1858 £150,000, and were this year £209,000, so that they now bore a much greater proportion to wages. He could not but think that the Vote had been most carelessly prepared, and that it had been carried out without a due regard to the interests of the men or to the real economy of the dockyards.

MR. SAMUDA said, the amount of work to be performed in the dockyards this year appeared to be very considerably less than it was last year. Instead of 23,500 tons of shipping to be built, there were only 14,400, being 9,000 tons less than last year. From the declarations of the First Lord of the Admiralty, it appeared that the Government were building two vessels of the *Monitor* class, of 500 and 600-horse-power respectively, from which they proposed to obtain 9 and 12 knots speed. There was a great similarity between the two vessels, and the difference in the horse power, one being 500 and the other 600-horse power, would only represent about half a knot. If the Admiralty could give a speed of 12 knots to one vessel, and he did not for a moment pretend to say that they could not, he thought that, when speed was a consideration of so much value in the present days of shipbuilding, it was extraordinary that the Admiralty should give no higher speed to the second vessel than 9 knots. On a former occasion allusion had been made to an observation of his with respect to the Indian transports. But, to the best of his recollection, what he had done on that occasion was merely to point out distinctly the failure of the application to the private firms for a competitive design. He now came to the proposal which he had put on the Paper, and which was a very reasonable one. The two vessels which he proposed to substitute were of similar tonnage to those which the Government designed to build; the size and material were similar. Now, there were serious reasons why the country should not commit itself to the extent to which the Admiralty seemed bent on committing it with regard to vessels of the class to which he referred. It would be recollected that during the whole time that the re-construction of the navy with iron-clad vessels had been in progress there had always been one main object which he had kept in view, and which, as far as he had been able, he had endeavoured to urge upon the Government, and that was that the ultimate aim of all their improvements should be to obtain a perfectly protected vessel. He had warned the Admiralty that it was useless to delude the country and to delude themselves—for none were so deluded as the Admiralty—by supposing that any vessel would become useful which had nothing but a patch of armour on a small portion of the hull, while all the rest of her was utterly at the mercy of any other vessel, however small. The Admiralty laid down as a condition for adoption at the time they were about to build their first iron-clad ships of the *Warrior* class that only the central part of the ship should be armoured. He gave the Admiralty full credit for this, that they believed the difficulties in the way of obtaining a perfectly armoured ship were too great to be overcome, and that they could not at the same time get a ship constructed of such a form as to give both a sufficient amount of displacement and that degree of speed which they justly looked on as indispensable. He felt at that time quite as strongly as he did now the impolicy of relying on a vessel so constructed and which he foresaw would be nothing but a log upon the water when the two ends were knocked away. In the proposal which he then sent to the Admiralty he had suggested that the ends should be protected. By continually pressing the same consideration upon them the Admiralty did by degrees depart from their original plan. In the vessels of the *Valiant* class they recognized the principle, though not to the full extent; but in the *Minotaur* class they covered with armour the entire vessel. They had then got something substantial, and if they had only applied themselves to decreasing the size and increasing the handiness of the vessel they would have arrived at a very useful and efficient class of vessel indeed. The hon. Member concluded by moving to omit the sums—

> "For building two Iron-clad Vessels of the *Audacious* class (four of which are already building, though as yet none have been tried), and to suggest in substitution for them two Turret Ships of the competitive designs submitted to the Admiralty by private firms, and which were rejected on the recommendation of the Controller and Chief Constructor of the Navy in favour of their own official design."

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £823,062, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum

necessary to defray the Salaries of the Officers and the Contingent Expenses of Her Majesty's Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869." —(*Mr. Samuda.*)

Mr. CHILDERS said, he thought it would be much more convenient to take the decision of the question on Vote 10, where there was a distinct sum for new armour-plated ships. That was the next Vote on which the question arose, and respecting which the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely) intended to address the House. He sympathized with his noble Friend (Lord Henry Lennox) in the difficulty in which he was placed by the unfortunate illness of the First Lord of the Admiralty; but the Committee would admit that no one could have explained the question more clearly, or stated the policy of the Government more intelligibly than the noble Lord had done. As to the alteration proposed in the programme of the year, he thought his noble Friend had done thorough justice to the Controller and the Chief Constructor; and he rejoiced that the Vote had not been passed without the questions being raised and the answers stated as to the first change he had originally offered to the Committee—a proposition to build a broadside ship and one of novel construction by contract, and one of each in the dockyard, instead of two broadsides in the dockyard and two of novel construction out of it; and he therefore approved the altered programme announced, for novel ships in private yards involved heavy extras for experience gained as construction proceeded. It was also judicious to reduce the class of vessels for special purposes from four to three on the completion of the new yacht in substitution for the *Osborne*, and to close Deptford as a building yard, which he hoped was the first step towards closing it as a naval yard. But in saying this he could not help referring to the unwise conduct of the Admiralty in deciding last year to build a small fleet of wooden vessels, and in going beyond their original intentions during the year as to the number of men in the dockyards. So fickle was their policy that, during the course of the year, and in spite of the assurances given in the debate on the Estimates, at Portsmouth the strength of the establishment was raised from 1,233 men to 1,562, and a sudden reduction was made this year to 930 men. The result of that was that very great distress prevailed among the men, and similar consequences followed at Woolwich, where the number of shipwrights had been reduced from 1,021, which was the number in the month of October, to 525. That was the main fault to which he had to call the attention of the Committee in connection with those Estimates, for he looked upon the policy of the Admiralty in other respects as being, on the whole, sound. He hoped the Government would be able to get this Vote.

Mr. OTWAY said, that what the country desired was to have the very best vessels constructed; and the country was disappointed at not having vessels of a light draught of water which, nevertheless, could carry heavy armour plates and guns. Every other maritime Power was building vessels different from those we were building. At Chatham the distress was not so severe as in other dockyards; but there was one class in the dockyard—the rope-makers—who had been rather hardly treated. He should like to ask his noble Friend why no provision was made for the workmen in Chatham Dockyard to dine comfortably? Surely some shed could be constructed in which the men could dine with some sort of comfort. With regard to superannuation allowances, he thought that if a man died just before he became entitled to superannuation allowance, his widow ought to receive some payment out of that fund to which her husband had so long contributed. Since the introduction of iron for shipbuilding the number of accidents had greatly increased, and great complaint was made that no accommodation existed for the men at the hospital, and that they had to contribute out of their own wages towards the expense of the hospital.

Lord HENRY LENNOX said, he hoped the Committee would allow this Vote to pass, in order that Progress might be reported, with a view to the Registration Bill being proceeded with.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS suggested that the Vote now before the Committee should be postponed.

Mr. DISRAELI hoped that, as the feeling of the Committee evidently was in favour of passing the Vote and reporting Progress, the hon. and learned Gentleman would not offer any opposition to that course.

MR. SAMUDA said, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

REGISTRATION (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Mr. Secretary G. Hardy, Sir J. Fergusson.*)

[BILL 167.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

COLONEL BARTTELOT said, he hoped the House would not think that he was going to offer a factious opposition to the Bill. It was not a party Bill, and it was not a Bill which could affect any individual Member; but it was simply a Bill to accelerate the registration of the voters in the country. But that was not the sole point for the House to consider. They were there to consider whether it was wise and prudent that a Bill of that kind should be passed for this specific year, and whether it would have the effect, which all wished, of placing on the register those whom they had admitted to the franchise. If the Bill was passed, it would prevent a large number of those whom they wished to enfranchise from getting that franchise, and there would be a universal cry when they met in December or January by those who were returned that their constituents were not fairly represented. The result would be that another election would loom in the distance, and he knew not if that was their wish. The Bill provided that the registration should be completed by the end of October. The elections were to take place in November, and they are to meet there in December. For what purpose? Simply to decide whether the Gentlemen opposite should sit on that side, and whether those who sat on that side shall go to the opposite Benches. Whether that was to take place time would show. If the registration was not complete it would matter little whether they met in January or December. Let them consider the complicated nature of the Bill. There was the compound-householder, a gentleman whom they thought dead and buried, but who, nevertheless would make alterations in the new registry necessary. There was also the lodger franchise, and he believed that in towns where 30,000 or 40,000 would be added to the register that register would not be complete. He knew something of the towns, and he ventured to say that November was a very bad month for the elections. He believed it would be altogether a false move if they were to hurry on the registrations now, simply to decide who was to sit on this and who on the other side of the House in November next.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, if he thought that this Bill would in any way affect the rights of the electors by diminishing their chances of getting upon the register he would not have considered it his duty on the part of the Government to propose it. But those who sat on the Select Committee were satisfied that nothing would be taken away from the rights of voters. The only question was whether sufficient time was allowed for revision. Those who had most considered the question believed there was. He was himself satisfied there was, and therefore he hoped the House would go into Committee.

MR. SMOLLETT said, he had a few observations to make on the Bill, which he thought had been but little discussed in the House. He must describe this as a Bill designed to slur over the registration and to hurry on the General Election at the earliest possible period. He dared say that some Gentlemen in that House were anxious to bring on an election; but he had asked himself, and he had asked persons out of that House, what possible object could be gained by the new House of Commons meeting in December. The only answer he could get to the question was this—"If we accept this Bill, and hurry on the elections, the new House of Commons will be able to meet in December, in order to decide which of the two factions in this House shall carry on its Business next Session." That might be a very important matter for those who expected Office; but hon. Gentlemen who were "outsiders" and the public at large did not care one farthing which set of statesmen might conduct the Business of the country during the months of December and January. When Parliament had passed a Bill enabling very large numbers to get themselves placed on the electoral roll, common sense and prudence would dictate that the registration should be conducted in the most effectual manner. This Bill came before the House with great recommendations. It professed to be a Ministerial Bill;

but they all knew under what circumstances it had been brought forward. It had been brought forward under coercion. That was his opinion. There had been a threat made by Gentlemen sitting on the Opposition side that they would withhold the Supplies ["No!"]; but he believed that threat would not have been carried out. The Bill had been subjected to the ordeal of a select Committee. How was that Committee composed? Gentlemen connected with the present Administration served on it. That Administration had been for some time exposed to such taunts from the front Opposition Bench, and the House itself had been in such a state of chronic anarchy, that the retention of Office by its members was almost intolerable. It was on that account that he described the Bill as having been brought in under compulsion. There also sat upon the Committee a number of Gentlemen who had held Office under the late Administration, and who were not at all indisposed to hold Office under that which was coming. He dared say those Gentlemen would not think the drawing of their official salaries so irksome a task as the right hon. Gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had considered it during the past few months. ["Question!"] He would not detain them many minutes; but what he had to say he must say out. There sat, then, on the Committee a number of Gentlemen who were very anxious to obtain Office at the very earliest period. Indeed, that anxiety was so great as to lead to the belief that something more than patriotism actuated them when they strove to obtain the meeting of Parliament in December next. Upon the decision of such a Committee he, for one, placed no reliance whatever, knowing, as he did, that there existed no desire at all in unofficial quarters, nor out-of-doors, that Parliament should assemble at so early a date. Now, why should any independent Member on either side of the House go an inch out of his way to bring about a change of Ministers in December instead of six weeks later, in the ordinary course of affairs? What reason had any independent Member to bridge more rapidly than need be the gulf which still yawned between the right hon. Member for South Lancashire and Office? What had kept the right hon. Gentleman out of Office for the last four or five months? He would himself answer that question with the utmost possible candour. It had been the behest and desire of a very considerable number of Gentlemen on the Opposition side, of whom the right hon. Gentleman was the ostensible Leader. They probably thought, and with justice, that the intellect of the right hon. Gentleman matured much more rapidly in the winter of Opposition than in the summer heat of Office. The House had been in a very excited state for the last four or five months. There had been in Office a Ministry which did not hold the reins of power. The Executive had been weak, not in ability, but in Parliamentary support. Then there had been a powerful Opposition, numbering at least 350 or 360 heads. If the Opposition had so willed it, they might in the early part of the Session have carried a Vote of Want of Confidence in the Ministry, and the result of such a Vote would have been to transfer the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire and the satellites who surrounded him to the right hand of the Speaker's Chair. What had prevented this from being done, and why had 350 Gentlemen allowed 300 Gentlemen to hold the reins of Office during the whole of the present Session? He would give an explanation of the circumstances. In doing so he should violate no confidence, as he should merely repeat what was openly spoken of and discussed at the Bar, in the Lobbies, in all political coteries, and very probably even in the sacred precincts of Brookes's. It was a well-known fact that there were on the Opposition Benches a number of Gentlemen who were esteemed Members of the Liberal party; but who refused to support a Vote of Want of Confidence in the present Government. In other words, they refused to be parties to any Motion the direct effect of which would be to place the right hon. Member for Lancashire in high Office. ["Question!"] There were scores of Gentlemen opposite who knew what he had stated to be an absolute fact. Those Gentlemen did not deny that the right hon. Member for South Lancashire possessed great abilities; but they distrusted his political sagacity, and were very probably not enamoured of his versatility; they had no confidence in his tact and his power to keep a party together. If, then, the right hon. Gentleman and his Friends had been kept out of Office by the behest and at the dictation of a considerable portion of Her Majesty's Opposition, what possible object could they have in now coming forward and desiring that we should meet next December, in order to determine whether by the new elections the right hon. Gentleman can be placed in the position of First Minister of the Crown. Under these circumstances he should give his vote against the Bill, and if it went into Committee he trusted the House would have an opportunity of discussing it on its merits on the third reading.

MR. MELLER said, the Bill would cause so much dissatisfaction that he must protest against it, and vote for the Amendment. For the last two years they had been discussing the desirability of making most important changes in the electoral system, and yet their labours were, after all, to have no fruition, as it were, because those whom it was sought to benefit, would receive no benefit at all, in consequence of the haste with which registration was to be slurred over. In the large towns and counties in the North great inconvenience would be caused, and he wished to point out that if the number of Revising Barristers were doubled, the number of election agents must be doubled also. The time at present allowed for registration was quite short enough, but it was proposed still further to shorten it, and as the Court of Common Pleas did not sit until some time on in the month of November, there would practically be no appeal from the decisions of the Revising Barristers. He did not like the idea of an election in November, for the reason that, as some two hours at least of the polling must take place in partial, if not entire darkness, it would give great facilities for personations. The question put before the country was whether Catholicism or Protestantism was to have the superiority. ["Oh, oh!"] Members might object to that, so he would say it was whether Ireland was to be pacified or not. It was incumbent on them, therefore, to have a well-selected jury, and to commit the decision of the question to a respectable constituency.

MR. MARSH said, he was of opinion that, on the whole, it was much better that this Bill should pass. It was possible that the Bill might be passed in a hurry; but then they would have the advantage of getting a Ministry established sooner. That difficulty even might be got over by the present Ministry resigning at once. The election gentry, *et genus omne*, might not, perhaps, have so much time to make up their books, and if an autumn Session were inconvenient they would all be there, and the Session would be a very short one. Commercial matters were very much depressed, and that depression would not cease until the General Election was over. It would be better to get the election over, so as to have a fair start again.

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 5, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Revision of Lists in Counties).

MR. CORRANCE suggested, but did not move, the insertion of words binding the Revising Barristers to commence their operations on the 14th of September next at latest.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 7 to 28, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 29 (Application of certain Rating Sections to Counties).

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that although it had been inserted by the Select Committee, in the spirit of caution which they had very properly exercised in dealing with the measure, he found, on careful examination, that it was quite unnecessary, and might possibly lead to mischief if permitted to remain in the Bill. The clause proposed to make the 30th section of the 2 *Will.* IV., c. 45, and the 75th section of the Act of 6 & 7 of the *Queen*, c. 18, the principal Act, applicable "to all cases of occupancy creating a franchise" by last year's Reform Act. But the 56th section of last year's Act made all Registration Acts apply to its provisions, and he feared the retention of this 29th clause would derogate from the full power of that 56th section.

MR. LEEMAN said, that the clause was well-considered by the Committee, and he hoped it would be retained.

MR. AYRTON thought it would be better to strike out the clause, and give the voters to which it applied the benefit of the general law.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, it was necessary to omit the clause.

Clause *struck out.*

Clauses 30 to 34, inclusive, *agreed to.*

MR. DIXON moved the addition of the following clause:—

(List of voters to be made out by overseers.)

"That the overseers of every parish or township in any City or Borough may, on or before the last day of July, make out or cause to be made out the lists of all persons who may be entitled to vote in the election of a Member or Members to serve in Parliament for such City or Borough, so far as practicable, in the manner following, viz.:—In the alphabetical order of streets or places in each parish or township, or where such parishes or townships shall have been divided into polling districts, then in the alphabetical order of streets or places in each polling district; the names of voters being arranged in the order in which they appear in each street or place in the rate-books for such parishes or townships."

The effect of the clause would be to make the register an exact copy of the rate-book, the streets being arranged in alphabetical order. At the present time expense is caused by having to re-arrange the rate-book and place the list of voters in alphabetical order. The authorities of Birmingham believe that this labour and expense are quite unnecessary, and they requested him to move the addition of this clause to the Bill, to avoid unnecessary expense, and for the purpose of furthering the objects of the Bill—namely, to save time. By adopting the Resolution there would be a very considerable saving effected for the candidates, because they would otherwise have to re-arrange the list of voters and undo what the overseers had already done. The expense of the operation in Birmingham last year was £250 on one side only, and the total expense was probably £500. The voters would be increased under the new Act, and it was not unreasonable to suppose that this particular item of expenditure would be increased considerably, perhaps trebled, if this clause should not be added to the Bill. The expense thus caused in Birmingham would probably reach £1,000; and one of their objects should be to make the elections as cheap, and not as dear as possible. He had altered the clause since it was first placed on the Notice Paper from "shall" to "may," so that the overseers might not be compelled to make out the lists in alphabetical order in places where it was not wished to put the clause into operation.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the proposal might seem suitable to Birmingham, which was only one parish, but it would cause great confusion in places where a borough contained several parishes. The clause appeared to be framed in order to save the candidate the expense of making out canvassing books. The result of making the clause permissive would be that some overseers would make out the register on one plan and some on the other. He was told that the overseers in some parishes had made considerable progress in preparing the lists for the present year, and they were very anxious that the clause should not pass.

MR. AYRTON thought that the clause would not work unless it was made imperative, or was added as a power to the overseers in addition to the duty which was now imperative. It would not do to have a permissive clause in substitution of the present duty.

MR. LOCKE said, he did not think any great difficulty would arise by the overseer carrying out the plan proposed by the clause, or that any serious additional expense would be thrown upon parishes.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he thought it would be much easier and cheaper for the overseer to be allowed merely to copy the rate-book, than to be obliged to arrange the list of names in alphabetical order.

MR. BOUVERIE said, it was necessary at election times that they should be able with facility to turn to the names of the electors, and that could be done only when the list was arranged alphabetically. On the whole, if there was to be a choice between the two methods, it would be better to adhere to the present practice.

MR. HIBBERT said, he thought the plan, if adopted at all, should only be adopted in those boroughs which consisted of one parish or township.

Clause *negatived.*

MR. FOLJAMBE rose to move the following new clause:—

"Where in any Borough the overseers shall, after the twenty-ninth day of September, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven, have rated the owner instead of the occupier of any dwelling-house or other tenement, in contravention of 'The Representation of the People Act, 1867,' the occupier of such premises shall, upon duly paying or tendering on or before the twentieth day of July next, the difference, if any, between the amount of poor rate payable on or before the fifth day of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight, in respect of such premises by such owner, and that which would have been payable by an ordinary occupier thereof, be entitled to be registered as a voter, as fully as if he had been rated and paid all rates in pursuance of the third and seventh sections of the said Act."

The clause was very similar to the 30th section of the old Reform Act; and his object in proposing it was to do an act of justice towards a class of occupiers who were fully entitled to be put upon the register. In a parish in his own constituency (East Retford) several hundreds of such men had been omitted from the list, and it was fair to suppose that the same thing might have occurred in other places. His clause would remedy that state of things.

VISCOUNT GALWAY supported the clause proposed by his hon. Colleague, and read a letter from the overseer of Worksop, explaining the circumstances under which between 500 and 600 persons there would be practically disfranchised unless some such clause as that were adopted.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, it was obvious that the clause was proposed to meet a particular case, and such legislation was always objectionable and dangerous. It was difficult to say whether it would meet that case, and still more difficult to say what its effect would be upon other cases. The persons whose names were said to have been improperly omitted by the overseer had a remedy at the time under the existing statutes, and if they had not then availed themselves of that remedy the passing of the proposed enactment in their favour would be giving them an unfair advantage.

SIR ROBERT COLLIER said, that the persons to whom the clause referred ought not to be allowed to suffer from the wrongful act of others. He thought that a good deal was to be said for the proposition that when a man whose landlord paid the composition rate, and himself paid the difference, he should have a vote.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, there could be no party feeling in this matter. He conceived that it would be injudicious to pass a clause for the sake of one particular borough, for its operations might extend to other cases to which it would be improper to apply it.

Clause *negatived.*

MR. VILLIERS moved the insertion of the following clause:—

(Overseers may cause houses and buildings in streets to be marked with numbers.)

"The overseers of any parish in England, the population whereof shall exceed ten thousand persons, according to the Census for the time being, may, with the consent of the Poor Law Board, from time to time cause the houses and buildings in all, or any of the streets, to be marked with numbers as they think fit, and the cost shall be chargeable upon and paid out of the monies to be raised for the relief of the poor of any such parish."

The right hon. Member said that in the manufacturing districts there were large blocks of houses without any numbers, and streets without any names, the property belonging to owners who, under the Compounding Acts, had been rated. Since the Reform Act of last year the compound-householder was done away with; and the clause he proposed would enable overseers to number the houses, so that the occupiers might be identified as the persons entitled to be placed on the register.

MR. POWELL said, he thought it would be inconvenient to introduce the clause into the Bill, inasmuch as such a power was already given in the Local Government Act.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the clause was not a fit one to be incorporated in the present Bill, though it might be a very proper one to be inserted in a rating Bill. This clause, besides, would have no operation in the present year with respect to registration, as the lists were now practically commenced.

Clause *negatived.*

MR. AYRTON said, that it would materially interfere with the progress of the proceedings before the Revising Barristers to have a large number of lodgers brought to their Courts to wait and see whether anybody would start up and challenge their votes. As these persons were to have their names in the lists long before the Revising Barristers held their Courts, it was only reasonable that those who wished to challenge the votes of any lodgers should give them notice before the holding of the Registration Courts. He hoped the Home Secretary would consider the expediency of introducing a provision by which notice should be given to lodgers of objections to their claims, without which they should not be compelled to come to the Court.

MR. BAINES said, he believed the lodgers were a much more respectable class of people than was at first supposed. He was certain that any clause which compelled the attendance of the lodger at the Court must be amended.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL objected to the suggestion. The effect of it would be to repeal a section in the Act of last Session, which had been deliberately adopted after considerable discussion.

MR. BAINES moved a clause to provide that lodgers who may have made a claim duly certified shall be entitled to vote unless notice of objection to his claim had been given to him three clear days before the sitting of the Revising Barrister's Court.

SIR ROBERT COLLIER supported the clause.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he hoped the clause would not be pressed. The subject was deliberately considered and decided last year, and the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens), who was much interested in the question, was then an assenting party to the decision then arrived at.

Clause *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 3, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading—* Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * (205); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2) * (207); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements * (206); Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal * (204); Bankruptcy Act Amendment * (208); Libel (Ireland) * (209).

Second Reading—Reformatory Schools (Ireland) * (122); Petroleum Act Amendment * (178).

Committee — Compulsory Church Rates Abolition (144-211); Liquidation * (181).

Report—Liquidation * (181).

Third Reading — Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) * (203); Judgments Extension * (160), and *passed.*

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATION.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: My Lords, I must begin by congratulating your Lordships on the return to the House of noble Lords opposite. I rise now with the intention and the wish to explain to your Lordships the course which the Government propose to take with respect to the Public Business of this House. After the unfortunate scene which I regret to say I witnessed yesterday evening, I cannot go into that explanation without first expressing what I feel with respect to the conduct of noble Lords opposite in leaving the House as they suddenly did in the midst of a debate. I do not believe that in either House of Parliament there lives a man old enough to remember conduct so disrespectful to the House itself, and, I must say, so wanting in respect to the noble Lords themselves. My Lords, there was no reason and no excuse whatever for —I will not say insulting the House, but for what might seem to be an insult to the House by breaking off a debate which was being conducted by your Lordships, and which ought to have been conducted with that equanimity and temper which it is the custom of your Lordships to exercise in this House. And when I say there was no reason for the conduct of which I complain, I say this—that if the noble Lords opposite really believed what they said—and they said no less than that Government had wantonly attempted to deceive them and Parliament—I affirm that they are totally wanting in any proof to substantiate such a charge. But, my Lords, if they had really any proof or conviction that such was the case, that was not the moment they ought to have chosen to say so. They passed by the fitting opportunity upon which they ought to have brought that accusation against us when on Tuesday night they accepted the discussion on the Scotch Reform Bill without any allusion to the charge that we were deceiving Parliament in consequence of the statement which Mr. Disraeli had made. I say if they had had any ground for their accusation they would have taken that opportunity of stating it, because a much stronger case could have been made with regard to the Scotch Reform Bill than could have been made out in respect of the Boundary Bill. Mr. Disraeli, it must be remembered, in the speech which was quoted yesterday, was speaking of the management and course of Business in the other House. He said that he considered the Scotch Reform Bill and the Boundary Bill as "virtually settled," meaning, of course, so far as regarded their progress through the Lower House. ["Hear, hear!" "No, no!"] The Scotch Reform Bill having thus been included in the sentence—being in fact the first that was mentioned, why did not the noble Lords bring up their complaint when we took that Bill in hand? Why is it, I ask, that this mare's nest was not discovered then? The Scotch Reform Bill was a much stronger case than the Boundary Bill, because the Amendments proposed upon the former on Tuesday night came directly from the Government, having been proposed by the noble Duke at the head of the Post Office (the Duke of Montrose).

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: No, no: there was no Notice given of those Amendments.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: Yes; Notice was given; and, that being so, I ask again, why did not the noble Lords bring forward their grave accusation on Tuesday last? And yet, having missed that opportunity, the noble Lords came forward yesterday evening, and said we had been false to our promises and had attempted to deceive the House. Had the noble Lords opposite believed the case which they strove to make out, I should have thought they would not have been able to contain themselves when the Amendment on the Scotch Reform Bill was proposed. No, my Lords, I suspect that discovery was made by some ingenious person between the Tuesday and the Thursday, and then followed what the French call a *mise en scène* on Thursday night—and I might use even stronger words of it, for I never saw the like before. I stated in the strongest language I could use, both when the noble Lords left the House and before they left it, that the Government had no idea of deceiving the House in any way; that they always said that the Report of the Commissioners ought to be upheld, and that Mr. Disraeli's words were applicable only to the conduct of Business in the other House. But I will now, with your Lordships' permission, read a letter which I received this morning from Mr. Disraeli on the subject. It is as follows:—

"10, Downing-street, Whitehall, July 3.

"My dear Lord,—I have learnt your proceedings in the House of Lords last night with astonishment. The interpretation placed on my words when speaking of the progress of Business in the House of Commons is one painfully distorted. I was answering an inquiry as to the prospects of Business in that House, and in estimating them I mentioned that certain measures, though they had not formally passed the House of Commons, might be considered virtually settled—that is to say, would lead, in the House of Commons, to no further debate or division. Yours sincerely,

"B. DISRAELI.

"The Right Hon. the Lord Privy Seal, G.C.B."

Now, my Lords, if you read the context of that speech in *The Times* newspaper, in which it is headed "The Business of the House," it is impossible for any candid man to suppose that my right hon. Friend could have meant anything but what related to the Business of the House of Commons—the course that Business was likely to take—and speaking of that he said that the House of Commons had virtually done with these two Bills. Well, my Lords, I can only say again that I deeply regret the scene that occurred last night. It really does remind me of what I used to see at a school for small boys when I was seven years old. There were very small boys, not above nine or ten years old, at the school to which I refer, and when one of them was caught at trap-ball or playing any other game in which he thought he was getting the worst of it he used to run away saying, "I won't play any more." That was exactly what was done last night by noble Lords opposite, who are not quite so young as the small boys to whom I have alluded.

I will now, my Lords, explain to your Lordships the intentions of the Government with respect to the Business of the House. We repudiate the accusation that has been made against us—we feel it the more that it was entirely undeserved. But after you had left your seats, and scarcely anyone remained on that side except one or two of your own supporters who blamed your conduct, we thought it would not have been respectful to the House to continue the discussion of the Bill. The discussion was accordingly adjourned. We were accused of hurrying your Lordships, and we have put off both the Boundary Bill and the Scotch Reform Bill to Monday next. My Lords, in doing that we certainly have to apologize to independent Peers who might have wished to move Amendments in both of these Bills, but whom now, for reasons I shall explain in a moment, the Government, I am afraid, will be obliged to request not to move those Amendments. Therefore, to a certain degree, we shall have prevented those independent Peers from taking action. To them I must tender an apology on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and I must ask my noble Friend behind me (Earl Beauchamp), not to move his Amendments in the Boundary Bill. We regret to have to ask him not to persist in those Amendments, for the reasons which I will give. My noble Friend, perhaps, is not aware that this is a question of very deep importance, both as respects the country and, I may say, the honour of the Government. We have been long taunted with wishing to remain in Office as long as possible, from the most paltry and sordid motives. We are therefore most anxious to meet these accusations. Our most anxious desire is, as has been stated in the House of Commons, that there should be a General Election as soon as possible, and with some considerable trouble and difficulty we have so managed matters that I believe such a consummation may be arrived at in November next. But, my Lords, it is necessary, as you all know, according to the Reform Act, that the claims for registration should be put in by the 20th of this month; there must be four days previous to these claims being put in, and therefore it becomes quite evident that the Boundary Bill and the Scotch Reform Bill must receive the Royal Assent by Friday next or this day week. I say the Scotch Reform Bill, because your Lordships will recollect that the seats of seven English boroughs will be transferred to Scotland, and that if the Scotch Reform Bill be not passed by Friday next the electors in those boroughs will be placed in such a position that, while deprived of their borough votes, they will have no means of putting in their claims to be registered as county electors. We are, therefore, placed in this position—that we are obliged to pass these Bills as quickly as we can, or else it will be impossible to have an election until after Christmas, or, in fact, till next year. These are the grounds, and in fact the only grounds, on which the Government are obliged to resist any Amendments to these Bills. It is not on account of any thing that occurred last night, because I positively deny the truth of the allegations which were then made against us. But it is under the necessity which I have described that Her Majesty's Government consents to induce your Lordships to pass the Bill without the Amendments.

Earl RUSSELL: After the accusation which the noble Earl has made against those who went away from the House last night, your Lordships cannot be surprised that I should endeavour to vindicate our conduct. At the outset I may say that in the course we thought it our duty to take we did not intend to create a sensation, as was done during the American War and the French War; but rather to indicate our sense that the Government were taking a very unusual and objectionable course. If the noble Duke the President of the Council (the Duke of Marlborough) had said that, as there seemed to be a misunderstanding on our part of the words that had fallen from the First Lord of the Treasury, the Government were ready to postpone the question in order that they might consider it further, I should have said at once that was quite satisfactory, and I am sure my noble Friends near me would have joined me in that expression of satisfaction. But the noble Earl said that we were guilty of disrespect to your Lordships' House. Now,

our only complaint was against the Ministers of the Crown; our only dispute was with them. But, on the other hand, I must complain of the noble Duke that he was himself disrespectful towards the First Minister of the Crown. He said he had never heard what the right hon. Gentleman had stated, and did not know what he had stated. Now, the First Minister of the Crown is the organ of the Government, and when he speaks in the House of Commons he, to a great degree, binds the Government. His Colleagues ought, at least, to accept and act upon his statements. The noble Duke, however, was so disrespectful to his Chief that he entirely disregarded the statement of his Chief, and did not take the trouble to attend to what he had said, and apparently did not care a farthing what had been done. Therefore, if we were disrespectful to the Government the noble Duke was disrespectful to the Head of the Government. Now, if the Government came down and told us that upon the Scotch Reform Bill they would support the Motion to strike out the clause for the disfranchisement of seven English boroughs as agreed to by the House of Commons, I should say in the same way that it would be contrary to the language held by the Government in the House of Commons to attempt now to preserve those boroughs, and increase the numbers of the House instead.

The Earl of MALMESBURY: We never intended to alter that clause; and I wish to explain that the reason we were obliged to pass the Scotch Reform Bill without Amendments as soon as we could was that it must be passed before the 13th, because those seven boroughs are included in the Bill, and voters within them will be in a dilemma if the Bill does not pass within that time.

Earl RUSSELL: The same question arises with regard to the Boundary Bill, because Mr. Disraeli said, "My great object is to carry the three supplementary Reform measures;" and in another speech, that he meant to promote despatch. It is evident from the Registration Bill that that must be the object of the Government; and it is obvious that if we alter the Boundary Bill as proposed there cannot be despatch, because the Bill would go back to the House of Commons; it would be the subject of great discussion if those boundaries were enlarged; probably after a great deal of discussion there would be a decision adverse to the proposal made in this House, and in that case we should have fresh debates here, and we could not have that despatch which is the object of the Government and of all parties. The situation in which we are placed is certainly a new and strange one, and I am very glad to find that those who are responsible for it are uneasy. They being uneasy—and it is Bentham, I think, who says it should be the object of Parliament to make Governments uneasy—our object is attained.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: The noble Earl is quite right in saying that the position is a somewhat strange one. In that opinion I think every one of your Lordships will concur. But a charge was made last night against the Government of a distinct breach of faith, and noble Lords took so strong a view that they withdrew from the House. Notwithstanding the appeal of the Leader of the House, I think that my Amendment on the Boundary Bill is an insignificant matter compared with the character of this House and with the charges which the noble Earl opposite has so lightly and recklessly made. It is rare that such charges are made in this House; it is rarer still to find that they are neither retracted nor apologized for. I suppose noble Lords opposite went upon the principle that if you throw mud enough some is sure to stick, and that they make these charges quite irrespective of the consequences to those who indulge in such an ignominious mode of warfare. In my opinion the charge has been completely and satisfactorily disposed of. ["No, no!"] If not, it is the duty of those who believe that a breach of faith has been committed to call upon the House to express an opinion on the subject. Such a charge ought not to be lightly made; it ought to be disposed of one way or the other; and I think the country will view with some surprise and regret the conduct of the noble Lords who do not withdraw that charge. With regard to the Amendment of which I gave Notice, it is difficult for an independent Member of your Lordships' House to resist such an appeal as has been made to me under present circumstances. The question of Reform has long been made the stock-in-trade of noble Lords opposite. They have been loud in their professions of Reform, but have invariably found some pretext for evading the fulfilment of their pledges and the enfranchisement of their fellow-countrymen. The effect of my Amendment would have been to enfranchise 18,600 additional electors, who would have gained votes under the proposed enlargement of these borough boundaries. That is a fact which has not been disputed, and which I trust the constituencies will bear in mind. That fact, taken in connection with the persevering efforts of noble Lords opposite to disfranchise the freemen, will test the value of those liberal professions of which we have heard a great deal too much. I am not going to enter into the general question of Reform. If I thought tha the charge of breach of faith could be sustained against the Government, or that by acceding to the appeal that has been made to me I was giving any countenance to so unsubstantial and trumpery an accusation, I should not yield to that appeal; but, as I believe that in the opinion of your Lordships the charge has been satisfactorily met, and that it is one of the most contemptible mare's nests ever trumped up in this House, I think it is due to the Government that I should not resist the appeal they have addressed to me.

THE DUKE OF MONTROSE: As my name was appended with the full consent of the Government to an Amendment to a clause in the Scotch Reform Bill for extending the boundaries of Glasgow, it is right that I should say a few words upon this subject. If I had supposed that there was any breach of faith or anything like what is called "a dodge" in such an Amendment I should certainly never have proposed it; but I did not think that there was any such pledge given as noble Lords opposite seem to suppose. The noble Duke the President of the Council and the Lord Chancellor both supported the Amendment upon that understanding; and when the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) says we were guilty of disrespect to the Prime Minister because we were not aware of the words he uttered, I answer that this was very natural, for the words of the Prime Minister referred merely to the course of the Business in the other House. He said that certain Bills had passed, that others were in progress, that the Scotch Reform Bill and the Boundary Bill were virtually settled, meaning as regards the Business of the House that there would be no more discussion upon them there. The accusation of noble Lords opposite, therefore, was perfectly unfounded; and I cannot understand at this moment how they can sit there and not state, like honourable Gentlemen, that they were mistaken. Have you any right to say that Mr. Disraeli was telling a falsehood? He says he did not mean what you supposed. That is the explanation of the matter; and if the question were put to any twelve men in a jury box every man among them would say that that is the natural meaning of his words. I repeat that there is no ground for the accusation; but the moment it was made I felt that it applied to the Amendment in the Scotch Reform Bill as much as to any Amendment in the Boundary Bill, and that if one was given up the other should be given up also.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: If I interpose, my Lords, it must be as a peacemaker, for it seems to me that we have got into rather warm latitudes when such words as "contemptible," "trumpery," and "falsehood" are introduced into our discussions. I was told that when I came into this House I should find the atmosphere one of temperate, calm, dignified serenity; but really I find it this evening a good deal warmer work than in the House of Commons. What I wish to suggest is that we are trying to decide a question which belongs to the House of Commons. It is quite clear that if Mr. Disraeli gave any pledge he did not do so with the consent of his Cabinet, because they knew nothing about the matter. Now, whether Mr. Disraeli did or did not give that pledge, or whether, putting it in the delicate words of the noble Duke, Mr. Disraeli told a falsehood—

THE DUKE OF MONTROSE: I beg leave to correct the noble Marquess. I said nothing of the kind. I merely asked whether noble Lords opposite meant to say that Mr. Disraeli told a falsehood?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am very sorry if I have misquoted the noble Duke, but he was in the recollection of the House. What I would suggest is that this very delicate and unpleasant question is not one for us to decide. The Members of the House of Commons are perfectly competent to deal with those who are in their midst, and to decide questions of an invidious character. I would humbly suggest that your Lordships are now satisfied that the Members of the Government in this House did not intend to be parties to any such pledge as that alleged to have been given in the other House, and that we should pass over the matter as one no longer within our jurisdiction.

LORD RAVENSWORTH wished to say he was no party to the Amendments of which Notice had been given by the noble Earl, nor to the withdrawal of them, and that in Committee he should move that the boundary of the borough of South Shields be remodelled according to the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My noble Friend (the Marquess of Salisbury) has drawn a contrast between the proceedings of this and of the other House of Parliament. He says he thinks that we present here a scene as exciting as any to be witnessed in the other branch of the Legislature. But my noble Friend forgot that your Lordships have a great safety-valve which has not yet been tried in the other House, and it is that, whenever a contest arises here, if it assume the appearance of seriousness, one side of the House can walk out and leave the other in undisputed possession of the field. I venture to say that if that be established as the uniform practice of either House it will be found one of the best possible sedatives against excitement, and will always have a most effectual result in preventing disputes from assuming the character of hostilities. But I only rise in order to remind your Lordships of the course which the Government feel compelled to take with regard to the future progress of these measures. In the other House of Parliament a Bill has been introduced for the purpose of arranging the various dates which have to be considered with reference to calling into existence the new constituencies, and preparing for a dissolution of Parliament. Before it was introduced the dates in it were considered by the Government with the greatest anxiety. The whole measure was based upon the assumption that the Boundary Bill and the Scotch Reform Bill would receive the Royal Assent by the 13th instant. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee of the other House, and that Committee virtually endorsed the propositions which were contained in it; and they in their turn also assumed that the two other Bills referred to would receive the Royal Assent upon the days named. If we had been favoured with the continued presence of noble Lords last evening, and if your Lordships had thought it right to make the Amendments proposed, there would have been just time sufficient to send the Amendments to the other House for consideration; but the result of the delay that has occurred—the Boundary Bill having been deferred to Monday—is that if the Amendments were made and we consider them on Monday, it would be utterly impossible for the Bill to pass through the necessary stages in this and the other House in time to receive the Royal Assent on the 13th inst. In point of fact, three or four days would be lost, and the times are so calculated that I may say the loss of an hour—certainly the loss of a day—would derange the whole plan of the Registration Bill and so overturn all our arrangements for a General Election this year. These are the reasons—I am sorry to say the imperative reasons—which oblige the Government to abstain from any support of a proposal which would alter in any substantial manner either the Boundary Bill or the Scotch Reform Bill. Let me say a word as to the accusation which was made last night. The Scotch Reform Bill as it stands now provides that the boundary of the borough of Glasgow shall not be altered. In the other House a proposition was made by the Government to alter that boundary in accordance with the wishes of the Corporation, and the opinion of the House was taken. In the first instance there was a tie; but upon the second division there was a majority of 5 against the Government. The noble Duke (the Duke of Montrose), with the assent of the Government, had given Notice of Amendments to alter the boundary of Glasgow in the manner desired by the Corporation, and of these Amendments Notice was given on Monday morning; on Tuesday evening the Bill was in Committee, and the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) complained that they had not been printed sufficiently long to give an opportunity to consider them. If it was the case that in the other House of Parliament the term "settled" was used with regard to the Boundary Bill in the sense of implying a pledge on the part of the Government that they would not be consenting parties to any alteration, it follows that the same pledge was given with regard to the Scotch Reform Bill. I cannot help thinking that the accusation made so gravely last night was an after-thought; because on Tuesday last the noble Duke complained that time had not been given to consider this Amendment about Glasgow. I therefore think that the accusation, however well it may have answered its purpose, found its first entrance into the minds of the noble Lords yesterday; and after the cool reflection they were able to bestow on the matter last night after they retired from Public Business, I had expected that this morning they would have been prepared to withdraw the accusation, which I think is quite untenable. They had ample opportunity of considering whether the words on which they founded the accusation would sustain it; for when the other elements of ability and talent on the Opposition side left the House last night, and the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) alone remained, we appealed to him to give us the words on which the charge was founded, and he said that the noble Earl who had left the House had taken the words with him. We were thus placed in an awkward position for continuing the discussion with the noble Duke single-handed, and without the words on which the charge rested. I trust now that noble Lords, especially as they have attained their object, and by delay have prevented any Amendments being made in the Bill, will admit that the construction they put on those words was altogether unwarranted.

Earl GRANVILLE said:—Speaking on behalf of several of my Friends and myself, I have to say, we do not wish to recede from the position we took last night. Without any disrespect to the House or to the Government, we do not apologize to the House, for the simple reason that we believe we did no more than was necessary to mark, in the strongest manner, our sense of the unusual position taken by the Government. The noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) has alluded to the warmth of this discussion. I do not know whether I spoke with any warmth yesterday; but if I did, I am quite sure that to-day the warmth has passed away. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack suggests that for the future when we become more than usually excited, there is a safety-valve which can be opened, by one side of the House walking out. Well, the value of that safety-valve has been proved in this instance, at all events; for, by our retirement, we have succeeded in defeating the proposal for the alteration of the Bill. But we may derive another lesson from this discussion; and that is, that we should possess a still more effectual sedative, if the Government would abstain from pressing an Amendment of this kind, after it had been disposed of in the House of Commons. My noble Friend near me would admit the physical superiority of the Lord Privy Seal; but would the noble Lord opposite like to pursue the comparison and measure by inches the intellectual stature of the two? ["Oh, oh!"] Do noble Lords object to the comparison, evidently intended by the noble Earl himself, or to my remarks upon it? The Boundary Bill and the Scotch Reform Bill were read a second time in this House without any remarks being made on the part of the Government, except that it was necessary to pass them in the most rapid manner. Then we find three or four sheets of Amendments to the Scotch Reform Bill on the Paper, and the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) objected to discussing them without further Notice. Thereupon, the Lord Privy Seal got up and said the Amendments were unimportant, with the exception of one, which he would postpone to Friday. Then we were astonished and surprised at an Amendment to the Boundary Bill being proposed, contrary to what we had been led to expect from the words of the Prime Minister in the other House. With respect to our secession last night, we might quote precedents for our conduct in walking out of the House; for, on more than one occasion, the Members of the Government in the other House have gone out in a body, because it was inconvenient to commit themselves on either side in a division. The practice, therefore, is one on which they are not entitled to pronounce an unqualified condemnation. Last night we were challenged to go on with the discussion. In the position in which we found ourselves, what were we to do? We remonstrated; but on finding that our remonstrances were perfectly useless, we went away. If we had remained, we should have been placed in a minority, and, under the circumstances, I think we took the right course in leaving the House. There would then very likely have been a great collision between the two Houses—for I do not think there was the slightest chance of these Amendments being passed into law, and therefore, in all probability, the delay which has been so much objected to would have arisen in that way.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: As allusions have been made to me by three or four speakers, I think I have a right to address the House. I wish to relate to the House an anecdote about the Scotch Reform Bill. Notice was given on the Paper that the Scotch Reform Bill was to be read a second time on the very day it was printed and circulated, or at all events not more than a day after. On that day I went across the House to the noble Earl the Lord Privy Seal and said to him, "We intend to move no Amendment of any importance to this Bill. I think it is a very good Bill." I was very much surprised, however, to see that when I expressed this favourable opinion of the Bill a very dark cloud passed over the countenance of the noble Earl. He evidently did not approve my saying it was a good Bill; and the suspicion immediately occurred to me—"Is it possible that the Government intend in Committee and without Notice to move important Amendments?" However, I dismissed that suspicion from my mind, and it was with infinite amazement that I afterwards saw on the Paper a number of Amendments, some of which, indeed, were merely formal, but one of which involved a most important alteration of the arrangements come to in the other House of Parliament. Although I have not hitherto said anything on the subject, I can assure noble Lords opposite that they have misconstrued my silence; it was my full intention, when that Amendment was brought forward, not only to oppose it on its own merits, but also to express my strong opinion that the pressing of it would be a breach of the undertaking which the Government had entered into in the House of Commons.

THE EARL OF DERBY: I have now had the honour of being a Member of your Lordships' House for twenty-four years, but never during that period have I witnessed anything with so much shame and regret for the character of the House as the scene last evening. I have been present at many warm and keenly-debated political discussions; but before this I never heard one in which there was introduced so much personal virulence and so many misrepresentations — and persevering misrepresentations. My Lords, I will admit that the expression used by Mr. Disraeli in the House of Commons might be capable of the misconstruction which was put upon it. At the same time, looking at all the circumstances, and considering that the expression was used on an occasion when the House of Commons was discussing what time there might be for their deliberations on particular measures which were passing through that House, and were to be submitted to this —looking at these circumstances I think it is quite clear that the remark of Mr. Disraeli simply meant that the Scotch Reform Bill and the Boundary Bill might be considered as settled so far as the House of Commons was concerned; that they would not occupy any more of the time of that House; and that in their then condition they would be sent up for the consideration of your Lordships. Now, what happened with regard to the debate on the Irish Church Bill? A division was taken in the House of Commons, and a very large majority gave a decision adverse to the Government. The Government, thereupon, allowed the Bill to pass through its future stages without any further opposition, in order that it might be sent up to your Lordships. But will any human being venture to contend that your Lordships were not perfectly free to deal with that Bill because the Ministers in the other House, after one debate and division, said it was not their intention to give the House any further trouble by dividing again upon the measure? Will any person say that the Ministers thereby debarred themselves from the right of dealing in this House with the measure as freely as if nothing had passed in the House of Commons? I admit, however, that the noble Lords opposite misconstrued that which to my mind was clearly and plainly the real meaning of the Prime Minister; but I think, my Lords, that, when that misinterpretation had been emphatically repudiated it might, have been open to the noble Lords to express their regret that such ambiguous terms had been used as to lead to such a misconstruction. But for them to persist in endeavouring to affix a stigma on the Government is to do that which I have never seen before, and which I hope I shall never see again. I think also, my Lords, that a most ungenerous use has been made of the course which the Government pursued last night. I say nothing about the dignified form of the retirement from the House of the noble Lords opposite who imitated, though on a very small scale, a memorable proceeding on the part of Mr. Fox, which was not generally approved at the time. But what was the consequence? Finding that under the pressure of excited feelings the noble Lords opposite refused to remain and discuss the question under consideration, Her Majesty's Government said—with what I will not call an excess of generosity, because I approve entirely the course they adopted—"We will not subject ourselves to the imputation of taking advantage even of the voluntary absence of our opponents. We have the power of passing this measure now without any opposition from the other side, but we will allow our opponents time to reflect on the charge which they have brought against us." The noble Earl (Earl Granville) says that the course which the noble Lords opposite pursued last night was vindicated by the success which attended it. Now, I must say that is a most ungenerous remark. It is equivalent to saying, "We calculated on the generosity of our opponents." ["No, no!"] What, then, did the noble Earl mean? To me his remark appeared to mean, "This move was successful, and why? Because if we had remained there would have been a division in favour of the Government, but our retirement acted on their generous feelings." If the noble Lords opposite had asked for further time to consider the question on the ground of the short Notice they had received, I am certain, from what I know of my noble Friends on this side and from the course they pursued last night, that they would have agreed to a postponement of the Bill. As it is, however, the Boundary Bill will have to be passed without the consideration of these Amendments, and we shall be compelled, without argument and without any comparison of reasons, to disregard the recommendations which the Commissioners, acting under the authority and by the direction of Parliament, made after investigating the whole subject during four or five months. This is a painful position for the House to be placed in; but as it is so placed I do not at all wonder at the course which has been pursued by Her Majesty's Government of yielding to the necessity of the case, and abandoning what they considered material Amendments rather than subject the country to the great inconvenience of having the Bill indefinitely postponed. Again I say that, in the course of my experience in this House, I have never heard anything so ungenerous and insulting in its tone as the cheer with which the opposite side of the House met my noble Friend's announcement that, in deference to the feeling on that side, the Government intended to withdraw the Amendments. I trust that on cooler reflection the noble Lords opposite will do justice to the motives which have actuated their opponents, and that after the solemn declaration which has been made on this side of the House they will, at all events, have the grace to withdraw the imputation which they have passed, without the shadow of a pretence, on the conduct, the motives, and the character of the Government.

The Earl of HARROWBY wished to say a word on the general question of breaches of faith with Parliament. He thought there had been more than one. Last year it was distinctly stated that the question of the boundaries was to be referred to a *quasi*-judicial tribunal, in order that the questions relating to those boundaries might be settled without reference to party principles or local jealousies. That arrangement was acceded to, and Parliament had a right to expect that it would be strictly acted upon. But how had it been carried out? Why, no sooner was the Report of the Commission presented than those local jealousies which were to have been so carefully excluded were all admitted as an element in the consideration of the matter. That, in his opinion, was a signal breach of faith with Parliament. There had been another breach of faith with reference to the representation of the people in Parliament. When the English Reform Bill of last year was passed every one supposed that the representation was settled as far as England was concerned; but when the Scotch Reform Bill came on for discussion in the House of Commons this Session the question of the English representation was re-opened, and several seats were taken from England in order that they might be transferred to Scotland. That, in his opinion, was another breach of faith with Parliament. Putting aside the occasion of the present miserable debate, which had given an opportunity for a display of feelings not in accordance with the gentlemanly habits which usually characterized the Members of their Lordship's House, he thought that in the two instances to which he had referred Parliament had reason to complain of its not having been fairly treated.

SOUTH AFRICA.

MOTION FOR A PAPER.

The Earl of CARNARVON, in rising to move for Copies of a Circular Despatch of the 30th of January, 1868, from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and of a Despatch of the 31st of March, also from the Colonial Office, said, he feared that the subject to which he was about to call the attention of their Lordships was not so exciting a one as that which had just engaged their attention. For himself he was resolved that no word should escape him calculated to give cause of complaint hereafter in reference to a very delicate question. For this reason he proposed to sedulously avoid entering on a controversy on the subject of letters patent, or on that of the general state of the colonial Church. He wished to call the attention of his noble Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies to two despatches on the subject of the consecration of a Bishop in South Africa, and which had reference to the state of things prevailing in the Church at Natal. On the 30th of January his noble Friend the Secretary of State wrote a very important despatch, in which he observed that it had come to the knowledge of Her Majesty's Government, through the newspapers, that there was an intention on the part of a colonial Bishop to consecrate another Bishop to the see of Natal; and that such an intention was viewed with apprehension and regret by Her Majesty's Government; and the Lieutenant Governor was instructed to use any influence he might possess to prevent such an occurrence. It is also stated that any ecclesiastical officers receiving a salary from the Government would be deprived of his salary and office if he assisted in such consecration. Now, though he (the Earl of Carnarvon) could not say that he agreed in that despatch, he did not want to enter into any discussion as to its terms. However, his noble Friend seemed to have reconsidered the subject, for on the 23rd of May he wrote a second despatch to the Lieutenant Governor, in which he stated that he had had certain communications with the Bishop of Capetown, who declared that it was not his intention in any manner to interfere with the legal rights of Dr. Colenso, his object simply being to consecrate a Bishop for those who would voluntarily submit themselves to his spiritual jurisdiction, and that nothing would be done by the new Bishop that would in any way conflict with any legal rights which Dr. Colenso, by virtue of his letters patent might have. Under these circumstances, his noble Friend the Colonial Secretary went on to state that Her Majesty's Government would interpose no obstacle to the proposed consecration; and that they would not require the Lieutenant Governor to use his influence to prevent parties from being concerned in the proposed consecration. Now, though this second despatch appeared to have been written in consequence of a misapprehension having existed when the first despatch was sent out, he (the Earl of Carnarvon) believed from a number of private letters which had reached him on the subject that the first despatch had been misunderstood in the country to which it was addressed. It appeared that immediately on the receipt of that despatch the colonial authorities of Natal wrote to Dr. Colenso communicating the purport of it to him, and requesting him to communicate not only to the salaried clergy, as his noble Friend had directed, but to all the clergy. Indeed, he was informed that the Natal authorities went very far beyond the terms of the despatch. They did not stop with the clergy, because he held in his hand unquestionable evidence that they so far mistook its tenour as to convey a most extraordinary warning to all civilians in the Government employ to take no part in the consecration, and give no countenance to it, under pain of the displeasure of Her Majesty's Government. He was sure his noble Friend had never intended that such a use should be made of the despatch. He need not point out to their Lordships how improper it was that such a communication should have been addressed to civilians serving under the Lieutenant Governor. He was further informed—though he confessed he was very reluctant to believe that such a thing could have occurred—that the military officers in the colony were induced to sign a document pledging themselves to take no part in the consecration. From some other circumstances which had reached him he was afraid that the local authorities had gone not only beyond the instructions of his hon. Friend, but beyond all constitutional limits. He was informed that a clergyman who had been for some time in possession of a church in Natal, and had held a school in that church which was acknowledged to be an excellent school, had been suddenly deprived of his grant for it, because he had declined to acknowledge Dr. Colenso for his Bishop. When he gave up the church and removed the school to a private house a technical argument was made use of to the effect that as the school was not held in a church he was not entitled to the grant. He had been furnished with another case, in which another clergyman had been deprived of a school grant. There were a large number of poor men dependent, in a great degree, on the local Government, who had been prevented attending certain churches to which they would otherwise have gone, in consequence of their fear of giving offence to the local authorities. Some of the information supplied to him had been furnished under the seal of secrecy—so much afraid were persons of compromising themselves in this matter with the local Government. Through this miserable controversy all the missionary labour of the Church in Natal, and all its civilizing influences were declining. From these facts he apprehended that there was much going on in the nature of religious persecution, and he thought the matter was well worthy the consideration of his noble Friend the Secretary for the Colonies. He thought it very much to be regretted that local authorities should depart from a position of neutrality, and should lend the weight of their patronage and support to either of the religious parties in the colony, contrary to the Instructions of previous Secretaries of State. Accordingly, he hoped to hear from his noble Friend that he had not countenanced proceedings on the part of the local authorities which, if they had not relation to such a serious subject, he should call ridiculous; but, on the contrary, that he had advised them to intermeddle as little as possible with religious matters. They could not hope permanently to maintain a Church with privileges and endowments in the colonies; and it was but common sense that if a Church could not be maintained with exceptional privileges, it should not be weighted, at least, with exceptional restraints.

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of Circular Despatch of 30th January 1868 from the Secretary of State for the Colonies relative to the Consecration of a Colonial Bishop in South Africa, and of a Despatch of 31st March on the same Subject.—(*The Earl of Carnarvon.*)

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM said, he was not disposed to regret that his noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon) had not postponed this Question till after the two Despatches had been produced, although he had rather misrepresented the policy indicated in them. He concurred entirely with the opinion which had been expressed by the noble Earl, that religious matters in the colony should be as little interfered with as possible by the civil Government, Colonial or

Imperial. Salaried officers appointed by the Crown, and holding office under the pleasure of the Crown, in his opinion, ought not to interfere in matters of partizanship; and accordingly he had thought it better to warn those officers not to interfere in such proceedings. The occurrences in the colony to which his noble Friend had referred amounted to what he could call by no other name than persecution; they had occurred without any authority from home, and, according to the advices hitherto received, some of those occurrences, at least, while the Governor of Natal was absent from the seat of government. At the same time, he believed that when many of those occurrences had been inquired into, they would be found capable of full and satisfactory explanation. In one of the cases referred to by the noble Earl, it would seem that a grant had been withdrawn from a school in consequence of its being removed from the church to some other place. There was no doubt that the school was a good one, and that the teachers were well-qualified; and it certainly seemed to him, upon first reading the papers, that a building of an ordinary character was better suited than a consecrated church to the holding of a school. But, on looking further into the matter, he found that the grant given by the colony for that particular year was for a school to be held at and in this certain church, and which could not be moved to any other place without the sanction of the Government previously obtained—a condition which appeared to have been utterly lost sight of. He had felt it his duty to point out to the Governor of the colony that such reasons, although applicable in the particular case, ought not to be reasons for withholding pecuniary aid; and he felt certain that the Governor, when he returned to the seat of government, would take such measures as would avoid the appearance of partizanship with either of the parties which had unhappily arisen in the colony. Having had an interview with the Bishop of Capetown, and learnt his Lordship's views as to many of the proceedings which had occurred, he felt it his duty to write the second despatch to which his noble Friend had referred. And there was a passage in that despatch which he desired to explain. It was drafted in accordance with what he understood to be the views of the Bishop of Capetown, expressed in two or three interviews; but unfortunately, owing to his Lordship being out of town, the final draft could not be submitted to him till the very evening that the despatch was to leave. His Lordship was strongly opposed to a particular phrase, and various suggestions were made before one could be adopted in which he felt disposed to concur; but eventually this difficulty was overcome by words written with his Lordship's own hand. It afterwards appeared, however, that his Lordship had an objection to some words which preceded this particular phrase, to which he himself did not attach any importance, and which were not struck out; so that the despatch, being rapidly transcribed, and there not being the opportunity of again submitting it to his Lordship, included these particular words. He could only say that he regretted there had been the slightest misconception on the subject; not one word had been intended to give the slightest offence to his Lordship. It was not right that ecclesiastical officers in the colony holding offices under the pleasure of the Crown should lend the weight of their authority to proceedings upon one side or the other; but, at the same time, it had never been contemplated to interfere with the fullest and freest independence of religious opinions. This was the principle that had been acted upon, and he thought it a most important principle to maintain in our colonial legislation. The despatches would be laid on the table as soon as possible, together with any further information that should happen to be received in the meantime.

Lord HOUGHTON said, that he wished the Papers had been on the table before the subject came on for discussion, because without them it could not be fairly dealt with. As, however, there was little chance of the question being again raised, he wished briefly to express his opinion on it. Remarking that the observations of the noble Duke were eminently statesmanlike, he expressed the belief that as long as the officials of the colony could be kept from the controversy the better it would be for the colony and the country. Injustice on one side naturally engendered injustice on the other; and much of what had happened could easily be traced to the treatment which the whole subject had received in this country, so widely different was it from the course recommended by the noble Duke. But since the feeling originally engendered had been uselessly kept up by discussions in the most distinguished body in this country, he did not think we could complain. The questions, however, which Dr. Colenso had started were quite beyond the province of this House; and he believed the best efforts of the noble Duke or of any other person were quite unable to settle the difficulty which had arisen. Dr. Colenso stood at this moment the spiritual and temporal Bishop of the diocese, and he exercised his right with great temper and judgment; and it was much to be regretted that he had not been treated with more brotherly friendship and kindness. He wished only to repeat his desire—the desire of all those who believed Dr. Colenso had been treated with great injustice—that the spirit advocated by the noble Duke would in future animate all those in this country who concerned themselves in the matter.

LORD LYTTELTON said, that while agreeing with the noble Lord that the subject could not be well dealt with until the Papers were before their Lordships, objected to the latter part of his observations, expressing an opinion that the position and proceedings in the colony were concurred in by only a very small minority.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD said, he had no intention of entering upon the general question, but could not refrain from saying a word upon what had fallen from the noble Baron (Lord Houghton), who took upon himself to lecture ecclesiastics and others for not having treated the person to whom he alluded with kindness and brotherly friendship. The fact, however, was as diametrically opposite to the statement of the noble Baron as it was possible for any fact to contradict any statement. Dr. Colenso had received private remonstrances, brotherly counsel—the tenderest and kindest counsel—from his brethren at home; but every attempt in the direction of counsel and remonstrance had only led him to some new outbreak of violence. He could not let the statement of the noble Baron go uncontradicted, though of course it had been made in that absolute ignorance of the subject which it was natural he should possess, and equally natural he should express.

Motion *agreed to.*

COMPULSORY CHURCH RATES ABOLITION BILL—(No. 144.)

(*The Earl Russell.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

EARL RUSSELL: Before dealing with the alterations made by the Select Committee in this Bill, which I think are on the whole improvements, I will offer a word or two on the general subject. My impression is that a Bill designed simply to abolish church rates unconditionally would, in effect, differ very little from what will be entailed by the passing of this. A few cases will occur of parishes in which there are no resident landlords, but only poor farmers, having a large and expensive church to maintain; in such cases local contributions will be few; but here the Church Building Society and other societies will step in and advance necessary funds. This is merely my impression of what will occur, though of course the Bill makes no allusion to such cases. It is stated in the Preamble that—

> "Church rates have for some years ceased to be made or collected in many parishes by reason of the opposition thereto, and in many other parishes where church rates have been made, the levying thereof has given rise to litigation and ill-feeling."

This is, no doubt, perfectly true, and the 1st clause proceeds to enact that no proceedings shall hereafter be taken to enforce or compel the payment of any church rate made in any parish or place in England and Wales. To that 1st clause the Government agrees, and therefore in principle the prayer of Dissenters is, in fact, complied with. The object of the 2nd and 3rd clauses was to distinguish between ordinary church rates and rates the payment whereof is secured by Act of Parliament, or where money has been borrowed on the security of church rates. All will agree in the justice of reserving the right to make and collect rates for such purposes. There are some other cases which may be doubtful, and, no matter what arrangements we may make, it is impossible that we can absolutely prevent disputes. All that we can do is to reserve church rates which are really commuted tithes, and to take our chance as to any disputes that may arise; and as to the necessity of future legislation, which is not unlikely to arise, especially as there are no less than 700 Acts of Parliament, some of them of a very difficult and intricate nature, in which church rates are mentioned. So much with regard to that portion of the Bill which relates to the abolition of compulsory church rates. The other part of the measure relates to application and security of voluntary contributions for the repair of the fabric and for the other purposes for which rates have been levied. Now, the Bill allows vestries to continue the making and receiving of rates, the only difference being that the power of compelling payment is taken away. A vestry may decide that a certain sum is required, and persons may voluntarily pay at a certain rate in the pound. I think that in this respect the Select Committee have made an improvement, for they retain the vestry, the name and powers of which are well-known; and I can conceive that in numerous parishes where church rates are at present made no great change will occur in consequence of the absence of compulsion. Things are far more likely to go on as at present under these circumstances than if a new body were constituted, as was proposed by the other House. Then there is a clause empowering the incumbent and two householders, one appointed by the patron and one by the bishop, to act as trustees and receive any bequests, donations, or contributions for ecclesiastical purposes, which funds they may hand over to the churchwardens to be applied to such ecclesiastical purposes as they may specify. That is a provision which will come into operation in some cases, but I think that the Church Building Society or the churchwardens will generally apply the contributions they may receive. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has given Notice of a further clause, requiring the trustees to lay before the vestry an annual statement of their receipts and expenditure. Upon the whole this is a Bill which fulfils its object, for while abolishing compulsory rates it empowers the vestry to make voluntary rates, and it also empowers trustees to receive contributions. As to its general effect it is, I trust, the settlement of a controversy which ever since 1833 or 1834 has given rise to much ill-will and litigation, and therefore the termination of such a dispute is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Moreover, there is much greater anxiety than used to exist, not only to keep our churches in proper repair, but to preserve them in that ancient character which has long made them an object of reverence. Such feelings are not confined to members of the Church, for many Protestant Dissenters, members of whose families have been married in churches in past times, or have been buried within their precincts, would be most unwilling to see those edifices fall into decay, and when the obnoxious compulsory powers are removed I believe they will contribute voluntarily. I know a case, indeed, in which a Dissenter gave £100 each to two churches, and I believe such cases will be more numerous after the passing of this measure. I hope, therefore, your Lordships will adopt the Bill in its present form, and send it down to the House of Commons. Some question may be raised there on the 9th clause, but I believe Protestant Dissenters, both those who are Members of the House of Commons and others who have taken a leading part in the controversy, are satisfied with a measure of this kind, and I am sure it will be a great advantage if we can pass such a Bill by the general consent of both Houses and of both Churchmen and Dissenters. It is much better to settle the question in this way than to leave it open, to be settled, perhaps, hereafter with angry feelings, when one party will be elated by victory and the other will feel sore under defeat. I shall not myself propose any alteration in the Bill as settled by the Select Committee.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill."—(*The Earl Russell.*)

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I regret to be obliged to agree with the noble Earl, that the effect of this Bill as it now stands will not differ widely—I should scarcely say that it will differ at all—from the effect of a Bill for total abolition of church rates. When it came up from the House of Commons, it contained some very valuable provisions for the protection of the Church. It contained a provision that if the churchwarden was a Dissenter and did not pay his church rate, he should not be allowed to administer the payments of those who did contribute, but that a Churchman should be appointed for that purpose. That provision has disappeared; and now it will be necessary for Churchmen who wish to give their voluntary contributions to place them, if there be a Dissenting churchwarden, in his hands, however bitter and hostile to the Church he may be. Again, there was a provision that those who had not paid the church rate one year should not form part of the vestry for the purposes of a church rate in the succeeding year. The result of that provision would have been that when once the first vestry had been held it would not be in the power of the Dissenters in any parish where they might be numerous and hostile to paralyze the action of the vestry, and to forbid altogether a voluntary rate from being raised. As the matter stands now it will remain in the power of the Dissenters, whenever they shall be irritated by some real or fancied grievance, to come to the vestry and prevent this voluntary rate from being made. Again, there was a third provision to this effect—that when any persons had promised to contribute to the maintenance of the Church, the churchwardens should have the power of going on with the church repairs, and afterwards of suing any person who, having promised to pay, had subsequently refused. It was obvious that the object was that the churchwardens should be exonerated from personal risk if they undertook repairs on the faith of being promised large sums which were afterwards refused. But that provision also had disappeared, and the effect of it would be this, that it would not be competent for any churchwarden, having any regard to his own safety, to spend a single farthing till he had it in his pocket. The statement of the noble Earl was, therefore, singularly just—that it scarcely differed, if it differed at all, from a Bill for the total abolition of church rates. He deeply regretted that in a Committee of their Lordships' House it should have assumed such a character. But as it was assented to by Her Majesty's Government he could only say that the views with which many persons in the House of Commons assented to the measure had been entirely departed from, and that their interest in the measure was quite defeated.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, as I had the honour of serving on the Select Committee to which your Lordships committed this Bill, and took an interest in the progress of the Bill through the Committee, perhaps your Lordships will allow me to say a few words with reference to some of the changes which have been made in it. I entirely agree in one respect with the observations of the noble Marquess who has just sat down. Nothing could be more unfortunate than that there should be any misconception as to the character of this Bill. I believe that this is a Bill for the abolition of church rates; that is, for the abolition of the compulsory power of levying those rates. I do not look upon the Bill as a compromise. I do not look upon it as giving back anything to the Church in return for the power which you take away. Having said so much, I will now state the advantages which I conceive to be gained by the clauses now to be found in the Bill over those which were in the Bill as it came from the House of Commons. When this Bill went into Committee it was clearly understood that the 1st clause, doing away with the coercive power of levying church rates, was not to be altered in any substantial manner. If it was the intention of your Lordships to do away with that clause the proper way would have been to have rejected the Bill on the Second Reading. The attention of the Committee, therefore, was addressed to the other parts of the Bill. The real difference between the clauses as they were before and as they are now is this—By the clauses of this Bill as they stand now, the Committee had it in view to leave the whole parochial machinery exactly as it stands at present *minus* the one power of the coercive levy of church rates. Their object in other respects was to leave the machinery untouched, so that in those parishes, of which there are a vast number, in which church rates are levied and coercive proceedings in the Courts of Law are unknown the course of making and levying the rate should go on just as at present. My Lords, I venture to entertain a hope that if this Bill becomes law the expectations of its supporters in that respect will be realized. I believe that, though by no means universally, yet in a very large number of parishes in the country, where from conscientious motives or otherwise, church rates have been refused, henceforth the vestries will assemble, church rates will be voted, and many persons will pay cheerfully and willingly who would refuse if they were levied compulsorily. If this be so the views which led to the introduction of those clauses will be fully accomplished. The view of the Committee was this, that the best hope of obtaining that result was by leaving the old machinery untouched; because if you introduced a new machinery you would put the present machinery out of gear. You would lose your old system without, perhaps, getting any other system in return. My noble Friend (the Marquess of Salisbury) referred to the clauses which came up from the House of Commons. I quite agree with him as to the plausibility of some of those clauses. For instance, nothing can be more plausible than to say, "Do not let anyone who does not pay church rate vote either as to the expenditure of that rate or as to the making of a new rate next year." But, my Lords, let us observe what the consequences of that would be. The noble Marquess said that if you once had a church rate made then those who did not pay would not be entitled to vote about a rate next year. But the effect of such a clause would be that you would furnish the strongest possible inducement to those who were opposed to the Church to resist the making of a rate the first year. As the clause stands now a strong Dissenter would say—"If you are going to make a church rate which cannot be levied coercively against me, I shall have an opportunity of appearing next year and objecting, and I would not mind interfering now." But if you tell him that if he allows a rate to be made this year he will be excluded for the future from voting on the question, he will say, "Now is my time. This is the only opportunity I shall have. I must get all my friends to come. Now is the time the battle must be fought, and fight we will to prevent the church rate being made." Well, what would the next consequence be? Suppose you make your church rate the first year; there may be 100 persons who ought to pay, but only fifty of them do pay. Next year instead of a constituency of 100 you get only fifty. The fifty make a new rate, and twenty fall off and do not pay. The third year you get a constituency of thirty, and perhaps ten of them would not pay. Thus by degress you get to a constituency so small and ridiculous that the thing must die out. In fact, the whole course of things I have described is so new and so contrary to experience that the moment you begin to work it in a parish it would be opposed because it was a new system. There was another provision in the Bill as it came from the House of Commons to this effect—that an action at law might be brought against persons who upon the making of a church rate held out a promise to pay and would not. I, for one, expressed my own opinion against that clause in Committee. I believe, coming down as you are now obliged to do to the voluntary system, the working of it depends entirely upon your doing nothing which would have an alarming effect upon those who are asked to come in and accept the voluntary system. If, therefore, you speak of actions at law, I am greatly afraid you will frighten many persons, who will say, "No doubt compulsory church rates have been abolished, but churchwardens may go to law with us if we promise, and therefore we will keep away from the vestry altogether." Now that is a reason of the value of which your Lordships may judge; but it was one which influenced me in suggesting that the clause as it came from the House of Commons should be omitted. The only other point in the Bill as it came from the House of Commons which was different from the Bill in its present shape was as to the mode of treating churchwardens. In the Bill as it came from the other House, if a churchwarden did not pay the rate there was a power to elect a treasurer in his place, who was to have the power of disbursement over the rates collected. If this treasurer is to be elected by those who pay the church rate, you run exactly into the danger I have attempted to describe; you have a diminishing constituency, which may never be called into existence, and you introduce a new officer altogether unknown to the parochial system. If a provision had been introduced that the vestry at large, in default of the churchwarden paying his rate, should be at liberty to elect a successor, the difficulty might have been avoided. Otherwise, you get into a new channel of operations to which no parish is accustomed. These are the reasons which weighed with the Committee, and induced them to amend the Bill and introduce the clauses which your Lordships now find there. I hope that with this machinery the Church even in country parishes will not suffer, and that the fabrics of the Church will continue to be decently maintained.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, that he originally thought, and was still of the opinion, that the best solution of the difficulty would be to abolish the compulsory collection of church rates, and leave the existing machinery as it is.

THE EARL OF DERBY said, it was not his intention to oppose the going into Committee; and although he retained all his objections to doing away with the compulsory power of levying church rates, yet, at the same time, the principle of the

1st clause having been adopted by their Lordships, and accepted also by a large majority of the House of Commons, he thought it would be useless to struggle against such a majority in both Houses. That point being settled, he would further say that it was his earnest desire that this question should be brought to a satisfactory issue in the present Session, and should not be left open for any further agitation or to be any cause of bitterness among the new constituencies. He must confess, however, that on one point, notwithstanding the statement just made by his noble and learned Friend, he was strongly inclined to agree with the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury). In many respects he thought the Bill had been amended by the Select Committee. As he understood it now, retaining all the existing powers of the vestry and all the existing machinery, the Bill simply provided that there should be no compulsory enforcement of rates. Clause 8 provided that no defaulter should have the opportunity of speaking or of raising any objection or discussion as to the mode in which church rates should be applied in the year during which he was a defaulter. But he (the Earl of Derby) thought that principle ought to be carried further. This was to be a voluntary rate, levied by a voluntary machinery. If so, surely the persons who paid the rates were the persons who should say whether the rates should or should not be levied. If persons objected to rates and threw the charge upon their fellow-parishioners, surely they ought not to have the opportunity of saying next year whether a similar charge should or should not be thrown upon those who had borne the charge in the last year. If the measure was a voluntary one, he thought it ought to be left to Churchmen alone to say whether the rates should be levied or not. He confessed that, clear as his noble and learned Friend (the Lord Chancellor) usually was, he did not understand the force of his argument when he said that if they restored the clause as it came from the House of Commons, they would furnish an inducement to persons to abstain from paying the rates.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I did not say that it would be an inducement to abstain from paying the rates, but that it would be an inducement to persons unfriendly to the Church to come forward the first year and prevent the church rate being made, because if they succeed in that, the working of the system would have no beginning.

THE EARL OF DERBY said, he misunderstood his noble and learned Friend, and indeed it was not always easy to hear what passed in the House. But what he said was that, year after year, you will have persons refusing to pay, so that gradually the non-payers will absorb the payers. Then his noble and learned Friend assumed that no person had a right to qualify himself by payment; but, as he (the Earl of Derby) understood it, in each year during which the church rate was levied, it would be demanded from each occupier, Churchman or Dissenter. It was perfectly open to anybody to refuse to pay; but though defaulters would be deprived of a voice in the expenditure, still, upon paying the rates when demanded, they might be restored to all the rights of Churchmen. It seemed to him that this was the only effectual mode of dealing with the question. On the other hand, he confessed that he did not lay much stress on the argument that Dissenters might be induced to put a stop to the machinery for levying a rate, more especially as they were told that this was a Bill for satisfying the Dissenters.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK said, it was not wonderful that a great difference of opinion should prevail about these clauses. But their Lordships should remember that the system which this Bill proposed to introduce was already in existence. There were thousands of parishes in which church rates were now levied upon the voluntary principle recognized in this Bill—namely, that though rates were voted, no compulsion should be resorted to. In thousands of parishes this principle exists already and works well. No doubt great inconvenience might arise in a few parishes where Dissenters persisted in coming to the vestry, though not subject to any tax, and where vestries made a point of electing Dissenting churchwardens. But were they to legislate for these few hostile cases or for the general body? He believed that the policy of fear and jealousy expressed by such clauses would be very mischievous to the Church, especially at that moment. He was in favour of a policy of greater generosity and of assuming that Dissenters would not go to the vestry to discuss rates and expenditure which did not affect their pockets, and that Churchmen would be elected as churchwardens. He believed that that would be the case in a majority of parishes. With regard to the exclusion of all those who did not pay rates he doubted the policy of ticketing them as defaulters in this way when their non-payment might have arisen from want of money. There, again, he thought the generous policy was the right one. To admit defaulters to the vestry and abide by any little exceptional trouble they might thus occasion would, he thought, be a smaller evil on the whole than to adopt this rate-paying qualification as a test of being a Churchman, and to recognize Churchmen only from the fact of their going to the vestry. Looking at the clauses in the Bill he thought them an improvement upon the House of Commons' clauses, and as to the first clause they were precluded now from discussing it. Upon the whole, the Bill was, in his opinion, much improved; and instead of launching into an unknown sea and creating new arrangements and new machinery, the measure did the minimum of mischief, for it left the whole Church system, which had been in practice for centuries, quite unimpaired.

Lord LYVEDEN said, that when it was proposed to refer this Bill to a Select Committee he felt that there were objections to such a course on the ground of the delay which it would entail; but he was bound now to acknowledge that this delay had been useful, and that the consideration bestowed upon the Bill in the Committee had effected great improvement on it as it originally stood. He could not understand how any Bill could more effectually abolish compulsory church rates than this did; and for that reason he was glad to observe the spirit in which it had been received and discussed by many noble Lords, and particularly by those who sat on the Episcopal Benches. If their Lordships had passed the Bill as it came up from the other House they would have got rid of Church rates, but they would also have established a system so complicated that it would have occasioned as much offence to Dissenters as the existing law. He was glad to compare the altered tone of many of their Lordships now with that manifested when he brought forward a Bill in 1864. He was then met by cries of "No surrender!" and "The Church in danger!" which had not been raised on the present occasion. The attitude of many noble Lords was completely changed, and he could not help thinking that the tone adopted by the right rev. and most rev. Prelates, as well as by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, would do more for the benefit of the Church than any other they could have taken. The willingness to concede would be gladly welcomed by those who hitherto had said, "I will give nothing to the Church under compulsion; but I will gladly do anything I can for the Church if the matter be left to my own free-will." There were many Dissenters who were in the habit of regarding the church as part of the parish, and who would not let it go down if their free-will offerings could sustain it. Everyone would acknowledge that compulsion and prosecution in favour of religion had always done most for the compelled and persecuted. On the other hand, religion gained by concession, as the Church would do in this instance. It was a concession on the part of the Church. He did not think Dissenters had a right to complain as against the Church, for they were taxed by the majority, and it was by a majority that taxation must always be be imposed. He hoped that the same change that had occurred upon this question would occur upon others, and that their Lordships would upon them exhibit the same readiness to accept the opinions of their fellow-subjects that they had shown in this instance. He congratulated their Lordships upon having done their duty without offering an obstructive opposition to this Bill, and he believed the result would be, that which their Lordships and the Bench of Bishops especially desired, increased veneration for the Church and increased contributions to her funds.

The Bishop of OXFORD: My Lords, I cannot admit that the alternative to concession in this case is persecution. I believe there was no persecution whatever on the part of the Church. Church rates were a legal tax upon property, and persons who held it bought it or inherited it subject to the payment of them. It was therefore no more persecution in asking persons to pay them, and they were no more victims of persecution if compelled to pay, than was the ordinary householder who had to submit to periodical visits from the tax collectors. A person who dislikes paying a tax always feels persecuted if he is made to pay. I do not think a bystander will readily admit that a man who refuses his assessed taxes is a virtuous object of pity for being made to pay them. But that is not now the question. It is admitted that the compulsory payment of church rates is to be given up, nd the question before us is the Bill. Although considerable improvements have been made in it, especially in its earlier portions, I confess I think that in one or two of its principal provisions it has been seriously injured, and I shall feel bound to propose Amendments upon the Report. First, as to the question concerning the settling of future rates by those who have not paid the last. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack seemed to think that it would be a provocation to Dissenters to go and object to a voluntary church rate being made if those who have not paid the rates would not be parties to settling the way in which a new voluntary rate should be made. The Bill that contained that clause was a compromise and a compact between the Dissenters and the House of Commons and the representatives of the Church of England there. It was most thoroughly considered by the Dissenting Members of the House of Commons, who, I must say, in this matter seem to have kept faith in the most praiseworthy manner with those who had the management of this Bill, and they agreed that it was a clause to which Dissenters had not any right to object. Neither do I think it is possible to say they have. Any person can come again into the voluntary church rate vestry by paying his own share of the rate for the year past; he does not lose any right; it is not that he must pay it now or never. At any time he can join that body which settles whether there shall or shall not be a voluntary rate by paying a subscription equal to the amount of the last rate. The main objection always taken to church rates has been the compulsion and not the amount. Those who objected to pay them have often said they would willingly give double the amount as a free gift, but they objected to the power to compel them to pay anything. That is entirely taken away by the Bill, and therefore there is no temptation to come the first time and object to the starting of the machinery. On the contrary, their representatives in Parliament have agreed to start it, and I think the probability is that, receiving this as a sacrifice on the part of the Church, and gratified that it has given up the power of compulsion, they will be even more ready than others to start the new machinery fairly. But the objection that it is new machinery I deny, for in nineteen cases out of twenty the vestry will be precisely the same, and the rate will be made as before, with this one difference, that the payment of it cannot be enforced. The transition from the existing to the future legal state is, therefore, a simple matter. I believe the vestry will be an increasing rather than a dying away constituency, especially in country parishes, where farmers will not like to be left out. But suppose the number of payers diminishes every year you will realize a state of inanition just as you would if opponents prevented the starting of the machinery. It does seem to me it is a fundamental error in the Bill, as altered by the Select Committe, that it takes away the one thing which would work well. Whilst in the country parishes there would be very little change, how would the Bill work in the towns where the rate has been refused? If the Bill passes through Committee, I shall feel bound to move several Amendments on the Report being brought up. First of all, I shall move an Amendment to restore Clause 8 to its original shape. Then, after the clause which makes the churchwardens the sole administrators, I shall propose to insert a new clause, containing a proviso that in the event of one of the churchwardens being a person who refuses to pay the rate a treasurer may be substituted in his place. I propose further to move that this Bill shall not come into force till a fortnight after Easter in next year; and also that a provision shall be inserted empowering the churchwardens to recover by legal process the various amounts which persons have promised to contribute. He thought it impossible to allow the churchwardens to incur expenses on the faith of promises and give them no remedy against the persons who failed to perform their undertakings.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX thought that, owing mainly to the exertions of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, the Bill had been greatly improved since it left the House of Commons.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE said, that when the original Bill came up from the Commons he would gladly have concurred in its rejection; but both sides of the House having sanctioned its principle by consenting to the second reading, he felt it his duty to make the best of it; and acting on that conviction he had consented to sit on the Select Committee. He thought that the Bill as it had come out of the Committee was a great improvement on the original measure; but it was susceptible of further amendment; and with this view he would give Notice of an Amendment—which his right rev. Brother the Bishop of London had proposed to move—the effect of which would be to set district chapelries and parishes free from all obligation to contribute to the church rate—or, as it must now be called, the voluntary rate—for the service of the mother churches. Most of their Lordships were aware what a fruitful source of irritation that obligation had hitherto been.

Motion *agreed to;* House in Committee accordingly.

Clauses 1 to 8 *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Power to appoint Church Trustees).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR moved to insert the following:—

> "The trustees shall once at the least in every year lay before the vestry an account of their receipts and expenditure during the preceding year, and of the mode in which such receipts have been derived and expenditure incurred; together with a statement of the amount, if any, of funds remaining in their hands at the date of such account."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 211.)

House adjourned at half past Eight o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 3, 1868.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class V.

Resolutions [July 2] *reported*—NAVY ESTIMATES.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Salmon Fisheries (Scotland)* [210].

Second Reading—Indorsing of Warrants* [208]; Investment of Trust Funds Supplemental* [164].

Special Report of Select Committee—Petit Juries (Ireland)* [No. 390].

Committee—Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-comm.*) [25], Adjourned Debate *further adjourned;* Metropolitan Police Funds* [132]; Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland)* [183]; Fairs (Metropolis)* [205].

Report — Petit Juries (Ireland)* [209]; Metropolitan Police Funds* [132]; Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland)* [183]; Fairs (Metropolis)* [205].

Considered as amended—Registration* [190]; Ecclesiastical Commissioners* [168]; Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland)* [194].

Third Reading—Land Writs Registration (Scotland)* [111]; Burials (Ireland)* [204], and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

COUNCIL ON EDUCATION REPORT.

QUESTION.

MR. POWELL said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, Whether the Reports for 1868 of (1.) Committee of Council on Education; (2.) Science and Art Department; (3.) Medical Officer of Privy Council, are to be published during this Session; and, if so, when; and, whether he can assign any reason why the publication of these Reports have been thus delayed until after the Votes to which they have reference?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU, in reply, said, that the reason why the Report for 1868 of the Committee of Council on Education had not been published until after the Education Vote was asked for was that the Vote was taken this year many weeks earlier than usual. The Report of the Science and Art Department would be published in a few days. The Report of the Medical Officer of Privy Council had been delayed in consequence of the coloured engravings, but it would shortly be in the hands of Members.

ARMY—NON-COMBATANT OFFICERS.

QUESTION.

CAPTAIN VIVIAN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Why non-combatant Officers when appointed to mounted corps are compelled to pay ration stoppages, although they received no mounted pay?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that it was impossible to deny that with reference to non-combatant officers, especially with respect to the medical officers, there was a great inconsistency in their pay. Some years ago the pay of the medical officers in the Army was reconsidered, and the pay of the Infantry medical officers was raised to the level of the Cavalry officers' pay, thereby leaving the Cavalry officers at some disadvantage with respect to forage deductions. It was, however, constantly found that medical officers in the Army were desirous of obtaining commissions in Cavalry regiments.

MEDICO-LEGAL INQUIRIES.
QUESTION.

MR. CLIVE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Her Majesty's Government have determined to recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission to report on the mode of conducting medico-legal inquiries as to the operation of the Sanitary Laws?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, that an influential deputation had waited upon him to urge the appointment of a Royal Commission, and the subject would not be lost sight of. Some documents were about to be laid before the Government with a view of seeing what steps should be taken in the matter.

CATTLE PLAGUE—RINDERPEST IN AUSTRIA.—QUESTION.

MR. MOFFATT said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can inform the House what course has been adopted by the Austrian Government for preventing the introduction of rinderpest from Hungary or Galicia into Austria?

LORD STANLEY said, he regretted that he was not in a position to answer the Question of the hon. Member satisfactorily. A Bill had passed the Lower House of the Austrian Legislature to prevent the introduction of the cattle plague, but he had not seen a copy of it. He had, however, written to Vienna at the request of the Privy Council Office to obtain a copy, which he hoped to receive in a few days.

SHERIFF OF THE COUNTY OF YORK.
QUESTION.

VISCOUNT MILTON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he sees any objection to the appointment of a High Sheriff for each of the Ridings of the county of York—namely, one for the East, one for the West, and one for the North Riding, and, if he does see any difficulty or objections, if he will state the same to the House?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that he had already stated his opinion that it was a very objectionable state of things that any one High Sheriff should have elections to conduct for the three Ridings, with divisions in them, and two assizes. It would not be necessary, he thought, to appoint a Sheriff for each Riding. It would be sufficient to have a Sheriff for the West Riding, to attend the assizes at Leeds, and another for the East and North Ridings, who should attend the assizes at York.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.
QUESTION.

MR. OTWAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether, having regard to the state of Public Business, and the period of the Session, he would object to substitute a measure having a temporary effect so far as the Indian Council in this Country is concerned, for the proposed Government of India Amendment Bill?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, in reply, said, there would be four vacancies in the Council of India this year, and there would be great difficulty in inducing gentlemen to accept the office, unless they knew the nature of the tenure by which they would hold their offices, and the amount of their salaries. The Government of India Amendment Bill only contained six clauses. The 1st had passed through Committee. To the 3rd, 5th, and 6th there was no objection. The 4th related to the appointment of the Governor General's Council in India, which might give rise to some discussion, and he proposed to withdraw it from the Bill and transfer it to the Governor General of India Bill. The last clause referred to the salaries of future Members of the Council. The Bill stood for Committee that day, and if he was allowed to pass it through Committee at the unopposed hour hon. Members might move any new clauses on the Report, and the field of discussion would thus be much narrowed.

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 139.]
(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Hunt.*)

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [26th June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" and which Amendment was,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the proposal to pass a permanent law, requiring that in order to prevent the introduction of the

Cattle Plague into this Country from abroad, all foreign cattle and other animals imported into the Port of London shall be landed at one prescribed spot, and shall not be removed thence alive, ought not to be considered apart from the general policy of imposing legal restrictions on the foreign cattle trade in other ports of the United Kingdom,"—(*Mr. Milner Gibson,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. CORRANCE*: During the long and able address of my right hon. Friend the Member for Ashton-under-Lyne (Mr. Milner Gibson), he referred to me as one partially responsible for the Bill which is now before the House. He has some right to do so, I admit; for on several occasions I have both urged its adoption, and advocated the principle upon which it rests. At the commencement of this Session I expressed my satisfaction at its introduction, in a paragraph in the Queen's Speech. Upon Committee I have given its main provisions my support, both personally and as President of one of those Chambers to which he alludes, he asks me to show cause for this in my place. As far as my humble powers go, he shall have no cause to complain of my reticence in such respect. Nevertheless, in re-opening a debate of so much importance, there are some considerations which press upon me with unusual weight. It seems to me that I have undertaken too much, at least if it is held necessary that I should follow in detail all the arguments the hon. Member has put forth. The ground he covered was immense—Spain, France, Portugal, Denmark and Barking Creek, with accompanying statistics, facts and figures appropriate to each. The right hon. Member for the City of London tells us that a lengthy statement must be answered at length. Why then I pity the House; but, as far as I am concerned, let the House be re-assured my remarks on each topic shall be brief. I shall impose limits on myself. I will not go to Spain or Portugal, or Denmark, or Barking Creek. I will not go into the details of this Bill, nor follow my right hon. Friend into the technical objections he takes. I leave this to more able hands than myself. It is always more pleasant to agree than to differ with my right hon. Friend, and I do agree with him up to a certain point. What is the nature of the Amendment he makes? He affirms a principle from which I do not dissent—that all legislation upon this matter should be of a general and comprehensive class. Well, is it not so up to this point? Why this is the view I have always held, and which I advocated last year in this House. Let us look back. In pursuance of this principle, I urged the adoption of the slaughter clause at all the ports, which by an act of Privy Council was carried out. In accordance with this principle the restrictions then existing upon the home traffic was relaxed, to the immediate benefit of the consumers of meat. The separation of the metropolitan market was urged to the same effect, and this again to be followed by other measures of a consistent class. But the right hon. Gentleman is not satisfied with this, and he wants legislation of a more comprehensive class, not consecutive measures such as this. Now, our differences begin at that point. Does he really think that we could carry such a measure as this, and can he really throw much blame upon Government for this? The right hon. Member was part of an Administration once; and what took place? A few years since our cattle were dying by scores; meat at famine price; farmers at their wits' end; consumers unconsuming; and what took place? If my memory serves me Her Majesty's Government preserved a most majestic attitude, but they did not move in the least. It was a vindication of a great policy, a policy which had a French name. Is this the policy the right hon. Member admires? He did not explain himself quite fully upon that point. The *laissez faire* did not cure the plague nevertheless. I will not impute it as a fault, for it is, and must be, as far as I can see, a characteristic of the legislation of this House, and Government, such as ours, cannot move until public opinion is expressed. In this then the right hon. Gentleman has blamed the action of the Government, rashly as I think; and there is some heedless rhetoric even on that side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman may see the errors of that course, but that he himself would take such prompt and decisive measures is what, from these antecedents, I should not expect. But, if such be the case, what next? What is the next step upon our path? A separate market we think. I leave the question of the absolute slaughter apart, and whether this should be discontinued or not. The necessity is certainly very great. Without it no effectual precaution; no good inspection; no quarantine; and lastly, no relaxation of the present restriction can be carried out, safely at least. Surely, it should form part of those complete arrangements you hope to carry out. The reasons against it do not seem to me to possess much weight. If there is difficulty in passing this law, much more so the complete measure of the right hon. Member. Who could get such a Bill through this House? The Select Committee would last several years, and no room in this House would hold the counsel for the defence. You would have deputations several miles long, and Parliament Street under blockade from morning until night. I am aware that there are inconveniences to this partial or consecutive form of legislation; we had an instance not long since. The Government in compliance with the great pressure put upon them by the hon. Member and his Friends on that side of the House, as he says—for I do not say so, mark that—the Government prematurely, as I think, made some relaxation in respect to certain stock—Spanish and Portuguese. Well, what took place? It was found to give an advantage to land borne stock, and difficulties sprung up. This I foresaw from the first. Of this the right hon. Gentleman takes advantage at once, though with some scruples of conscience I should think. If Her Majesty's Ministers will profit by the use made of such a concession it will act as a warning, no doubt. But in connection with such a measure, my right hon. Friend has really stated a remarkable fact, I mean, what would be inserted in the papers as a remarkable fact along with the big turnip, of course. He tells us that in Manchester and Birmingham it has rained ribs of beef ever since. [An hon. MEMBER: He says "cattle."] Well, that is more remarkable, of course; but for the euphony, I like ribs of beef, if he will permit me for this once:—that may account for the drought. All the rain has turned to ribs of beef. Where on earth could they have come from? Not from Spain or Portugal, without doubt, for the Returns are before us as to that—about 3,000 head into Liverpool during the year. Why, that would not make one moderate shower of beef-steaks. But it has been raining ribs of beef, we are assured of that; and the action of Her Majesty's Government has been the cause of this—we gather that fact, at least. This is one of those acts for which the discretion of the Privy Council ought to be praised according to the theory the right hon. Gentleman has put forth. Does he praise them for this? Why, he does not scruple to say that it is an electioneering trick—raining ribs of beef. Well, I do not wonder at his discomfiture at such a trick as this for an adversary to possess. It outdoes Houdin, and beats Mr. Home outright. There is something substantial about this; and if Her Majesty's Government should exercise this art, put in gentle showers of this sort about Christmas next, I think we shall know what sort of a Parliament to expect. There will not be a Radical returned to this House, and, I am afraid, some very moderate Whigs at best. But is it not just possible that the right hon. Gentleman has been drawing upon his imagination just a little. I, at least, must think so upon one point; and if it has been raining ribs of beef, Her Majesty's Government have shown themselves very weather wise in such respects. I give them full credit for this, while, I doubt, with a view to the present measure, the expediency of the act. Now, let me turn to an argument my right hon. Friend has much pressed—namely, the wisdom and policy of leaving an irresponsible power in the hands of the Privy Council in matters of this class. We have had some experience of government of this sort, and we like government by Acts of Parliament best. Why, what is our experience of this sort of government, and to what has it led? Let us look back a little for this. My right hon. Friend may remember something of this. At a time of a most critical kind it resisted every evidence and advice, scientific and practical alike. Supported by the urban Press, it defied alike science and common sense, and we know the rest. That it was not until scourged by an intolerable and widely-spread plague, and threatened by a famine which reached to these gates that it accorded aught. Nor, indeed, was it until the advent of a new Administration that a real change in its policy took place. Happily for this country that it did so, for let me ask him, and right hon. Members to reflect upon the consequences, had this scourge continued during one more year with wheat at 70*s.*, and the distress of the poorer class increased by it, and who can doubt that, had the Privy Council had its way, this would have been the case? The right hon. Gentleman has alluded to France, and he now recommends us to imitate a policy which is not that of *laissez faire*—at least, an admirable system no doubt, and followed by an admirable result. Well, once more, let me recall the memory of the right hon. Gentleman to anterior facts. Does my hon. Friend recollect a correspondence with my humble self upon this — writing to him as President of the Board of Trade — as President of a simple "Farmer's Club ?" Well, I have copies of these, and their purport is that I called upon the President of the Board of Trade to consider the question from the stand-point of France. I urged imitation of that system, and the appointment of a Minister of Agriculture like Mr. Behic, and provincial newspapers called me a modest man, and they were right; but it seems that I was right, too, nevertheless, and it commands the right hon. Gentleman's consent. I have considered the matter well since, and I have come to the conclusion that under Privy Council government that system could not be carried out, though it could under Mr. Behic and the Emperor of France. The difference must at all times be, that we have no Emperor and we have no Mr. Behic. There is no superior power there to over-rule and meddle and muddle everything it has the misfortune to touch. Here there are several such. Under what influence does the Privy Council act ? Under what pressure from without ? What has been imputed to it by the right hon. Gentleman himself as a cause for this last Order respecting Portuguese stock ? Is there anything to inspire respect in this ? Nor, Sir, let me say plainly, does confidence exist ? I will not impute it as a fault that a French system cannot be carried out,—we lack every element of success. The high and irresponsible authority, which sets mere selfish suggestions at naught, the skilled official, the aptitude for management, and the patience to endure—all these are wanting to us. But the right hon. Gentleman has complained that no scientific evidence was brought before the Committee by the promoters of this Bill. What is it that the right hon. Gentleman wants ? I know that until very lately he had doubts upon a very vital point—namely, the specific origin of this disease. This is an important point. But upon what grounds does the right hon. Gentleman doubt ? To us, who are less sceptically minded, the demonstration amounts to proof. In favour of it we have not only the opinions of all our best veterinarians, but the united testimony of all Europe on its behalf. In that great European Congress held at Hamburg in 1863, out of nearly 200 veterinarians, there was not a dissentient voice. Nay, the President, Professor Zugger, speaks thus —

> "Rinderpest is not a disease of to-day. It is an old disease, and when we deliberate upon its prevention or limitation, we must not forget its history. And what does that history prove ? It proves that the malady spreads as a contagious disease over the West and South of Europe, coming from the East, and this happens always at a time when learned men start the question. Does rinderpest really spread by means of a contagion, or does it not ? Does it develop primarily ? And when this question, emanating from learned men, excited attention in any country, it was always a misfortune for that country. France, Holland, and England can testify to this."

Now, we, at least, do not want any further demonstration than that which we have so dearly bought, and we can very well dispense with any further doubts of learned men. But the next argument is this. That what we as agriculturalists want, is a gigantic system of Protection for our cattle, similar to that we had for corn. And on this what evidence is adduced ? That of Sir James Elphinstone, who says that the present drawback upon Scotch cattle amounts to as much as £2 per head. Well, with the accuracy of his calculation we have little to do; let us assume it to be a fact. Does it at all prove that the consumer would be taxed to this amount ? For this is what is said—"Why, it is so much dearer, no doubt, to him. If by any means you reduce the profit of an article to the producer, do you think he will produce at a loss, especially when the reduction is caused by artificial means ?" The consumer pays for it, no doubt, and even on the foreign stock, the price of which will be thus artificially enhanced. It acts as a protective duty to him unless he labours under similar disadvantages, and then the consumer pays for both at the increased rate. Well, this is not Free Trade ? But "what is Free Trade ?" I may at this time, at least, be asked. I will be very plain upon this point. Upon a former occasion the right hon. Member for South Lancashire taunted us. He said that we never lost an occasion of nibbling at this. Now, I will, at least, on the present occasion, leave him no occasion to say so. We are not apt at explanation, and we find it better to call a spade a spade than an agricultural implement, which also might be a rake. What is this Free Trade, of the honour of which right hon. Gentlemen are so susceptible. I say it is time to ask, what is this watchword, or catchword, which we hear from so many lips? All claim it alike. We do know what it has meant, in some cases at least. Let me ask the right hon. Gentleman this—applied to Ireland, did it mean Irish depopulation, and that Fenianism which follows upon its wake, to which you offer up the Irish Church? Some facts would lead us to suppose this. Let me ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider this. In 1660 you passed a law prohibiting the importation of Irish cattle into England, and the land went to tillage, of course. In 1690 you placed 4*s.* additional duty upon every 20*s.* worth of broadcloth exported. So sheep and woollen manufactures go out. By 10 *Will.* III. you put 2*s.* on serge and baize and kersey. And a little later, by 3 & 4 *Anne*, you smite the linen trade with a prohibitory law. In 1848 you tell the same people to compete with the whole world in what they like. Now is that Free Trade? Will the right hon. Gentleman tell me so? Then it is not (thus applied) a principle I can accept. Once more, does it mean unchecked monopoly and selfishness? Does it mean cattle plague? Does it mean the sale of *Alabamas?* We have heard it claimed for each. Does it mean the free enjoyment of vice and misery and dirt? Then it is a principle I do not nibble at—I do not accept. If the right hon. Gentleman deign to reply, let him answer this. If not let him once more appeal to popular ignorance and stamp out the doubt. And let him also reply to a greater than I am in this House, who in answer to his imputation at that very time spoke thus —

> "In my right hon. Friend's mind political economy seems to stand for a set of practical maxims. It is not a science. It is not a theory of the manner in which causes produce effects. It is a set of practical rules, and these practical rules are indefeasible. Now, so far from being a set of rules to be applied without regard for times, or places, or circumstances, the function of political economy is to enable us to find the rules which ought to govern any state of circumstances with which we have to deal, which are never the same in any two cases. My right hon. Friend has been very plain spoken, and I will be plain spoken too. Political economy has many enemies, but its worst enemies are its friends. It is such modes of argument as this that has made political economy so thoroughly unpopular with a large and not the least philanthropic portion of the people of England. In my hon. Friend's mind political economy seems to exist as a bar, even to the fair consideration of anything that is proposed for the benefit of the economic condition of any people, in any but the old ways."

I place the quotation unreservedly at the disposal of that Bench, and if its wisdom is recognized it may save us from some future mishaps. But if this is not Protection, is it starvation of the poorer class? The argument has been much pressed, and a learned Counsel was very eloquent upon this, but most deficient in proof. Why, turn to evidence, and to what does it amount. Who want to feed the poorer classes, and by what means? Well, we are told—that brought and driven through narrow and crowded streets to the abomination of the *abattoirs* reeking in our midst, they are slaughtered, and sold—to whom? —the poorer classes? Well to the Jew middleman first, and then, through such philanthropic hands, finally sold to the poorer class, with a second and third profit, no doubt. I can claim some sympathy with the poorer class, but not of this sort. Nor do I quite believe in a dispensation to which a Jew salesman administers after this sort. Otherwise the argument is self-destructive, for if foreign stock is not imported, it will be because home stock is too cheap, and the argument that the poorer classes will buy foreign meat—in the first place because it is dearer, and the second place because it is bad—will not hold good. At any rate my sympathies do not extend to this. The learned Counsel was eloquent, I admit, and he has published his speech, and some hon. Members have read it, no doubt. Well, he did not convince me, I confess; first, because I thought that perhaps he mistook his audience; and, secondly, because he did not, in my humble judgment, prove his case. Nor, if I am permitted to say so, did the right hon. Gentleman, who has urged this with so much ability upon this House? I have, I feel, trespassed too long upon the House; but I think it will be admitted that I have not done so needlessly, if due allowance be made for the number and variety of the arguments I have had to meet. One only remains—the consumers' interest in this. There can be but one rational opinion, that as far as he is concerned all restrictions are bad. Nothing but dire necessity can justify them in any case. He pays for trouble and risk and loss. This sealed London market and restricted traffic are at his cost. But, he also pays for cattle plagues of all sorts. Is this clearly understood? I must think not. Why, what has been proposed in this case? That if a foreign cattle market is put under certain restrictions for a certain purpose, the same should also apply to another market where no such necessity exists. Why, what sort of legislation is this? Is the consumer interested? Let me, at least, ask this. My right hon. Friend does not, of course, agree to it. He has more justly assumed that our object must be rather to relax in every possible way. But there is only one way in which this would be possible and safe. Separate the market for foreign stock. The right hon. Gentleman wants to maintain the present system, until it shall be possible to carry out the complete system he suggests. Now, let my right hon. Friend remember this, that he cannot do so if he would, no, not—should this Bill drop—for six weeks. Consumers and producers will make common cause, and sweep away this system, especially since the admission of foreign stock. It is a grave responsibility you seek, you who would defeat this scheme. With the relaxation will come the disease and fresh distress, and it will be with consumers you will have to settle accounts. With wheat at 70*s.* and harvest doubtful as yet, dare you face the winter thus? I speak for the poorer class. Under your system of government we have suffered much. You call our attention to France. There may come a time when wearied with your delays, your war of parties, your needless exertions and self-inflicted ills, the people of this country may indeed look to France, and remembering the advice you now give, may seek protection in the sense of immunity from needless evils, in the policy of Imperial France.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he had listened with great concern to the closing sentences of the hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Corrance's) speech, and it astounded him not a little to hear one, who rose as the representative of what was termed the agricultural interest, assuming the attitude of a suffering and persecuted man. What had he suffered? He had suffered the abstraction of the power of supporting his own industry at the expense of others, and had also experienced the great evil of obtaining under the influence of free competition a higher range of prices for almost every production in which he was interested than the system of Protection afforded. The matter of the Bill was complicated enough in itself, so that there was no need to embarrass its consideration still further by attempts to revive the animosities of a by-gone controversy. At the close of the Session they were just at the beginning of the discussion of the details of a Bill involving considerations of the most complicated and obscure character, and which were hardly to be despatched without endless controversy. The noble Lord the Vice President of the Council who, judging from the state of the Treasury Bench, appeared to be the sole representative of the Government upon this measure, had in his very animated speech the other day left out of view two fundamental considerations, without a clear understanding as to which it would be impossible to entertain such a measure. He would not accuse hon. Gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding the provocation which their language seemed to offer, of the intention to return to Protection under the veil of an enactment of this kind; but he could not forget that the noble Lord had expressed his entire condemnation of the foreign cattle trade, and in the corrected copy of the noble Lord's speech which was now before him, the noble Lord assumed that a certain group of diseases had been imported by means of foreign cattle, and that the loss resulting from those diseases was greater than the aggregate value of the cattle imported. The noble Lord also assumed that a wholesale system of contraband was carried on to enable the butchers to pass off foreign meat as British, to the injury of the consumers. Finally, the noble Lord complained of the good old lamp of 1842 having been exchanged for the lackered lantern brought to us by the stranger—this good old lamp being, no doubt, the exclusive privilege for the benefit of the British agriculturist of supplying not only the markets of London but all the markets of the country. The object of such representations could not be mistaken—it was to describe as a calamity the removal of prohibitions and the introduction of foreign cattle. But he drew a broad distinction between this part of the noble Lord's speech and that in which he discussed the restrictions upon British cattle which were now in force. He was bound to say that as regards one portion of his argument on that head—namely, with respect to the present extent of the metropolitan district, it appeared unanswerable. With regard to those restrictions generally he did not presume to give any opinion whether they could with safety be removed. He would venture to say he had but little faith in them, and but a feeble conviction of their necessity. He had a strong sympathy with the agriculturists so long as the tendency of their arguments was only to demand that the restrictions on themselves should be brought to the minimum consistent with the public welfare; but the current altogether turned when they began to urge demands for restrictions, for which the necessity had not been shown, upon the importation of foreign cattle. There were two branches of this question on which the speech of the noble Lord did not contain a single word, but which, nevertheless, were vital to its due consideration. The first of these was, why should they depart from the basis of the present system—a system under which the responsible Ministers of the Crown considered from time to time what restrictions were or were not necessary either in respect of foreign or British cattle? The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down said they had already had enough of the Privy Council; but if that was so, this Bill was not the proper mode of applying a remedy. The proper mode would be to fall back on the Motion proposed by his right hon. Friend near him (Mr. Milner Gibson). He laid down a proposition which it was difficult to dispute—that it was premature, at the very least, to pass a law such as that for London, without taking into consideration the policy they ought to pursue of imposing statutory restrictions on the cattle trade in other parts of the United Kingdom. His own belief was that that view of the case was insurmountable, both in argument and in common sense, and that this Bill as it stood was not fit to be carried into law. In a case of this kind the argument in favour of working by the instrument of a large discretion in the Executive rather than by rigid, stereotyped, statutory restrictions was obvious and strong. That was a state of things exceedingly appropriate, considering the present state of our knowledge and experience with regard to cattle diseases. It was very easy to assume that the cattle plague was imported from abroad — but how? By the bodies of foreign cattle, and by them exclusively, or by other means, by persons whose contact with them was close and immediate? The opinion of many was that the cattle plague was imported by the last of these means. That was the opinion with regard to its importation into Ireland. There was no proof that the exclusive communication of the cattle plague was by the movement of the bodies of cattle. How did the cattle plague in Aberdeenshire leap over a space of twenty—or as some said thirty—miles? It was not in that instance communicated by the movement of cattle. In that state of things two matters appeared to be perfectly clear. One was that the greatest vigilance should be exercised by the Government in watching the state of affairs in foreign countries and restricting or stopping importation from ports suspected. The other was that wherever the mischief appeared the most stringent measures should be applied for restricting the evil. Other restrictions, it appeared to him, should in the present state of our knowledge and experience be in the hands of the Executive Government, who should deal from day to day with the actual necessities of the case. He objected altogether to the transition from the discretionary powers of the Privy Council to a rigid system of enactment by statute. But if the time had arrived for a departure from the principle to which he had referred, why should the change apply to the markets of London only, and not to those of the country generally? The noble Lord had not said a single word upon that important portion of the argument; but if there were to be such a transition from executive discretion to the stereotyped provisions of the law, the transition should, at all events, be uniform—not necessarily uniform in its details, but founded upon a comprehensive consideration of the whole circumstances of the kingdom. If this transition were to be made crude and rigid, provisions like those contained in the Bill should not receive the force of law. We had already gained some experience in the working of the system of separate markets. He was not arguing absolutely and unconditionally against the system; all he said was that that system was so fenced round with doubts and difficulties and evils and inconveniences, that whatever was to be done towards carrying it into effect should be done under the discretion and responsibility of the Executive, and not by an Act of Parliament. Taking the case of the port of Hull, he found that in the year 1867 the working of the separate market system there had been greatly to reduce the import of sheep, lambs, and pigs, and almost to extinguish that of cattle. The importation of sheep and lambs into Hull since the formation of a separate market had fallen from 69,000 head to 9,000; pigs had diminished from 15,000 head to 3,000; cattle from 41,000 head to 15,000, and for the first fraction of the year 1868 the trade had been so reduced that it might be considered to have ceased. That was a very serious matter, which certainly deserved the greatest consideration, supposing that it was not the intention of the Government merely to take the sense of the House upon the subject by taking a division upon going into Committee. Another point which the noble Lord had not referred to in the slightest degree, and to which he wished to draw especial attention, was the question of finance. The contemplated outlay under this Bill amounted to £300,000, which, by compensation and other expenses, would be raised to £500,000. If a large building was to be erected at this vast expense, and if the public was to become a speculator in slaughterhouses, we ought, in the first place, to see clearly whence that £500,000 was to come. An hon. Member asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day, whether, in the event of any deficiency arising in the funds necessary for the erection and sustentation of this market, that deficiency was to be supplied out of the Consolidated Fund? and to that question the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied in unequivocal terms that it was not. He himself thereupon ventured to ask the right hon. Gentleman, in the event of such deficiency arising, in what way it was to be met? but to that question he was not fortunate enough to obtain a reply. It was, however, absolutely necessary that they should have a reply to that question before they proceeded further with this measure. It was impossible that they could authorize the outlay of this large sum of money without taking into consideration, in the first place, the provisions by which the Bill was to be converted from a phantom into a reality. If the Commissioners were not armed with sufficient borrowing powers, the House might find itself in the ridiculous position that, after a prolonged conflict in that House, the Assent of the Crown might be given to a statute which might prove to be an absolute dead letter. He hoped the noble Lord would make some statement upon this part of the question. By another part of the Bill it was provided that the Corporation of the City of London might become the market authorities under the Bill, and might pledge their credit to raise the money necessary for its purposes; but what precedent was there in existence for appointing authorities in this way without their willingness to act having been previously ascertained? He believed the Corporation of London had withdrawn from the advocacy of the Bill; but even if they had not he could not understand how they could appropriate their general securities for the purposes of the market. The representatives of the City of London were opposed to the Bill, and he could not understand how the Corporation could be said to be in favour of it. In the event of their declining to accept the responsibility of acting as the managers of the market, the Crown was authorized to appoint Commissioners, who were to have power to borrow money for the purposes of the Bill. But he should like to know how—if under such circumstances a deficiency arose—it was possible to avoid that deficiency being made good out of the public purse, and similar demands being made upon it on behalf of the other great ports of the United Kingdom. The deficiency could not be made good at the expense of the ratepayers of the metropolis, who were of opinion that the effect of the Bill would be permanently to raise the price of meat. Mr. Dudley Baxter, who was no mean authority in such matters, was of the same opinion. If the ratepayers of London, then, were not to contribute them, whence were the funds for the maintenance of the market to come? Were they to come from the foreign cattle market itself? At Islington they had only one fixed capital to bear the charge of, and they had got the whole of the tolls, both from British and foreign cattle, for the purpose; but the tolls from British and foreign cattle together did not yet yield a revenue sufficient by £7,000 a year to bear the charge of the Islington market. And now it was proposed to clap on another £500,000 for establishing the proposed new market. That was a state of things which required explanation; and as a body which was bound to give something of solidity to the schemes it adopted, it was necessary that the House should call on the Government to point out to them distinctly the source from which the cost of that market was to be derived. It was impossible to maintain the new market by means of a simple augmentation of the dues. The financial elements of the scheme, then, should be thoroughly sifted, together with that other point which lay at the root of the whole question—namely, the expediency or inexpediency of a transition from an elastic system worked by the Executive Government to a rigid statutory system leaving no room for discretion before they could advantageously consider the provisions of any particular plan.

MR. HENLEY said, the question before them was whether they should go into Committee on that Bill and consider the difficulties just raised, among others, or whether they should adopt an Amendment which would virtually get rid of the whole matter. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) told them there were two vital questions, the largest of which was whether they should proceed by way of legislation at all, or should leave the whole of those great and difficult subjects in the hands of the Privy Council. The right hon. Gentleman, however, had carefully avoided giving the slightest opinion on the question, aye or no, whether there ought to be a separate market. Supposing the Privy Council came to the conclusion that there should be a separate market, how was it possible for the Privy Council to carry it out and to deal with all those difficulties which the right hon. Gentleman stated, and which the Select Committee, sitting for no end of time, had attempted to solve? That was almost a conclusive answer to the suggestion that those things should be left altogether to the discretion of the Privy Council. Had the country reason to be satisfied with the power of the Privy Council? What happened when the cattle plague visited this country? They had a Privy Council then, which he dared say doubted, as the two right hon. Gentlemen opposite probably doubted now, whether that disease came from abroad. [MR. MILNER GIBSON was understood to indicate dissent.] The right hon. Gentleman shook his head. That was some comfort, at all events. The other right hon. Gentleman was still mute as far as shaking heads went. But the immense majority of the people of this country had no such doubt. And how did they suffer by the want of action and the vacillation of the Privy Council for six or seven months, before Parliament and the voice of the country compelled them to take those measures which they might have taken beforehand? The Privy Council began by proclamation to stamp out the plague, but they had not the heart to go on with it. And why? Because they saw the great expense it would entail; and so they allowed the disease to spread over the country, to the great injury and even the ruin of many persons. They did nothing efficacious until Parliament met. They were now told they ought not to refer to Free Trade at all; but last week the right hon. Member for Ashton brought up Sir Robert Peel, and blew a great Free Trade trumpet. [MR. MILNER GIBSON indicated dissent.] The right hon. Gentleman shook his head again, but he was in the recollection of the House, who would bear him out in saying that the right hon. Gentleman talked a great deal about the reversal of the policy of Sir Robert Peel. When the right hon. Gentleman brought that in, and all that rubbish about farmers' friends and election cries, the impression left on his mind was that the right hon. Gentleman had got so uncommonly bad a case that he had to cover his total want of argument in that way. It was asked if they were not content with the French system, why did they not take the quarantine system and treat beasts as they would do human beings coming from suspected countries? He believed that quarantine would form a far greater impediment to the foreign trade than what was now proposed. What was the French system? The French were threatened as we were, and very much about the same time. What did the French do, and what did our Privy Council, of which the right hon. Gentleman was then a member, do? If he was so fond of the French system, why had he not acted upon it, and so prevented the disease from coming to this country? The right hon. Gentleman boasted that the French system left France with the loss of only forty-five head of cattle; but the French prohibited all foreign cattle from entering their country. They would need green spectacles to look at the fury which the right hon. Gentleman would be in if anybody asked him to prohibit foreign cattle from coming here. Neither of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite had, in his opinion, dealt satisfactorily with the peculiarity of the case which the Bill was intended to meet. The market in Copenhagen-fields had for many years been the central market for the cattle trade, not only of London but of the entire country. The Privy Council, however, had felt it to be their duty to impose restrictions on the going out of cattle from that market, and what had been the result? The whole number of cattle which used to come into the London market previous to the breaking out of the cattle plague amounted to 343,000 a year on an average; last year the number was only 287,000; so that the effect of the Privy Council regulations had been to reduce the supply of cattle in the market by 1,000 a week. Was it likely, if these regulations were to become permanent, that the supply of meat would increase? But what had been the effect of the system of restriction on the foreign trade. In the first thirteen weeks of 1867 the number of foreign cattle which entered the London market was 26,000, while in the corresponding part of the present year it was only 10,000. It had been stated, and he believed with truth, that the number of cattle slaughtered in the United Kingdom for the consumption of the people ranged between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000 per annum, and that the whole number of foreign cattle which used to be slaughtered was something over 200,000, the number at present being only 150,000 or 160,000. Now, would it, he should like to know, promote the interests of the producer or consumer that restrictions on the movement of 2,000,000 of cattle should be continued, rather than that the proposed conditions should be laid down with respect to the comparatively limited number of foreign cattle which entered our ports? The noble Lord had given the other day a list of ten countries which it had been reported to the Privy Council were infected by the plague last year. These countries were Austria, Bavaria, Belgium, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Germany, Prussia, Russia, and Turkey. Now, if those countries were so infected, what Privy Council regulations could be adopted, he should like to know, which would protect this country from a recurrence of the evils under which we had already suffered? The French had means of getting information as to those infected localities which we did not possess, because, except the comparatively small number which entered by the port of Marseilles, the cattle for the French markets must either walk or be conveyed by railway, and then the places from which they came might be easily ascertained. In this country, however, into which foreign cattle were imported by sea, it was impossible to find out whence they were brought. But the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) found fault with the present Bill because its operation would be in his opinion limited, There was no good reason, however, for not doing some good because all good could not be effected. The argument of the right hon. Gentleman was that which was used against the reform of the Courts of Chancery, and it was one to which he thought but little weight was to be attached. The right hon. Gentleman would keep us with this danger hanging over us for years, because we cannot deal with the whole question at once. What harm could there be in letting in the cattle of Spain, where cattle plague had never been known to exist? The right hon. Gentleman did not venture to say that the Bill did not proceed in the right direction. It was quite possible that the Bill would not effect a great deal; but at all events it afforded evidence of the wish of the Government to relieve the home trade, in respect to which there was no risk of infection, from restrictions, by the establishment of a separate market for foreign cattle. The infection of the cattle plague was of the most subtle and of the most mysterious nature, for cattle when placed under such circumstances that their seizure by the disease seemed a certainty had often been known to escape altogether, whereas they often took it where it was impossible to trace the means of infection. It was almost impossible to say whether the cattle brought from Rotterdam or other places by sea did not come from infected countries, and therefore it was necessary to take some precautions to prevent the spread of disease in this country.

Mr. LOWE said, there was a great deal of justice in the criticisms of his two right hon. Friends near him; but the real question before the House was not whether this Bill applied a remedy in the best possible way, but whether the remedy was one which ought to be applied at all. The simple question was, whether it was advisable to have a second meat market placed on the shore, so that the animals when landed could be slaughtered on the spot. He did not doubt the finance of his right hon. Friend the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone); but, at the same time, he felt sure that, if the establishment of such a market were thought desirable, there would be found sufficient ingenuity in the House to supply the requisite money. It was a great pity that the whole scheme of the Government was not before the House; but there was no reason in not doing one thing because they could not do another. His right hon. Friend the Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson) had imported into this discussion a degree of heat and vehemence which, considering the extreme sweetness of his nature, was hardly to be accounted for, except on the supposition that he had been in the company of that class of persons who were once not thought fit to serve on juries on account of the ferocity which their trade was supposed to engender. His right hon.

Friend took every possible objection to the Bill, and yet concluded with a Motion which amounted to a declaration that, though he disliked the thing being done at all, yet he objected to its not being done all at once. The question was, whether the principle of having a separate market for foreign cattle, with compulsory slaughter, was right or not. On behalf of the Cattle Plague Commissioners—whose views the Government had really adopted—he hoped he should be excused for trespassing on the House for a short time. What was the state of things? He believed that the country had lost £6,000,000 by the cattle plague, and it was exposed to enormous risk for the future. They ought not to cherish the belief that because 100 years had elapsed since the last appearance of the cattle plague, the same interval would occur again. The cattle plague was *en permanence* on the steppes of Russia, and by means of the facilities afforded by railways it was capable of being carried in a very few days from those steppes to ports whence the cattle were exported to England. Every year was likely to increase the danger which now existed. Under these circumstances, the Cattle Plague Commission found that the only protection against this terrible enemy was a system of inspection; and all the evidence they took proved entirely that to lean on inspection was to lean on a broken reed, utterly worthless. It must be so. It was not in human nature that the inspection of a large number of beasts by a person who had no particular interest in the matter should be otherwise than perfunctory and imperfect. Therefore the Commission sought some other protection, and they found it in enactments such as were proposed by this Bill, which his right hon. Friend told him was an interference with the principles of Free Trade. How did the matter stand at the present moment? There was nothing to prevent any amount of diseased cattle being brought into London. The metropolis was almost defenceless. A *cordon* was, indeed, drawn around it, which cost for police £16,000 a year; but as long as they allowed foreign cattle to be merely inspected—which could not be relied on at all—diseased cattle from Copenhagen might be introduced into the London market, and driven to be slaughtered in the interior, spreading infection throughout the country. It was said the Privy Council had all the powers that were required, and there need not be a rigid Parliamentary law on the subject. But the condition of the London market, as he had described it, was a permanent one; it was almost at any moment liable to an invasion of the cattle plague, and this permanent condition of things required a permanent remedy. It was not a case for a temporary remedy. It was not desirable to prevent the importation of foreign meat; but it was necessary that measures should be taken to have it slaughtered at the waterside, where every precaution might be taken to prevent infection. They could not say that, absolutely, no infection should come, because that in all cases could not be secured. That was a course of argument which would go to abolish the whole criminal law. But they could say that foreign cattle should be slaughtered on the seashore, and thus prevent the evil of driving foreign cattle through the streets and spreading contagion. This was the object of the Bill—to prevent foreign cattle from coming into contact with English cattle. The present state of things was full of mischief, both to the metropolis and to the country. If he fancied a dairy cow he could not get it; if a calf was born in the metropolis, instead of going into the neighbouring counties to be agisted into a cow, it must be killed. If a farmer sent a beast to the market to be sold for a certain price, and he could not get that price, he must take what he could get. But he was told, if this Bill passed, the price of meat would rise, and beasts would fetch £2 a head more than at present. He was not able to enter into that question, but what he said was this — the butchers of London had found it worth their while to deluge every Member of Parliament with pamphlets, and beset them in every possible way. They had retained very able counsel to recommend their view of the whole question, and he was asked to believe that they were doing all this with a view to reduce the price of meat. He believed they knew very well that on the balance of things this Bill would not make any very great difference in the price of meat, because it was not merely cattle plague, but pleuro-pneumonia, that went so far to raise the price. The question was, what ought they to do with the present state of things? It was permanent; therefore they should have a permanent remedy. They might depend upon it they must submit to some impediment to foreign importations of cattle, or be prepared periodically, at no long intervals, to have the most injurious restraints put on domestic cattle. Therefore, although he had been grievously intimidated by his right hon. Friend, he must say he had heard nothing that proved to him that the Cattle Plague Commission were wrong in their recommendations, and he sincerely hoped the House would give a second reading to this Bill. There were a number of questions that might fairly be considered in Committee; but he did trust the House would not acquiesce in a state of things which would attach a permanent stigma to the metropolis as liable always to be infected with the cattle plague, and having no means of sending cattle down into the country.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he hoped he should receive the indulgence of the House while he endeavoured to show the interest which the metropolis had in this matter. It was one of those questions which brought home to the great centres of population how numerically weak they were in that House. Hitherto no one connected with the metropolis had enjoyed the opportunity of being heard. They must watch this Bill most jealously, and see that the great supply of foreign cattle required by the wants of the metropolis was not cut off. For the consumption of the metropolis no less than 68 per cent of the foreign cattle imported, and 72 per cent of the foreign sheep were required; and of the cattle slaughtered in London it was calculated that 42 per cent of the whole was foreign. The restrictions in foreign trade had seriously interfered with the supply, and if still stronger restrictions were imposed, a still greater diminution must be expected. The experiment now proposed was to be made not at the expense of the agricultural districts, but of London consumers and ratepayers. It was said that the Government wished to try the effect of the system first in the metropolis; but the metropolis had a right to ask the Government how they were going to deal with the other ports afterwards. The notion of the Government evidently was that the door at London was to be shut while the doors at the other ports were to be left open to inspection. The Government permitted Spanish and Portuguese, and soon they would permit Danish cattle to be landed at all ports of the kingdom, except London; but he wanted to know why the latter City, with its vast population, was to be deprived of its foreign meat in order that the metropolis might continue to be the emporium of the cattle trade of the country. The noble Lord said that if this measure were adopted now other measures would be brought forward next Session; but could the noble Lord guarantee that the new Parliament would be willing to adopt his views upon this subject? The House had had no declaration from Her Majesty's Government as to what their plans were. The large towns interested in this Bill—if it were to be proceeded with, of which he had much doubt, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not in his place—would have reason to complain that they could hear nothing as to the policy to be pursued. His right hon. Friend the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) supported the Bill as a protection against the cattle plague; but the real object of the Bill was to remove the restrictions on the home trade. It was an insurrection of the agriculturists against their restrictions, and an attempt to have the whole burden placed on the foreign trade. The Commission, of which the right hon. Member for Calne was a Member, recommended that all restrictions placed on the home trade in cattle should be extended to the foreign trade also; but from the evidence taken before the Commission it appeared that the present system of inspection was far from being insufficient. The right hon. Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) said that the system of inspection was never sufficient, and that, therefore, this Bill ought to pass; but Mr. Pell, a considerable authority among agriculturists, in giving his evidence before the Commission, stated that the only objection to the system of inspection was its cumbrous machinery—that was to say, that it did not suit the convenience of the agriculturists. Admitting that it was desirable that the agriculturists should have a central market, easily approachable by railway, that was no reason why it should be situated inside of London, and why the people of London should be deprived of foreign meat. He thought it wrong that 3,000,000 people should be starved in order to preserve the health of 2,500,000 cattle. It was said that the restrictions had prevented home cattle from coming to London; but, instead of a diminution, there had been an increase of home cattle coming to London. He hoped the noble Lord would say, in his reply, whether the same inspection as at present was to be kept up in the new market or not. If not, there would be increased danger of the cattle plague. The opinion of the Secretary to the Central Chamber of Agriculture was that there ought to be a safety market into which cattle should be poured from all countries, whether infected or not. If there was to be a market of that kind—a market into which diseased cattle would be poured from every country in Europe, without let or hindrance—he should like to know what his right hon. Friend the Member for Calne would say to such a market being established without inspection. Neither France nor Prussia, nor any other country, would throw open its ports to cattle from infected countries; but there was to be a market for them in London, and yet this was called a measure for keeping the cattle plague out of the country. It was evident that if the cattle plague was once fairly established in the metropolitan cattle market, it would be very difficult to get it out again. The most inferior beasts in Europe would be sent to such a market. He defied the Government to assert that they intended to do away with inspection. There was another objection. At present ten days were allowed for the slaughter of foreign cattle, but under the new system cattle were to be allowed to remain as long as the owners liked. The market was to contain 5,000 beasts and 30,000 sheep. Suppose these quantities arrived one week and there was no sale for them, the market next week would be full, and where were the new arrivals to be put? It had been asked why they wanted scientific evidence on that subject. What they wanted it for was to ascertain whether the restrictions proposed by that Bill were as effectual for the prevention of the cattle plague as other restrictions, and not one single medical witness was called before the Select Committee to prove that. On the other hand, there was a host of scientific witnesses to prove the danger of the cattle plague being communicated from that separate market to the home market. The disease was so infectious that if they had it in the one market they would have it in the other. It was impossible to make regulations that would prevent that. The beasts from the home market would be scattered over the whole country, and, coming in contact with other beasts, would thus carry the disease through the kingdom. The effect of the Bill would be that if infection was carried by clothes from one market to the other, then the beasts were to be allowed to circulate freely throughout the country, taking the plague with them. As to the *cordon* round London to which reference had been made, it had kept the health of the herds and flocks of the country in a better state than it had been for a long time, and had been perfectly effectual for its purpose. The question of slaughter houses had been very much misrepresented. He would say let them be done away with if it were necessary for sanitary purposes, but let it not be done to handicap the foreigner. It could hardly be doubted by anyone that the Bill would tend to diminish the supply of foreign cattle for London. It was absolutely certain that the butcher would go first to the English market, and when he could no longer supply himself there conveniently and cheaply, as a last resource he would go to the foreign cattle market. Would the foreign producers continue to send their cattle to this country on those terms? It had been said that his right hon. Friend (Mr. Milner Gibson) was all for the foreigner, but did not think of the Englishman. He was surprised that such a line of argument should in these days be used. The foreign producer was the friend of the English consumer, and to draw a distinction between the foreign and the home producer was to overlook the fact that this country depended to a great extent on the foreign producer for its supply of the first necessaries of life. It was asked, why not make the foreign cattle market a dead-meat market? But the feeding of London could not be carried on under the circumstances of a dead-meat market. The retail butcher would never be able to go ten miles below London to get his meat. Moreover, what was the course of the foreign cattle trade? In the very months when the dead-meat trade was smallest the foreign cattle trade was largest, and *vice versâ*. In August there were ten times as many beasts imported as in January, and eleven times as many sheep. July, August, September, and October, were the months in which the foreign cattle chiefly reached this country. On the other hand, there was a certain dead-meat trade in January, February, March, and April, just when the foreign cattle could not arrive here, owing to the geographical circumstances of the countries from which they came. In the hot months they could not have a dead-meat trade. But there being such objections as he had stated to the Bill, had every means been taken, he should like to know, to discover some alternative scheme? He thought not. There were, however, other schemes which might be adopted. They might have a market outside for the transit cattle, while the consuming market should be in the centre of London; or there might be a certain place where there would be a junction of railways, through which the cattle would be allowed to pass. A small market might be established at the riverside for the purpose of receiving the cattle from certain countries where the cattle plague was known to exist. What he so strongly objected to was that London should be debarred from drawing its supplies from Denmark, Portugal, and Spain, which had never been suspected. Denmark supplied 25 per cent of the whole of the foreign cattle which arrived in this country. Another serious objection to the Bill was that if it were carried into effect, the wharfingers, salesmen, and others whose trade it interfered with must be compensated, but if the House should next year reverse the policy embodied in this Bill it could not make these people refund the money they had received. [" Divide!"] He had no wish to detain the House, but he must be permitted to say a few words on the question of expense as it affected his constituents. Who was to bear the burden of the costly experiment which it was proposed to make? Some hon. Members were careless about what might be done in this matter, because they proposed to throw the whole expense on the metropolis. Was it possible that the citizens of London could look with favour on a scheme under the operation of which they would have to pay for two markets, while one now sufficed? He hoped the House would perceive the unfairness of throwing additional taxation on the metropolis for such a purpose. But it was suggested that the new markets would be self-supporting. Seeing that the one already in existence was not self-supporting, he could not understand how that statement could be maintained. How was this new market to be self-supporting with few cattle when the present market was not self-supporting with much cattle? They could not allow this Bill to pass alone, and yet they had no security that the same statutory regulations would be applied to other ports, though they were asked to incur this enormous expenditure. Were they to make this experiment at the fag end of the Session at the cost of the ratepayers of London and of the metropolis? They would have to incur an expenditure of £500,000, and derange their foreign cattle trade; because foreigners, on reading the speech of the noble Lord the Vice-President of the Council, would assume that it was the policy of England to shut out foreign cattle. Such was the way in which foreign Governments would read the noble Lord's sneers about foreign producers. He hoped the House would pause before they passed this Bill, which was really not a measure for the prevention of the cattle plague, it being admitted even by hon. Gentlemen opposite that at present the inspection was satisfactory. These restrictions on the cattle trade must be shared by all alike, or they would diminish the supply of food. Was it fair to pass this Bill when Government was silent about other ports, and when they had called no scientific witnesses to show that the present system was unsatisfactory?

Mr. READ said, in answer to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen), that although we could not do all we might wish, that was no reason why we should not do all we could. The metropolis must be viewed exceptionally in this matter, because no less than 70 per cent of the cattle imported into England was sent to London, and it was only in the metropolis that foreign cattle, save Spanish and Portuguese, mixed with our home stock. London, he believed, at present enjoyed the privilege of importing cattle not only from Denmark, but from every portion of the globe, and he held in his hand a Return which would show the right hon. Gentleman that, instead of Denmark furnishing a quarter of the whole supply of foreign cattle imported into this country during the three years ending December last, only 23,000 out of 698,000 cattle imported from abroad came from that country.

Mr. GOSCHEN pointed out the fact that a Return of the cattle imported during the last eight years showed that on the average the imports from Denmark were 25 per cent of the number imported.

Mr. READ: The right hon. Gentleman had complained that the market would not be ready for two years and a half. Well, considering that markets could not be created by the stroke of a fairy's wand, he did not regard that period as being anything unusual, though he would at the same time remark that if this Bill were rejected it might be three years and a half instead of two years and a half before the market could be completed. Now, in this matter he could not help thinking that the Corporation had acted in a very pitiful and pettish manner. They first said that there could not be any profit from the market, but directly it was urged that the profits, if any should arise, should be devoted to reducing the tolls of the foreign cattle market, they threw up the whole concern. Now, with reference to the Privy Council, he could only say that the Orders of that body had been most vacillating and contradictory. At the first outbreak of the cattle plague in June, 1865, he went to them and implored them to arrest the progress of the disease by preventing the foreign cattle being taken into the country. But the Council either objected to that course or were not strong enough to take it. They sent inspectors into the country to kill the cattle on the different farms, and refused to make any compensation to the owners whose cattle were destroyed, and it was not until the House passed a Bill on the subject, in 1866, that the progress of the disease received any check. That Bill was founded on the Report of the Cattle Plague Commissioners, and those gentlemen stated that to avoid continual outbreaks of the disease certain ports ought to be set aside as ports of debarkation, and cattle there imported killed at the water side. And he would remind the House that those who were then opposed to the system of "stamping out," and who stigmatized the practice as barbarous and retrogressive, were just those who were now opposing this measure. The present system must, at the best, be ineffectual; for in the metropolitan cattle market the cattle imported were allowed to mix with the sheep; and, as there was no restriction on the removal of sheep, the disease could easily be conveyed from one part of the country to another, so that the present system of inspection was a farce, perfectly useless for the purposes intended. Who was to know, too, when the plague broke out in any of the slaughter-houses? The animals diseased would at once be killed, the fact concealed, and the infection might be carried into the country by means of the manure. But with a new cattle market the case would be different. The right hon. Gentleman had accused him of being in favour of relaxing the strictness of the present system of inspection. That was true to this extent. He thought that it ought not to be carried on for twelve hours, that the cattle ought to be allowed to pass into some comfortable lairs close by, and that if one bullock was infected with pleuro-pneumonia, or foot-and-mouth disease, it was not necessary on that account to kill all the remainder. But a vigilant inspection there must undoubtedly be. There would be a resident inspector, who, at any outbreak of the disease, would immediately order the cattle to be killed and the place to be disinfected. He did not for a moment contend that we could by this or any other means secure absolute prevention; but still the plan suggested gave them, he believed, the minimum risk. A complaint had been made that the towns had not been fairly represented on the Committee, whereas, the fact was that out of the Members forming that Committee seven represented counties and seven boroughs; but the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council (Lord Robert Montagu) was in the chair and could only give a casting vote, and the hon. Baronet the Member for Northumberland (Sir Matthew Ridley) was so seriously ill that he could not attend. So in the divisions there generally appeared the names of seven borough and only five county members. The Government had been taunted with not supporting the Bill with veterinary evidence, whereas it was agreed by all parties to put in the scientific evidence taken before the Cattle Plague Commissioners and the Trade in Animals Committee and not call any veterinary witnesses. But the opponents disregarded this agreement, and Professor Spooner was examined by the opponents, as were also several veterinary surgeons. And he would ground his argument for the Bill on the evidence of the latter gentlemen, who maintained that the present restrictions, to be of any service, ought to be more stringent. We were told we could safely rely on the precaution of foreign governments and our own inspectors; but these veterinaries were expected to detect incubating diseases, whereas after two years' study some learned professors did not know the cattle plague when they saw it. He appealed to the House, therefore, not to take into consideration the interests of any particular class, or of any particular individuals, but to do all they could to keep these diseases out of the country; an attempt which, if successful, would result in greatly reducing the price paid for meat.

MR. HEADLAM said, he desired to remind the House that the whole country, and not the metropolis alone, was interested in a proposal which was founded upon the principle of dealing with foreign cattle, however healthy, in a different manner from the way in which other cattle were dealt with. They were going to legislate in a more permanent form than by Act of Parliament, because by building this market they were about to lay down for all time to come that they were to deal in a certain way with foreign cattle. The noble Lord who introduced the Bill sought to apply to the metropolis the same restrictions as had been applied to other ports; but he (Mr. Headlam) entirely disagreed with the noble Lord as to the effect of those restrictions. Before the restrictions were imposed, in the town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, which he represented, there had been a large trade in the importation of cattle from Denmark, but though no cattle plague existed in Denmark, the trade had now been strangled, and this had caused a great interference with the supply of the necessaries and luxuries of life to his constituents. A similar result had ensued at Southampton.

Mr. MOFFATT then moved that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. JACOB BRIGHT seconded the Motion.

Mr. AYRTON (who spoke amidst loud cries of "Divide!") said, that in the course of the debate, which had lasted two days, certain questions of general policy had been raised, and yet no Member of the Cabinet had risen to express the views of the Government with regard to them. Under these circumstances the adjournment of the debate was the only course which could be adopted. He was not one of those who were against the agricultural party; and the noble Lord who introduced this measure said that he (Mr. Ayrton) was the father of the Bill. He certainly had a right to be heard, but he wished to hear a Member of the Cabinet, no Member of which had given an opinion on this subject, nor was any Cabinet Minister present.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Headlam.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 79; Noes 224: Majority 145.

Question again proposed.

Mr. COGAN said, he thought the discussion and the numbers which had just been announced would show plainly to the country that this Select Committee, which sat for nine weeks on this Bill, came to the proper conclusion when they reported in its favour. He did not believe the effect of the measure would be to enhance the price of meat to the consumer in the metropolis. The importation of foreign cattle must be placed on a sounder and less capricious footing than at present, or the supply of foreign cattle would be put a stop to altogether. Those who supported this Bill had been called Protectionists and opponents of Free Trade; but he was glad now to learn from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) that that charge was now repudiated. He regretted the means which had been resorted to in order to procrastinate the debate and prevent the passing of the Bill.

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

FORCES IN NEW ZEALAND.

OBSERVATIONS.

Viscount ENFIELD said, he rose to call attention to the services of the troops engaged in the late New Zealand War. In so doing he was conscious that the recollection of these services had been to a great effaced by the Abyssinian campaign, to the troops engaged in which the House had yesterday paid a graceful and grateful compliment. The war in New Zealand might be traced back to the campaigns of 1845 and 1846, but the principle interest attached of course to those commenced in the Waikato districts in 1863, and ending in the submission of their hostile tribes in 1866. The late war in New Zealand was, to some extent, unpopular in this country, and might have been impolitic. It certainly was very costly, but he would not discuss those questions. A soldier or sailor had nothing to do with politics; his duty was to go where he was sent, and to fight when he was ordered, and if he did his duty well he was entitled to his reward. Everyone would admit that the troops went through all the hardships and vicissitudes of a well-fought campaign. It was frequently urged that the medal should be granted only for services against a foreign enemy, but this rule had been departed from in some notable instances—such as the Indian Mutiny and the Kaffir War; the latter especially bearing a great analogy to the New Zealand campaign. In the case of the superior officers engaged in New Zealand recognition had been made of their services to the following extent:—Two Generals had been made Knights Commanders of the Bath;

fourteen officers of the two services of the respective ranks of Colonel, Major, and Captain had been made Commanders of the Bath ; twenty-one brevet promotions had been given to officers, and seven had been decorated with the Victoria Cross. The non-commissioned officers and privates, however, had only been rewarded to the following extent :—Four non-commissioned officers had received the Victoria Cross, as also did one blue-jacket and a drummer. Five distinguished-conduct medals had been issued to the soldiers, and three commissions had been given from the ranks. The nature, however, of these rewards proved that the war had been considered a serious and severe one; the Maori race, one of the most formidable subject to British authority, fighting with all those local advantages which made them doubly dangerous. The forces engaged consisted of portions of the Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, and Military Train ; the 1st Battalion 12th Foot, 2nd Battalion 14th Foot, 2nd Battalion 18th Foot, the 40th Regiment, 43rd Regiment, 50th Regiment, 57th Regiment, 65th Regiment, 68th Regiment, and 70th Regiment. To those were added 300 men of the Royal Naval Brigade, and some colonial forces, comprising Forest Rangers, Bush Rangers, and Native troops. To his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro (Captain Vivian) he was indebted for some very useful details of the campaigns, from which he had been enabled to ascertain that the number of skirmishes and engagements were fifteen in all. The number of troops employed were—of land forces about 9,000 men ; and of the Naval Brigade 300 men and officers. The total of killed and wounded, he regretted to say, was 688, of whom 18 officers were killed, 56 wounded, and 15 died subsequently of wounds received before the enemy. The Naval Brigade lost—in killed 6 officers and 14 men, and in wounded 8 officers and 32 men, making a total loss of 60. The New Zealand War was one in which the troops met with most harrassing duties, repeated ambuscades, and perpetual fighting either on a small or a large scale. They had no "loot" to look forward to and no prize-money to receive. There was none of the usual romance and excitement of war, but they did their duty with resolute bravery. He might state that he had no connection either privately or officially with either branch of the service engaged in that war. He would not move any Resolution on the subject, believing that such a course might be unconstitutional and impolitic ; but he trusted the day would be far distant when an independent Member of Parliament would hesitate to say a word in his place in behalf of the services of English soldiers and sailors who had been by ill-luck or inadvertence overlooked or neglected. The noble Viscount in conclusion, asked the Secretary of State for War whether a medal would be issued to the soldiers and sailors who had been engaged in the New Zealand War ?

COLONEL NORTH said, he rose with great pleasure to support the noble Viscount's request. None could have brought the subject forward with greater ability or effect than the noble Viscount, the eldest son of one of our most distinguished officers. His noble Friend had rather under-stated than over-stated the number of casualties in the New Zealand War, and the ability and zeal of the gallant men engaged in it. Those men had gone through greater fatigues, with less excitement to carry them forward, than soldiers engaged in campaigns of greater magnitude. It was often so of little wars. A friend of his who had been engaged in the Kaffir and Crimean Wars had declared the hardships of the former far more severe than those of the latter. He trusted, therefore, the Secretary for War would recommend Her Majesty to bestow some mark of distinction upon the men engaged in New Zealand, in acknowledgment of their faithful services to their Queen and country.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL said, he thought that this was a real question of hardship, and he feared that we had not been in the habit of rewarding our troops in the way they had a right to expect. He was quite sure if this subject were considered by the House justice would be done. After all, a bit of metal or a ribbon was not of much intrinsic value, but in the eyes of the soldier and his family it was viewed with much pride, as a certificate that he had deserved well of his country. He hoped that no petty notions of economy would stand in the way of those decorations being granted to a number of gallant men who had done great service to their country. They had just spent £5,000,000 on the Abyssinian War, and he hoped they would not refuse a few hundreds for the purpose of giving these men their well-earned decorations.

MR. GILPIN said, he felt in rather a curious position as a supporter of this request since he was neither soldier nor soldier's friend; but he added his voice to that of the noble Viscount on the principle that we are bound in common justice adequately to reward those whom we employ. He had friends in New Zealand, and he knew the sense they entertained of the services rendered by the soldiers. Those occupying a high position had been rewarded, and perhaps not too highly; but he knew that many of them felt that they had been rewarded for acts which they could not have performed except by the aid of those men whose claims had been so ably advocated by his noble Friend.

Mr. DISRAELI: I regret very much my right hon. Friend the Secretary for War is not present, because he would speak with more authority than I can on this subject; what are the reasons of his absence at this particular hour — whether he is at New Zealand or not—I will not now inquire. But in considering this question I am sure the House will in candour remember that the New Zealand War was originated and conducted to a conclusion not under the present Government, and that therefore we are not responsible for any neglect of the troops engaged, or for any deficiency of feeling in the matter of recognizing the very great things those troops accomplished. Regarding these very severe colonial struggles, which perhaps too frequently occur, we must always remember that the merits of those engaged are not to be estimated merely by the result of the operations. Those who are engaged in a great European struggle or Imperial war have that excitement to sustain them which is produced by a consciousness of the considerable circumstances with which they are connected, and the public recognition of their services in the journals of Europe. A soldier engaged under such circumstances is sustained by the feeling that an admiring world and a grateful country are applauding his deeds, and will offer him the tribute of reward and praise, and this he feels is some compensation for the great hazards and endurance he is called on to undergo. But not less heroic qualities are requisite in connection with these more obscure encounters, and I think it was very wise on the part of the Government to recognize the conduct of the troops engaged in the campaigns of the Kaffir War. The noble Viscount who introduced this question, with that propriety which always characterizes his proceedings in this House, has called our attention to the ample recognition of the services of the officers, but we must remember that this is not the age in which we should forget the qualities of the men. Only yesterday the House, in the most generous spirit of appreciation, publicly acknowledged how grateful this great country is to the soldiers and sailors engaged in the Abyssinian Expedition; and certainly, in the case of the New Zealand War, I am sure it is not conducive to the honour of the country or the satisfaction of any subject of the Queen—and it cannot, I am sure, accord with the feeling of the Sovereign herself—that the services of those engaged in this prolonged struggle should not be recognized in the manner in which I am sure every generous and patriotic man would desire. I can, therefore, assure the noble Viscount, while reminding him that the present Government are in no way responsible for any neglect hitherto, that we will give the most candid consideration to the subject, and I am sure the ultimate decision arrived at will become the dignity and honour and good feeling of the country.

SCOTLAND—MIDDLE CLASS SCHOOLS.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. GRANT DUFF: My original purpose was to have called the attention of the House at some length to the Report on Scotch Burgh and Middle Class Schools, which has been laid on the table this year by the same Commissioners who last year reported upon elementary schools in Scotland. When I put my Notice on the Paper, however, I hoped that, before my Motion came on, we should have had the advantage of listening to a full discussion of that very remarkable document which the Schools Inquiry Commissioners for England have recently given us—a document which will, I am sure, as soon as the country has got its mind sufficiently clear of electoral cares to give an earnest attention to it, be recognized as a most valuable contribution to the better ordering and happiness of this great nation. In that hope I have been disappointed, if, indeed, I can say that I really am disappointed that a Parliament—wearied with the agitations of a Session during which Members have been morally tossed in a blanket, to a degree which the nerves of few can stand —should not have its last hours embittered by being questioned as to its opinion on the details or even the principles of secondary education. Feeling, however, as I do, that Scotch educational reformers will have their hands greatly strengthened by the noble Report of the English Commissioners, and believing that the Scotch Commissioners would have given us a Report of somewhat wider scope and range if they had not known that the whole subject of secondary education was being concurrently considered in England, I have abandoned my original purpose, and shall confine myself to a very few remarks on matters with regard to which I should like to elicit the opinion of the learned Lord opposite (the Lord Advocate). I turn, then, to the recommendations of the Commissioners, printed at the end of their Report, and to these I shall confine myself. They occupy little more than one widely printed octavo page. The first two of these, relating to superannuation allowances and grants for building, do not call for any special remark; for everyone will, I think, agree in the policy recommended, at least everyone who knows that the total endowment of all Burgh Schools under the partial or exclusive management of Town Councils does not exceed £3,000 a year, while the fees amount to £42,000. Then comes the 3rd—

> "In consideration of the aid thus contributed, all Burgh Schools and the buildings and offices of such schools should be examined every year by one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, who should report both as regards the efficiency of the teaching and the state of the buildings and offices. The Inspectors should have like access to Burgh Schools for these purposes, as is possessed in relation to elementary schools."

Now, this recommendation seems to me the most important of all, because, although our Burgh and Middle Class Schools are most terribly in want of money, they are even more in want of guidance — guidance from persons who, being thoroughly familiar with all that is being done in those countries where secondary education has been brought to its highest pitch, can aid and co-operate with those whose experience has been, from the nature of things, confined to a narrower field. It is infinitely to the credit of the masters of Scotch Burgh and Middle Class Schools that they should have thoroughly recognized this. Here is the passage from the Report of the Assistant Commissioners which the Commissioners incorporate in their Report with regard to this subject—

> "In the notes of 'Particulars of Inquiry,' which we were instructed to distribute among the teachers in the different schools, the question bearing on this subject is in these words—'Would it in your opinion be an advantage or otherwise if the Burgh Schools were examined annually, and reported on by independent examiners?' To this question we have received 105 answers from teachers in all the important schools in Scotland. Of these answers, 84, or 80 per cent, are in the affirmative, 11 are in the negative, and 10 are doubtful—that is to say, 80 per cent of the best teachers in the Public Middle Class Schools consider that it would be of advantage to their schools if they were examined annually, and reported on by independent examiners. Nothing can be more satisfactory than this result, and there is no feature connected with the inquiry which reflects greater credit upon the teachers throughout Scotland than this desire which they have expressed to exhibit the true condition of their schools, and to secure the benefit of independent examination. It is of a piece with the perfect courtesy with which they received us when we visited the schools, and with the liberal manner in which they gave us every assistance in arriving at an estimate of the work done in the schools. It will be remarked that there is no mention of any recompense or return in exchange for the liberty of examination. They say simply and definitely it will be of advantage to the schools if they be examined."

Then we come to recommendation No. 4, relating to tenure, which I pass by for the present. The 5th recommendation is as follows:—

> "In cases where, from the want of a Burgh School, the Parochial School discharges the functions of a Secondary School, we recommend that special grants should be made to the master by the Treasury in order to encourage the study of the higher subjects."

Now, I think one may safely say that, without some such arrangement as this, it will be found impossible to devise a system of education which will satisfy the people of Scotland. The Commissioners most properly point out that the theory of our school system, as originally conceived by Knox and others, was to supply every member of the community with the means of obtaining for his children not only the elements of education, but such instruction as would fit him to pass to the Burgh School, and thence to the University, or directly to the University from the Parish School. They observe at page 10 of their Report—

> "The connection between the Parochial and Burgh Schools and the University is therefore one essential element in our scheme of national education. The only way in which this element can be preserved is by insisting that the teachers in every Burgh or Secondary School, and many of the Parochial Schools, should be capable of instructing their pupils, not only in the subjects common to all Primary Schools, but in the elements of Latin, mathematics, and Greek. To be satisfied with any standard of competency inferior to this would be to lower the character of education which has hitherto prevailed in this country,

> to deprive meritorious poverty of the means of gratifying a legitimate ambition, and to destroy the link which has hitherto united our schools with our Universities, and which, according to universal consent, has proved of the utmost value to the people of this country."

I do not think that our educational system in Scotland will be put on a satisfactory footing until the highest authority in matters of education—that is to say, this House—thoroughly accepts the sentiments conveyed in this extract. Of course the first thing to be looked to is that every child in the country shall have an opportunity of receiving the very elements of education—shall be put in a position, that is to say, to be a real human being, as distinguished from a featherless biped. That end would be to a great extent accomplished if we passed the Bill which the Commissioners suggested last year. If we passed that Bill, or a Bill pretty like it, for there are numbers of details connected with this subject which, for all I care, may be settled in any one of half-a-dozen ways, if only something substantial is done for widening the area of education and undenominationalizing it. If that, I say, were done, the next thing to be attended to is this excellent recommendation of the Commissioners about favouring by public grants the teaching of the higher branches. These grants to the elementary schools should be liberal. We are quite in favour of the thoroughness of the Revised Code, and its payments by results properly estimated. We do not want schoolmasters to slight the lower part of their work, under the plea that they are attending to the higher part of it; but then we say a good man can perfectly attend to both, and we will not have the narrowness of the Revised Code forced upon us. We are not at this time of day going to put the ship about, and go off in a direction opposite to that in which we have been sailing for three centuries. Now we come to the 6th recommendation, with which I entirely disagree, and which is as follows:—

> "Excepting in these particulars, we do not recommend that further grants of public money should be made on account of Burgh Schools in Scotland, nor any other alteration in their management or superintendence."

I think, Sir, that the Commissioners have left out two most important suggestions, which they ought to have included in their recommendations, and which are strongly urged by their Assistant Commissioners at page 146 of their Report. The first of these is, that there should be established in parts of Scotland where the Burgh and Middle Class School accommodation is insufficient, district schools, to which all boys might go when they had passed through the elementary school, if they could afford it; and to which boys who could not afford it from their own resources might go by the help of small exhibitions, gained by competitive examination at the elementary schools. These district schools should give a thoroughly good education to boys up to sixteen or seventeen, and should have both a classical side and a modern side, so as to prepare at once for the Universities or for active life. Without these the grants for advanced teaching to elementary schoolmasters would not be enough —although, as I have said, very valuable. I do not want very many of these schools to begin with—four or six in the whole country, perhaps, to act as models; but then they should be first-rate of their kind, as good, say, as the Zurich secondary schools. and that means, as hon. Gentlemen who have seen these remarkable institutions will know, something very good indeed. With regard to the exhibitions, I think it would be quite fair if the Committee of Council were only to meet local benevolence half way. The creation of small exhibitions—bursaries we call them —to support young men at the University, has long been a favourite object of Scotch benevolence. We have quite enough of these for all purposes—nay, some might say, too many; for they are constantly given away by mere favour, and not as the result of competitive examination. If the Committee of Council were to lead the way, it would soon find people ready to follow it on this road. The 7th and last recommendation relates to the great educational foundations, known in Scotland as Hospitals, which possess about £50,000 a year; but about them I shall say nothing, preferring to wait, in the hope that public opinion, and the opinion of those connected with these institutions, will be gradually led to see means for rendering them more generally useful than they now are, by the educational discussions which are sure to occupy a very large share of public attention from 1869 onward. Before sitting down, I have only to add that I have read with great pleasure the interesting and remarkable Report of Messrs. Harvey and Sellar. Some controversy is going on in various parts of Scotland as to the accuracy or inaccuracy of various parts of it. That of course is inevitable, and the result will no doubt be to sift their statements, and enable each locality to know the exact state of affairs. One thing is sufficiently clear, and that is, that between the Report to which I am alluding —the Report of Mr. Fearon—and the Report of Messrs. Demogeot and Mantuci, we have really got as complete a picture of our Scotch secondary education as we need want. One word as to the Report of Mr. Fearon. It is an excellent Report, but, in reading it, we should bear in mind that it was addressed for English purposes to an English Commission. It was intended to show to inefficient masters of well-endowed schools in England how much is done with comparatively slender appliances by many schoolmasters on the other side of the Tweed. It made me think of the Germania of Tacitus, which was, we are told, intended not only to set forth the virtues of the barbarians, but to satirize the vices of Rome. Good as it is, it would do positive harm in Scotland, if it led our schoolmasters to try themselves only by an English standard. Luckily, it is bound up with Mr. Arnold's Report upon Foreign Schools, so that our Scotch schoolmasters may work out a higher ideal for themselves by the study of his pages. Give the Burgh and Middle Class Schoolmasters of Scotland good pay, honourable treatment, good models, and the constant disinterested advice of men whose abilities and profound knowledge of education they cannot fail to recognize—and no others should be appointed inspectors—and you will soon have a *corps d'elite* which will hold its own with any similar body of men in the world.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, that the questions to which the hon. Gentleman had called attention were of great importance to those interested in education in general, and in Scotch education in particular. As, however, no measure founded upon the Reports of the Commissioners and sub-Commissioners had been introduced this Session, and as a great deal of other Business was now before the House, he would not enter into the subject at any great length. The Reports presented last year on elementary education disclosed a state of affairs in the urban districts with which he should have attempted to deal this Session had not the House been so fully occupied with other questions. They showed, however, that in the rural districts elementary education, so far as regarded quality, was in a very satisfactory condition, though there might be room for some improvements. This year's Reports had been presented on secondary or middle-class education, and he thought there was reason for congratulation on its very satisfactory state, whether as regarded quality or quantity. One in 205 of the population of Scotland attended the secondary schools, exclusive of private ones, whereas in Prussia, which was esteemed the most advanced country educationally, the attendance was 1 in 249, and in France 1 in 570. He would not state the proportion in England for fear of exciting sectional prejudices, but secondary education was certainly in a more gratifying position in Scotland than in any other country in Europe. It appeared, moreover, from the exhaustive and instructive Reports of the sub-Commissioners that 71 per cent of the teachers had received a University education, 36 per cent having graduated at Universities. This showed the intimate connection between the Universities and the secondary schools. He looked upon it as a fact of great importance that 1 in 1,000 of the population of Scotland went to the Universities, whereas in Germany the proportion was 1 in 2,600, and in England only 1 in 5,800. Moreover, 58 per cent of the students at the Scotch Universities came from the elementary schools. It was very desirable to maintain and strengthen the connection subsisting between the Universities and the teachers in the elementary and secondary schools. The system of education in those schools was very different from the English system, and in any future legislation that difference ought to be kept in view, for it would not be wise to assimilate the Scotch elementary schools to the English schools as at present constituted. The gross estimated attendance at the secondary schools was 16,000. The endowments, he was sorry to say, were very small, amounting only to about £3,000 a year. The fees were about £42,000, and, taking into account the assistance given by public bodies, the entire cost of secondary education was from £45,000 to £50,000. The average cost per pupil, girls being included, was £3 11*s.* 6*d.*, a rate about equal to that of England ; but in this country there were very large endowments, the revenues of Eton and Winchester alone exceeding the entire receipts of the Scotch secondary schools and Universities put together. The educational grants from all public sources, national and municipal, amounted to about 16*s.* for each pupil, whereas in France the amount was 37*s.* and in Prussia 41*s.*—namely, 21*s.* from the State and 20*s.* from the municipality. These facts showed that Scotland was entitled to some credit for turning such narrow resources to the best possible account. The efficiency of the Scotch schools materially depended on the masters, and on the liberal education many of them had received at the Universities. To obtain that education they underwent, he might almost say, privations; and the benefits of it were not confined to themselves, but were shared by all with whom they were brought into contact. Care ought, therefore, to be taken not to deteriorate but rather to improve their position. With regard to the recommendations contained in the Reports, he could not at the present time give any pledge on the part of the Government, but could only indicate what steps ought, in his individual opinion, to be taken. It had been urged that there should be a retiring provision out of the public funds for teachers in the secondary schools, who, from old age or other circumstances, became disabled. To that proposition he was inclined to accede. But with reference to the buildings, he thought that a more doubtful question. It was a matter for those interested in the locality to attend to the buildings, whether in the way of erecting new buildings or maintaining old. There was a great deal to be said for annual inspection. He thought, moreover, that if any concessions were made on the part of the Government to maintain secondary education it was but right that there should be some Government supervision, in order to insure that the schools were properly conducted. He was glad to see that nearly 80 per cent of those interested in secondary education were desirous that there should be Government inspection. Then as to supplementary schools in those districts where the population was very sparse, that was a question which deserved serious consideration, but with respect to which he would rather not express a definite opinion at present. With respect to the creation of exhibitions he would be happy to see them conferred upon deserving pupils in the important schools. But from his experience of official life he knew there was a body called the Treasury, which exercised a strict supervision over these matters, and it would be improper for him to express any further opinion on the subject. The only other matter to which he would refer related to the Hospitals. Certainly while the funds for the support of education in Scotland were in general very limited, as far as the hospitals connected with Edinburgh were concerned there was a superfluity, or, in other words, there was upwards of £40,000 a year derived from foundations, which were called in Scotland "mortifications," commencing at the time of George Heriot, the goldsmith, in the reign of James I. of England. Now, that was a matter which was really of very great interest to the inhabitants of Edinburgh. The consideration was always forced upon them that this £40,000 a year was not probably employed in the most beneficial manner. The children were lodged in hospitals, where they acquired habits, not of luxury, but of comfort not altogether consistent with the position in life which they might afterwards hold, and it was a question whether that almost monastic life was the best fitted for preparing young people for the world. The funds for those foundations had increased very much owing to improvement in the property; but the will of the testators must to a great extent be respected, and it was only where the funds had been increased very much that they could be applied to any new purposes. The funds of George Heriot's hospital had been applied to the extent of £3,000 or £4,000 to the support, not of in-door but out-door pupils, and a great deal of good had been done in that way. The whole question was one which deserved the attention of the public, and would probably come before that House. In all other respects Scotland was badly off for educational funds. The people of Scotland contributed largely towards the support of the public Exchequer, while they did not derive very great benefit from the expenditure of the public money. If, therefore, the Treasury should see their way to making concessions in the manner suggested by the hon. Gentleman and recommended by the Commissioners, he would be happy to do anything in his power towards that end. He could not, however, express himself very definitely on a subject upon which he had not had an opportunity of consulting Her Majesty's Government.

COLONEL SYKES said, the salaries of the schoolmasters in Aberdeenshire were exceedingly low, ranging generally from £40 to £70 a year, even with the forty-five teachers who participated in the Milne bequest; and in November, 1866, in forty parishes where the teachers did not participate in the Milne bequest, the maximum salary was £50 per annum, and the minimum was £20, in the parish of Culsamond with a population of 1,165 souls! He had presented a petition some years ago from seven schoolmasters of Aberdeenshire, five of whom were Masters of Arts. Two of them were receiving £24 a year, and yet they were doing their duty zealously, honestly, and ably. How did they obtain the education that enabled them to fulfil their duties so well? In this way: the sons of small tradesmen, or small farmers, went to a parochial school; the master, having obtained a University education, was able to teach them Latin, extending even to mathematics, Greek, and French. They were thus enabled to go to the University of Aberdeen, and compete for bursaries of £10 or £20 per annum, and thus to pursue the same career as those from whom they had received their instruction. From such a source came men who had gone through a most honourable career in various parts of the world. It had been justly said that there was no part of the world in which you would not find a Scotchman; and it was equally true that you would generally find him successful in life. What was that success attributed to but to the education which he had received in early life at his parochial school? The schoolmasters felt some alarm at the change which was about to take place by the substitution of national for parochial schools, which had existed for 300 years. They said that if they were to be controlled by a central body in Edinburgh, at least they should have some representatives in that body, and that seemed to him to be a reasonable demand.

MR. RAMSAY said, he hoped that next Session the learned Lord Advocate would bring in a Bill which would meet the educational requirements of Scotland. Though, on the whole, the people of Scotland might be better educated than those of England, yet one-tenth part of the population in the rural districts were very imperfectly educated, the parochial schools being quite inadequate to meet the wants of these parishes. The average pay of the schoolmasters in the Highlands did not exceed 10*s.* a week.

CARELESS USE OF LUCIFER MATCHES: OBSERVATIONS.

MR. HENNIKER-MAJOR, who had given Notice that he would call attention to the danger arising to life and property form the careless use of Lucifer Matches, said, at this late period of the Session, when he could not hope to arrive at any satisfactory or practical result on the subject of the Notice standing in his name on the Paper, he did not think that he would be justified, although the opportunities of doing so were not very numerous, in proceeding with it, particularly when he took into consideration the large amount of important Business still remaining to be got over: he should, therefore, withdraw his Notice. Perhaps, however, the House would allow him to make a very few remarks, to show his reasons for bringing the matter forward. A large number of fires, causing very great damage to property, in his own and adjoining counties, had occurred lately from the careless use of lucifer matches. This was considered to be so serious that last year, at the Assizes in Suffolk, the Grand Jury, of which he was foreman, made a Presentment on the subject; it was a rare thing in that county for a Presentment to be made, but so many cases of arson came before them, proved to have arisen chiefly from children playing with, and having easy access to, lucifer matches, that they thought it right to do so. The number of fires arising from the same cause increased through the winter, and the case became a still more serious one. To show the amount of damage done by the careless use of lucifer matches, he would mention that the Norwich Union Fire Insurance Office, which insures one-seventh of the whole agricultural property and farming stock in the country, paid in three years for insurances for damage done by 133 fires no less than £13,462, calculating on that basis, the amount paid throughout the country by Insurance Offices for insured property of this class would be £94,234, for damage done by 931 fires caused entirely by the indiscriminate sale and use of these articles; and when it was considered what the amount would probably be on uninsured property not taken into calculation, this was a very serious matter indeed. In the Report of the Evidence before a Select Committee of the House last year on Fire Protection, in answer to a question put as to the amount of the payments made for insurances by the Sun Fire Office for fires arising from the same cause, the gentleman representing that office stated that they were no less than £10,000 a year. He hoped he had justified himself for having placed the Notice on the Paper, and shown that the subject was an important one. He would put off any further remarks to some future opportunity, and would content himself now with the few observations he had made. He wished merely to press upon the Government the importance of the question, with a hope that they might consider it with a view to some remedy.

IRELAND—WRITS OF ERROR IN CRIMINAL CASES.

RESOLUTION.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he rose to call attention to the granting of Writs of Error in criminal cases, and to move a Resolution on the subject. It had lately been asserted by a Law Officer of the Crown in Ireland that writs of error were not a matter of right but a matter of grace. In the case of Mr. Pigott, the proprietor of the *Irishman* newspaper, who was sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment for the insertion of a seditious libel in that journal, a petition signed by Counsel for a writ of error was presented on the 21st of April. On the 13th of May—and he complained of this delay—Sir Thomas Larcom replied that, in the opinion of the Attorney General, no grounds existed for granting the writ. As it was stated that the reason for this refusal was because no grounds of error had been assigned in the original petition, another petition was presented on May 28, and on June 5, the issue of the writ was again refused. A petition was thereupon presented on behalf of Mr. Pigott to the Lord Chancellor, and the case was argued before him, but his Lordship decided that he had no jurisdiction to interfere. He did not impute blame to the Attorney General, who had acted, he believed, *bonâ fide*, though, as he thought, in an unconstitutional manner, in erroneously refusing to grant a writ of error when it was applied for on behalf of Mr. Pigott; but as the matter was an important one, he felt it his duty to bring it before Parliament. The question whether writs of error were a matter of right or of favour did not now for the first time come before Parliament. In the reign of Charles I. Sir Thomas Armstrong was indicted for high treason, and outlawed; he afterwards surrendered and was executed—the Attorney General refusing a writ of error. In 1689, on the petition of his widow and daughters, his case was brought before the House of Commons, which appointed a Committee of thirty-five Members to examine into the circumstances of the case, and also to ascertain and state the law as to writs of error in criminal cases. That Committee reported that the refusal of the writ was altogether unlawful, and further that—

> "A writ of error for the reversal of judgment in treason or felony is the right of the subject, and ought to be granted at his desire, and is not an act of grace or favour which may be denied or granted at pleasure."

The House confirmed the Report, and expelled the Attorney General by a majority of 131 against 71. This showed with what jealousy Parliament looked into the matter immediately after the Revolution. Again, in 1704, in the reign of Anne, where, in the Aylesbury case, actions were brought against the returning officers for disallowing votes, a writ of error was refused by the Attorney General, and the case came before the House of Lords, who took the opinion of the Judges, with Chief Justice Holt at their head, on the point, and, after getting their opinion, the Lords resolved—

> "That a writ of error is not a writ of grace, but of right, and ought not to be denied to the subject when duly applied for—though at the request of either House of Parliament—the denial thereof being an obstruction of justice, and contrary to Magna Charta."

Following this up, the Lords presented an Address to Her Majesty. praying her to direct a writ of error to issue, and in that Address they say—

> "Whether writs of error ought to be granted, and what ought to be done upon writs of error afterwards, are very different things. The only matter under your Majesty's consideration is, whether in right and justice the Petitioners are not entitled to have writs of error granted.
>
> "We are sure that the House of Commons in 1689 was of opinion that a writ of error, even in cases of felony and treason, is the right of the subject, and ought to be granted at his desire, and is not an act of grace and favour which may be denied or granted at pleasure. So that, as far as the opinion of the House of Commons ought to have weight in such a question, whatever the present opinion of the House is, they then thought a writ of error was the right of the subject in capital cases, where only it had been at any time doubted of.
>
> "But that it is a writ of right in all other cases has been affirmed in the law books, is verified by the constant practice, and is the opinion of all your present Judges except Mr. Baron Price and Mr. Baron Smith."

And the Lords then go on to argue in the strongest manner the justice and expediency of this view of the law. After this Address was presented to Her Majesty, the Judges were again summoned, and on their opinion being laid before Her Majesty, she sent a Message to the Lords that she would comply with their request; but the Parliament having been very soon after dissolved, all the proceedings fell to the ground. In modern times the question as to the rights of a writ of error came before Lord Chancellor Hart. In 1828, the Attorney General of Ireland, refused to grant his fiat for a writ of error in the case of Radford Roe, who had been convicted of perjury and forgery, and the cursitor refused to issue it without his fiat, whereupon an application was made to Lord Chancellor Hart, who held that the cursitor was bound to issue the writ. Under those circumstances, then, he thought it was a very unconstitutional act for an Attorney General—especially in Ireland—to refuse to grant a writ of error. He was aware that the dicta of some modern English Judges might be quoted in favour of the course taken by the Attorney General for Ireland; but it had been held over and over again by the earlier English Judges that the writ of error was a right, and not a matter of grace. Two modern cases which came before Lord Campbell "*Ex parte* Newton," in 1855, and "*Ex parte* Lee," in 1858, will be relied upon. In both the Court decided it had no jurisdiction to interfere in the matter—that the Attorney General should act on his own responsibility—and that if the object for which the writ of error was applied for was merely to raise an objection which did not affect the merits of the case, then he should refuse to grant his *fiat*—the right to grant the writ of error being one of the Prerogatives of the Crown. It was a monstrous doctrine that the Attorney General—the Prosecutor—was to decide that the ground on which a writ of error was applied for had nothing to do with the merits of a case, and though this doctrine had the sanction of Lord Campbell, he would venture to say that a more monstrous doctrine was never laid down even in the worst times of Royal Prerogative. He had felt it his bounden duty to bring forward this question, as it was decided by a solemn Resolution of this House in the reign of William III. that the issuing of a writ of error was a matter of right and not of grace. This doctrine, which was endorsed by ten out of twelve Judges in the reign of Queen Anne, and by the House of Lords at that period, had been attempted to be over-ridden by modern English Judges who had not studied the Constitutional Law so well as they had studied the Common Law; but he hoped this House would not sanction such an attempt. The whole of our law relating to appeals in criminal cases was a disgrace to the country. England was the only country in the world without a Court of Appeal on questions of fact in criminal cases. The only appeal was to the Home Secretary, which was most unsatisfactory. It was true that an appeal might be made on a point of law, but such an appeal was only allowed to the Court of Criminal appeal by consent of the Judge who tried the case or else by writ of error; and it was now laid down that the latter method could not be resorted to except by consent of the Attorney General. The Attorney General for Ireland had acted against precedent, for in cases of misdemeanour especially the writ of error was always felt to be a matter of right, and since the decision of Lord Chancellor Hart it had been so considered in Ireland. If, however, the Attorney General refused a writ, Parliament was the only power that could control him. He would not go into the question whether Mr. Pigott was justly convicted or not, but the fact remained that the further investigation of the case had been stopped without any appeal, because the Attorney General, who was the prosecutor, had refused the writ of error in defiance of the Resolutions of Parliament and of the law laid down by the Judges. In conclusion he would beg to move the Resolution of which he had given notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House doth agree with the Resolution passed by this House on the 19th day of November 1689, and doth re-affirm that a Writ of Error for the reversal of a Judgment in Misdemeanor, Felony, or Treason is the right of the subject, and ought to be granted at his desire, and is not an act of Grace or Favour which may be denied or granted at Pleasure,"—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WARREN): I think it would have been more fair and becoming on the part of the hon. and learned Baronet if he had given in the Notice which he had placed on the Paper some intimation of an intention to impeach my conduct on the present occasion. [Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN denied that he had done so.] My conduct has certainly been impeached, for the hon. and learned Baronet has asserted that the Attorney General has been guilty of unreasonable delay, and violated the constitutional rule applicable to the granting of writs of error. The Resolution, however, contained nothing but an allegation which I am prepared to prove utterly unfounded. I confess, however, I cannot sufficiently admire the ingenuity and bustling importunity with which, during the present Session, the hon. and learned Member for Clare had sought opportunities to provoke the House to interfere in matters relating to the Queen and her Royal Prerogative. On reference to the Papers of the House, I find that the Prerogative of the Queen in connection with the peerage of Ireland was the subject of a Bill introduced by the hon. and learned Baronet; but that measure was brought to an untimely end by the interference of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department. I also find that a Motion of the hon. and learned Baronet stood on the Paper proposing that the House should interfere as to the Queen's Prerogative in connection with the title of honour called knighthood — an interference sought by none, and repudiated by many of those on whom the hon. and learned Baronet was desirous of thrusting the honour. Again, the hon. and learned Baronet had during the present Session placed on the table Notices of Motions connected with the residence of the Sovereign, and with regard to the declarations which the Queen, as the Protestant Sovereign of a Protestant kingdom, was required to make. ["Question!"] I am speaking to the question, as the present was one of a series of attacks upon the Prerogative of the Crown. The hon. and learned Baronet had also introduced a Motion proposing that the House should interfere with the Queen in a matter connected with a charitable institution. That Motion met the ignominious defeat which in my opinion it richly deserved. And now the hon. and learned Baronet has made a direct attack on the Royal Prerogative; for I am in a position to satisfy the House that the granting of writs of error is strictly a matter of Prerogative. The hon. and learned Baronet had commenced by saying that the present practice was of modern date. But when the subject was discussed recently, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland remarked that it had been thoroughly investigated, and shown to date back at least as far as the time of the Plantagenets. I find it distinctly laid down in two cases—known as "Crawle's case" and "The Rioters' case"—decided in 1683 and 1684, that in all cases, whether of treason, felony, or misdemeanour, the granting of a fiat for a writ of error was a matter of Royal Prerogative, and that the assent of the Sovereign must be obtained. As to the case which occurred in the reign of Queen Anne, ten out of twelve Judges held that the writ of error should be granted as a matter of right in cases of misdemeanour; and that judgment was afterwards explained in the case of the notorious Wilkes by Lord Mansfield, who laid it down that even in cases of misdemeanour the writ did not issue as a matter of right unless sufficient probable grounds were shown. The universal practice in Ireland had been to apply to the Lord Lieutenant, and he, exercising the Royal Prerogative, referred the matter to the Attorney General. It was granted in cases of treason and felony merely as a matter of grace; in cases of misdemeanour, upon probable grounds of error being shown to the satisfaction of the Attorney General; and there was no authority to the contrary, except the case decided by Sir Anthony Hart, who was not a great criminal lawyer, but simply a master of Equity practice. What would have happened in the case of Mr. Pigott if the law had been otherwise? Under the recent Act of Parliament relating to misdemeanours, if a writ of error were issued the prisoner would be discharged on bail. Mr. Pigott could have got a writ of error as a matter of course, and been admitted to bail pending the appeal. Now, what advantage would the public have derived from his conviction if, after the lapse of perhaps two years, the sentence on this gentleman was ratified, and he was sent back to prison? Blackstone, who wrote after the Resolution referred to by the hon. and learned Baronet had been passed by the House of Commons, laid down the law thus—

> "Writs of error to reverse judgments in case of misdemeanours are not to be allowed of course but on sufficient probable cause shown to the Attorney General, and then they are understood to be grantable of common right, and *a debito justitiae.* But writs of error to reverse attainders

in capital cases are only allowed *ex gratiâ*, and not without express warrant under the King's sign manual, or at least by the consent of the Attorney General."

That was the law recognized by Lord Campbell and the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench. In Lee's case Lord Campbell said—

> "It is part of the Prerogative of the Crown that a writ of error should not issue except with the concurrence of the Crown, testified by the fiat of the Attorney General."

Chief Justice Jervis, and Lord Chancellor Brewster—who was unrivalled in his experience of criminal law—all held that that was the law. I apprehend, therefore, that this was the ancient and legal practice; and as I was bound by my oath to advise the Queen according to law, I advised the Lord Lieutenant, Her Majesty's deputy, that there were no probable grounds for granting a writ of error in Mr. Pigott's case. I desire now to say a few words as to my personal conduct. I was attending to my duties in the House of Commons when the application was presented to the Lord Lieutenant in Ireland; but in the course of two or three days the memorial was forwarded. It contained no allegation of any error in the record, nor had any point been raised at the trial by Mr. Heron, who conducted the defence of the prisoner. On receiving the application, I took time to consider, and to institute inquiries about the record. When I refused my sanction the parties immediately presented a petition to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland for a fiat to the writ of error, notwithstanding the opinion of the Attorney General. When the case came on for argument the Lord Chancellor, without hearing counsel for the Crown, expressed a strong opinion against the memorial, and upon my consent ordered the petition to be taken off the file of the Court of Chancery. When the second petition was presented to me as Attorney General, I, wishing to have my own opinion strengthened if I was right, corrected if I was wrong, directed that all the papers should be laid before the Counsel who had been engaged in the case, including with the Solicitor General and Law Adviser, Dr. Ball and Mr. Murphy, who were not Law Officers of the Crown. They met in consultation in my absence, and arrived at the unanimous opinion that there were no grounds whatever for a reversal of my decision in the case. Acting on the law as laid down by Lord Campbell and by the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, I refused my sanction to the prosecution of a writ of error in the matter. I may observe that when the matter came on to be heard before the Lord Chancellor, Mr. Butt did not state that the case was a clear one in his favour, but only that it was an arguable case. Every one knew that when a barrister only went the length of saying that his case was an "arguable" one he meant that, while something might be said in its favour, the law was against him. It was not on light grounds that I would refuse my sanction to a writ of error. Only that day the Judges of England in the case of a writ of error brought to the House of Lords on behalf of a man named Mulcahy, who had been convicted in Ireland of a political offence, gave their opinion against the first point raised in Pigott's memorial. For myself, I venture to say that, in acting as I have, I acted according to law, and in the conscientious discharge of my manifest duty. If the law was to be changed, it must be done, not by one branch of the Legislature, but by the two branches, and the consent of the Sovereign. I hope that in this, and all such cases, whoever may be the individual holding the office which I have now the honour to fill, the House of Commons will support him in maintaining the Prerogative of the Crown.

MR. O'BEIRNE said, he had heard with great astonishment the lecture delivered by the right hon. and learned Gentleman to the hon. and learned Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) as to his course of proceeding in that House, and the Notices he had from time to time placed upon its records. He (Mr. O'Beirne) was quite at a loss to understand by what right the hon. and learned Gentleman so presumed upon his position. The hon. and learned Baronet had gained for himself the respect and regard of both sides of the House, and was not open to such remarks as had been made. He (Mr. O'Beirne) did not intend to treat this subject as a matter of law merely. He was not disposed to follow his hon. and learned Friend, by whom the question had been introduced, into the pages of Blackstone or the long-past Resolutions of Parliament. He desired rather to look upon it in a popular point of view, and to ask the House to consider what the impressions of the public must be if such proceedings as those stated by his hon. and learned Friend were permitted. There could be no doubt that the policy of Parliament had always been to protect the accused against anything that could bear the character of injustice, and it was that disposition that marked the action of the Legislature in the instances which had been cited by his learned Friend, and to which the right hon. Gentleman opposite had given no reply whatever. It was of great importance that our law, and, above all, our criminal law, should be administered with the most rigid impartiality; and it was also of great importance that it should be in its application placed above and beyond all suspicion. It was because the refusal to grant a writ of error, in such a case as that of Mr. Pigott, was calculated to cast some doubt upon the administration of that law, that the consideration of the Motion of his hon. and learned Friend was of such moment. Surely if a doubt existed this was a case where the legal discretion of the right hon. Gentleman might have been well used in favour of the prisoner—where the rules springing from principles and precedents might well be stretched a little if such were necessary. He (Mr. O'Beirne) was not anxious to impute unworthy or prejudiced motives to the right hon. Gentleman, whose duty must, or certainly ought to have been very distasteful to him. Nor did he desire to call in question the conduct of the prosecution, the evidence brought forward, or the result of the trial. What he desired to impress upon the House was this—that the right hon. Gentleman was the leader against the prisoner; that when the verdict was obtained he was the judge—the irresponsible judge—as to whether there should be an appeal by writ of error from that verdict, and that he refused to permit any such appeal. He (Mr. O'Beirne) now stated broadly, and he called upon the occupants of the opposite Bench to contradict him if he was mistaken, that this was the first instance in which a writ of error was refused in Ireland in the case of a misdemeanour. Was this so or not? if it was so, he must say he considered the right hon. Gentleman, in taking upon himself to refuse it, acted illegally and unconstitutionally, and his hon. and learned Friend (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) discharged a proper duty in bringing forward the subject for the consideration of this House. The noble Earl the Chief Secretary for Ireland would remember the celebrated case of Mr. O'Connell and his friends who were prosecuted some twenty years ago for an offence falling within the same category. Then a writ of error was brought and the conviction was annulled. There was no hesitation upon that occasion to grant the writ. Since then the feeling of the Legislature had been shown by an Act which passed, providing that when a writ of error was brought the prisoner should be immediately admitted to bail. This was manifestly for the purpose of protecting him from any injustice, the bail being bound to deliver him up to the authorities to fulfil his sentence in case judgment in error pronounced against him. The right hon. Gentleman in his remarks relied upon the fact that no causes of error were stated by Mr. Pigott in his memorial. This he (Mr. O'Beirne) apprehended was a mistake, as on looking to the memorial he (Mr. O'Beirne) found six points of error very clearly, as he thought, stated and certified by the three learned counsel who had charge of the defence.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WARREN): The hon. Member was under a misapprehension—the points of error alluded to were in the second memorial. He (the Attorney General) had alluded to the first memorial.

MR. O'BEIRNE: It seemed to him that the fact of the second memorial made the case only the stronger against the course adopted by the right hon. Gentleman, who, having refused the first application, had been by the second afforded a further opportunity to consider the matter, and then repeated his refusal. As to the circumstance to which he had also referred, and upon which he seemed to rely, that the Lord Chancellor of Ireland had, in giving his judgment, expressed a strong opinion on the case, he (Mr. O'Beirne) could not attach any importance to such a statement, as the point for his Lordship's decision manifestly was whether he had jurisdiction or not, and the judgment merely ruled that no such jurisdiction existed. The right hon. Gentleman also relied upon the fact that granting a writ of error was a Prerogative of the Crown, and that he was bound by his oath to advise Her Majesty according to law. Now, this seemed to be rather a singular statement. No doubt what the right hon. Gentleman meant to say was that he was bound to advise Her Majesty according to the law as he believed it to be. An oath of any other nature would be rather an unusual one. But there was nothing to satisfy the public or the House that because the right hon. Gentleman took this oath he was not open to mistakes. Certainly, it was now of the utmost moment that the House should express an opinion upon this question. If the law was to be considered to justify the refusal to allow an appeal merely upon the irresponsible dictum of the Attorney General—himself probably, as in this case, the prosecutor, and answerable for the error committed—it should be at once openly so declared. Once it was clearly ascertained and known that a power so dangerous was authorized by law the Legislature would speedily adopt effective measures to protect Her Majesty's subjects from so great an injustice.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL expressed his surprise that the hon. and learned Baronet should ask the House of Commons to pass a Resolution of a most extraordinary character merely because Resolutions of a similar nature had been passed in the reign of William III., laying down as a constitutional practice what the Courts of Law had ever since consistently denied. There were few things in the law which could not be contradicted by an ingenious advocate; but, as far as legal authorities could establish a principle, it had been laid down beyond all dispute and question that in cases of treason and felony the grant of a writ of error was not *ex debito justitiæ*, but simply *ex gratiâ* by the Crown; and according to modern practice it was the duty—and by no means an agreeable one—of the Attorney General to determine whether there was such a case in the face of the petition, or appearing from the papers, as to induce him to say that the writ of error ought to issue. The duty of the Attorney General was twofold: to see that the writ was not withheld if proper and sufficient grounds were advanced, and on the other hand not to allow the writ to be issued upon insufficient or purely frivolous grounds. In the case of misdemeanour there was this distinction, as the law had been laid down, that the Law Officer ought not to advise the Crown to refuse the writ in any case where there was a probability that it might be successful. He did not propose to argue before the House of Commons a question which might be argued for days and days before the Court of Queen's Bench, and he was not about to canvass, as other Members appeared to have done, the motives which induced his right hon. Friend to return the answer which he gave; but dealing simply with the Motion put before the House, and advising them to the best of his ability upon the subject, he ventured to suggest that they should come to no such Resolution as that which was proposed. Its only effect could be to mis-state the law; and even if such a statement were put forward it would have no binding effect upon the Judges or Courts of this country. The right hon. Baronet seemed to have misunderstood the question, which was not decided without long consideration, the learned counsel having asked for time to prepare, and, having investigated the authorities and found what he could, the judgment of the Court was still against him. That learned Judge, Lord Campbell, while clearly laying down the principle upon which alone the writ ought to issue, said that the decision of the Attorney General was in the nature of a judicial function, in which he had a duty to perform towards the people at large, and also towards the Court. If he decided improperly or corruptly, the Attorney General might be made responsible in Parliament and dismissed by the Crown, but the Court had no power to review his decision. Mr. Justice Erle, afterwards Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and one of the most eminent Judges that in modern times adorned the Bench, after stating that it was the duty of the Attorney General in cases of misdemeanour to grant his fiat for a reasonable cause, said that it was equally his duty to refuse it if there was no reasonable cause, and generously added an expression of his own opinion in the following words:—

> "If the Attorney General wished for his private satisfaction to know how, supposing this Court had the supreme jurisdiction which he possesses, we should have exercised the jurisdiction, I, for one, have no objection to say that I should have done as he did, and have refused the writ."

If, then, modern authorities and ancient practice concurred, he wished to know upon what ground the House could now be asked to affirm a totally different principle? The practice and the reasons for it were to be found in books so old that probably their names were unfamiliar to Members of that House—in *Fortescue*, in *Salkeld*, *Borroughs*, and other writers; and these all concurred in declaring that in cases of treason and felony the issue of a writ of error was *ex gratiâ*, and not *ex debito justitiæ*, and in misdemeanour only on probable cause shown. The Judges, moreover, had declared in the strongest manner that the recommendation rested with the Attorney General, and that they had no power to reverse the decision.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he would withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

NAVY—NAVAL MEDALS.

OBSERVATIONS.

CAPTAIN MACKINNON said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the services of Officers, Seamen, and Marines of Her Majesty's Navy, who had not receive decorations in accordance with Admiralty Circulars of June, 1847, 1848, and 1858, which awarded medals to survivors in actions since 1793, a period over fifty years; and to ask, whether Honorary Rewards, as understood by above Circulars, for Gallant Services are to be discontinued? The manner in which all such rewards in the Royal Navy had been bestowed during the last thirty years, had gone far to destroy the value which they ought to possess. This was especially the case in the Syrian, China, and Russian Wars, where many received them without being under fire, or even within hearing of any engagement, really gallant services, meanwhile of various kinds, having been passed over without any recognition. The Admiralty, upon the 7th of June, 1847, issued a circular with reference to the granting of medals, and had this rule been fairly carried out great heartburnings and dissatisfaction would have been prevented. But in the wars which followed there were examples of two medals being worn, for the Black Sea and Baltic, the wearer of which might never have been under fire, and thousands of men in the transport service and in blockading ships received this medal who had never been within sound of an enemy's gun. There would have been no injustice in excluding ships not actually engaged, as no medals were given in the long war with France for blockading or transport service. Even the ships of Nelson's fleet who were absent while the battle of Trafalgar was fought, but returned in time to assist the disabled ships, did not receive the Trafalgar clasp. But the unfairness of the present system would be shown when compared with gallant actions for which no medal had ever been given, although the deeds themselves were well known and appreciated in naval history. Take, for instance, such cases as the attack on the pirate schooner *Zaragorana* by Captain Walcott, with boats of the *Tyne*, on the 31st of March, 1823. This notorious pirate, who hoisted the black flag, and would neither give nor take quarter, was chased into a narrow creek off Baracoa, in the West Indies. Moored head and stern, with broadside sprung to oppose, she yet was carried with great gallantry against double the number of the assailants. Or take the two actions of Lieutenant Ramsay, commanding the *Black Joke* tender, in one of which, after a desperate and continuous fight of some hours, he captured the *Marinerito*, with five guns and seventy-seven men, more than double the force of the *Black Joke.*

Notice taken that Forty Members are not present:—House counted; and Forty Members being found present—

CAPTAIN MACKINNON resuming, said, he would not occupy the attention of the House long. He did not press for an immediate reply from the Government, but would rest satisfied with a promise that the matter should be attended to.

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, that in the absence of his right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, he was unable to give his hon. and gallant Friend a definite Answer to the inquiry he had addressed to the Government respecting naval decorations; but he would do so on Tuesday if the Question were repeated. The subject was one which had engaged the attention of several Boards of Admiralty, and he would not fail to bring the matter under the notice of the present Board.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £87,615, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam."

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN moved that the Chairman report Progress. He was not a very young Member of the House, but he had never seen anything so extraordinary as what had just occurred. He had waited from nine o'clock until twenty minutes to twelve to hear Mr. Speaker call upon him, in accordance with what he submitted was the custom of the House. He supposed that Mr. Speaker was putting the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member (Captain Mackinnon), and he did not for a moment suppose that the Question being put was whether the House should go into Committee of Supply. The custom of the House was that the fairest chance should be given to all hon. Members, on whatever side of the House they sat; and he really felt inclined to doubt whether he could be awake, the scene that had just passed was of so unusual a character. To say the least, it was very sharp practice.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan.*)

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he was greatly surprised at the course taken by hon. Members. In the first place, an hon. and gallant Member was simply calling attention to a subject, and no Motion was before the House except that the Speaker leave the Chair. The Speaker waited some time, and then put the Question most distinctly that he should leave the Chair, which was carried, for no one objected to it, and he left the Chair in the ordinary course.

Colonel FRENCH said, that the right hon. Gentleman had not given a very accurate description of what had passed. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Henry Lennox) was in conversation with Mr. Speaker at the close of the speech of the hon. and gallant Member (Captain Mackinnon); but it was impossible for the House to know the nature of the conversation, and he thought that at least Mr. Speaker had taken hon. Members by surprise; he thought that the hon. Members whose names were on the Paper ought to have been called on before the Question was put. Without any notice or understanding of what course Mr. Speaker was about to take, the right hon. Gentleman left the Chair, although he called the right hon. Gentleman's attention when he was on the step of the Chair. He thought there ought to be an understanding between hon. Members and the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. DISRAELI said, he thought the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel French) was mistaken in his recollection. So far as his (Mr. Disraeli's) experience went—and it was not inconsiderable — the Speaker had followed the usual course. It had never been the practice to call the names of Members who had given Notice of Amendments on going into Supply. He should, however, be happy to give any assistance in his power to enable Members who considered themselves aggrieved to bring forward their Motions on an early day. When he looked at the Paper he did not see that any serious injury had been done to any hon. Gentleman; but even if so, it had been by his own inadvertence. There were two or three Notices on the Paper which took precedence of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman's—one relating to the Royal Irish Academy, which was a very fertile subject, and after that a Motion on the subject of the Privy Council and the importation of foreign cattle. These would have occupied the available time of the House if they had come on, so that he had sustained no injury whatever, even if the Speaker had waited until it came to his turn. His Question was, moreover, addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and as his right hon. Friend was absent, and the Question was one which he alone could answer, the Government would have been obliged to appeal to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to postpone his Question. He felt certain it would not be his wish to obstruct the progress of Public Business. The hon. Member for Dudley (Mr. H. B. Sheridan) would also have had no opportunity of bringing forward his Motion if those before him on the Paper had been called upon. He trusted he would withdraw his Motion, because if Progress were reported it would not furnish the hon. Gentleman with any remedy, or enable him to bring forward the subject of his Notice.

Mr. OTWAY said, that though he was inconvenienced by what had occurred, yet he was perfectly willing to submit with good humour. There was, however, no opportunity, except on Fridays, for private Members to bring any matter under the attention of the House, Tuesdays having now been taken from them, so that they had only three more nights this Session. He must say that the Speaker distinctly put the Question that he should leave the Chair, and he (Mr. Otway) remained quiet, thinking that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel French) was about to rise. The Prime Minister was willing to give every facility he could to private Members to bring on their Business, and therefore he would make the small return of offering no obstruction to the progress of Public Business.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, that on Tuesdays every Motion was a substantive Motion put from the Chair, and the practice was for the Speaker to call upon every Member to make his Motion. But on Friday there was technically only one Motion, and the various Notices were merely Amendments to the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair. It was then "each man for himself."

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he had erroneously expected that Mr. Speaker would have called upon each Member having Notices on the Paper.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

Colonel SYKES lamented that he had to address the House at that late hour (a few minutes to twelve o'clock), when, after a lengthened sitting, he could not hope to command its attention. Time was when Mr. Brotherton used to move the adjournment of the House at midnight, and it would be well for the interests of the country if the practice were resumed, particularly on nights when Estimates were proposed. He would prefer postponing his Motion; but, if the House wished it, he would proceed! ["Go on."] Well, then, he rose to move that the salary of the Envoy and Chief Superintendent at Pekin be put on the same footing as that of the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary and Consul General in Japan, and said he should lament exceedingly if it were thought that in making this Motion he desired to depreciate the services of Sir Rutherford Alcock, our Envoy in Pekin. The votes for diplomatic salaries had gone on increasing year by year. There was a net increase of £16,632 this year for the diplomatic service of China, Japan, and Siam, the total amount being £100,983 last year and £117,615 for the coming year. Colonel Crossman had moreover reported in favour of building houses for the diplomatic, judicial, and consular services at an expense of £171,402, and there was in addition a sum of £7,500 to be asked for the purchase of a wharf for the Admiralty at Shanghai. He contended that the salary of £6,000 per annum was now disproportionate to the duties of the Envoy. There was no such thing as an Executive Government in China. The Emperor was a boy of twelve years of age, in the guidance of two women—the widows of the last Emperor—the provinces were in the hands of viceroys who had enough to do to hold their own against rebellions which existed in many of the viceroyalties, and the viceroys either could not obey or slighted the mandates from Pekin, where the authority was so feeble that it could not guarantee the safety of its Ambassador to Europe—Mr. Burlinghame, on his short journey from Pekin to Tien-Tsin—rebels, even in the vicinity of the capital, rendering the roads dangerous, and Mr. Burlinghame was only enabled to reach Tien-Tsin by the aid of British sailors. Under such circumstances, the position of Sir Rutherford Alcock was most undignified, for he was accredited to an impotent Government which could not fulfil any engagements it might enter into with him. The treaty of Tien-Tsin, for example, contained clauses respecting transit duties, of vital importance to the foreign trader, which were violated by the local Mandarins; and the remonstrances of our Minister were wholly without effect. The salary of our Envoy and Chief Superintendent at Pekin was £6,000, which was a large sum compared with the salaries and allowances of our Envoys and diplomatic agents in different parts of the world. Sir Henry Parkes, our Envoy Extraordinary in Japan, whose life was daily exposed to the utmost risk from the fanaticism of the Japanese people, and whose labours were ceaseless, received only £4,000 a year. In conclusion, while entertaining the highest respect for Sir Rutherford Alcock, he felt it his duty, in the interest of the British taxpayer, to move that the Minister's salary be reduced from £6,000 to £4,000 per annum.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the item of £6,000, for the Envoy and Chief Superintendent in China, be reduced by the sum of £2,000."—(*Colonel Sykes.*)

Lord STANLEY said, he could hardly think the hon. and gallant Gentleman was in earnest in making that proposition. [Colonel Sykes: Quite.] Nobody understood Chinese affairs better than the hon. and gallant Member; but when he urged that the salaries of our Ministers at Pekin and in Japan should be the same, he forgot that our commercial interest was exactly ten times greater in China than it was in Japan. That was one ground of the difference between the salaries of the two Ministers. Again, China was a very distant country, and every article of European comfort was very expensive at Pekin, where there were no hotels, and they could not expect to get service there at the same price as in Europe. Our countrymen naturally looked to the Envoy for hospitality. As to the weakness of the Chinese Government, with that we had nothing to do. If the Taepings got the upper hand—which they had not done and did not seem likely to do—we should recognize them as the *de facto* Government. With regard to the execution of the treaty of Tien-Tsin there was a Minister from the Court of Pekin accredited to Europe to take that question into consideration. That, therefore, was no reason for diminishing the salary of our Minister in China: £6,000 a year was not an unreasonable sum to pay the person who at the other end of the world was charged with commercial interests involving £60,000,000 or £70,000,000, and which were rapidly increasing.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, the mission appeared to be altogether one of a very expensive character. He objected to the largeness of the Vote, and still more to its increase year after year. £172,000 was a heavy sum per annum to pay for China. There were abundance of Scotchmen in China seeking situations, and there would be no difficulty in finding men at less salaries than were now paid.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he hoped the hon. and gallant Member would not press his Amendment to a division. The sum proposed was by no means too great for a Minister in China.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

COLONEL SYKES then moved that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £500, the salary of the Vice Consul at Taku. The place, he said, consisted of a little more than a mud shore and a few huts, and literally contained no house in which an European gentleman could reside. There were three Consuls at Tien-Tsin, and a Vice-Consul at Taku. The three former were absent, and the work of the four had to be done by the Vice Consul at Taku. The services of the latter could very well be dispensed with.

LORD STANLEY pointed out that Taku was the port of Tien-Tsin, and that the last Returns showed that ninety-two British ships had been cleared and ninety-one entered there. The trade, which was a growing trade, was only just beginning to be developed, and a salary of £500 a year to the person who looked after our interests at Taku was, under the circumstances, he thought, not too much.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Item of £500, for Salary of the Vice Consul at Taku, be omitted from the proposed Vote," — (*Colonel Sykes,*)—put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £36,314, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Extraordinary Expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad."

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK objected to the payment of sums of money to Noblemen for going to Russia and Austria to invest the Sovereigns of those countries with the Order of the Garter, and moved that the Vote be reduced by £2,500.

MR. LABOUCHERE thought the expenses of these official ceremonies were very extravagant. The Persian Boundary Commission, he believed, was in a state of suspended animation as regarded everything but the charge for which it appeared on the Estimates. He observed that a charge of £478 was made for the extraordinary expenses of the mission at Frankfort. There was a large number of Englishmen there, and there were also great commercial interests requiring the attention of the Consul, who received no pay. He thought that the whole system of unpaid Consuls was bad.

LORD STANLEY said that it would, no doubt, be more satisfactory to have all Consuls paid; but if the system of paying all Consuls were introduced, the House must make up its mind to increase the Estimates by something like £100,000. He had been in hopes that they had heard the last of the Persian Boundary Commission, but some delay had arisen within the last year, and he could only say that he trusted it would not again appear on the Estimates. With respect to the investiture of Foreign Sovereigns with the Order of the Garter, he observed that that was an international compliment, and it was the practice of all the great Powers of Europe reciprocally to confer similar compliments.

Motion made, and Question,

"That a sum, not exceeding £33,814, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Extraordinary Expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad,'—(*Mr. Lusk,*)

—put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £52,950, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Salaries and Allowances of Governors, &c., and for other Expenses in certain Colonies."

Sir WILLIAM GALLWEY moved that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again." — (*Sir William Gallwey.*)

Mr. DISRAELI said, he feared that when, after a Morning's Sitting, the House resumed at nine, hon. Members were in danger of supposing that twelve o'clock was midnight, and feeling as if they had been sitting for a long time, whereas they were in fact only commencing the Public Business. He hoped that they might be allowed to proceed.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH: This is a proof of the inconvenience of sitting at two o'clock.

Sir WILLIAM GALLWEY: The right hon. Gentleman does not attend here at eleven o'clock and sit on Committee till four.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH: I hope the hon. Baronet will allow these last three Votes of Class V. to be taken.

Sir WILLIAM GALLWEY assented.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £3,072, to complete the sum for Orange River Territory and St. Helena.

(5.) £9,231, to complete the sum for Emigration.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported upon *Monday* next;

Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

BRISTOL WRIT.

Mr. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE, in rising to move that Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Bristol, in the room of John William Miles, Esquire, whose Election has been determined to be void, said, that Bristol had for a long time past been exceedingly ill-treated, and had, in fact, been made the foot-ball of contending parties. During the passing of the Reform Bill through the House a very large minority regarded Bristol as a city of so much importance that they voted in favour of an additional Member being given her. At that time the constituency was practically represented by a single Member, the other representative abstaining from all part in the proceedings. It was, indeed, understood that the Gentleman to whom he had referred would have retired from the House, but for the fact that those in whose hands he had placed his resignation regarded the interests of party as paramount to every other consideration. Bristol was still being bandied about from party to party. It was only a very few days after the late election was declared void that an hon. Member on the other side of the House gave Notice that he would move for the issuing of the Writ. At the time the Notice was given, it was supposed that the candidate who belonged to the party opposite would have been returned without opposition, but as soon as it was found that that was not to be the case the Notice was withdrawn. A similar Notice was subsequently given by another hon. Member, and that Notice was also withdrawn. If the Committee by whom the validity of the last election had been decided had reported that bribery had extensively prevailed he should not for a moment have thought of making this Motion so soon after the issue of their Report; but the Committee reported that they "had no reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed, regard being had to the number of registered electors." His hon. Friend the Chairman of that Committee had assured him that when that evidence was in the hands of Members the Report would be fully confirmed. He trusted that, under these circumstances, the House would see the propriety of giving to Bristol its full share of representation.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Bristol, in the room of John William Miles, esquire, whose Election has been determined to be void." — (*Mr. Neville-Grenville.*)

Mr. BASS moved, as an Amendment—

> "That no Writ be issued for the City of Bristol until seven days after the evidence taken before the Election Committee for that city shall have been in the hands of Members."

He had no doubt when the matter came to be fully discussed they would find out much more than what appeared on the surface. One of the principal citizens of Bristol, for instance, had assured him that for one case of bribery exposed before the Committee at least another dozen could have been proved, while at the present moment he believed that corruption, intimidation, treating, and bribery were being resorted to almost beyond precedent, under the idea that owing to the short time that the existence of the present Parliament was to be prolonged any examination by a Committee into the proceedings would be out of the question.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "no Writ be issued for the City of Bristol until seven days after the evidence taken before the Election Committee for that city shall have been in the hands of Members,"—(*Mr. Bass,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH seconded the Amendment of the hon. Member for Derby (Mr. Bass). He believed that the House ought to take every opportunity in its power of discouraging the bribery and other malpractices which so extensively prevailed at elections. He protested against the notions that the amount of corruption was to be considered with relation to the size of the constituency, and that where one member of a family had been unseated for corruption, another member of the same family should step into the seat and profit by the bribery.

Mr. ADAM explained that the Motion for the issue of a Writ which he had placed on the Paper had been withdrawn out of deference to a general feeling on that side of the House against such a course being adopted, and he trusted that the Motion would not now be pressed.

Mr. HOWES said, that as Chairman of the Committee by whom the validity of the late election was decided, he would beg to remind the House that the evidence taken by the Committee had not yet been laid on the table. The Committee had, it was true, reported that bribery did not appear to have extensively prevailed, regard being had to the number of registered electors. The House should bear in mind the fact that Bristol contained 15,000 electors, while the total number of persons proved to have been guilty of corrupt practices was, if he remembered rightly, forty-six. Even supposing that double the number of cases of bribery proved before the Committee had occurred—though this had never been suggested as probable—it would not show that bribery extensively prevailed, for fifty cases out of a constituency of 15,000 were a very different thing from as many cases out of a constituency of 200. As to intimidation, though charged in the Petition, it was distinctly withdrawn by counsel, and it was admitted that Mr. Miles had no complicity in the corrupt practices which had voided his return, while on the other side no imputation was made against his competitor, Mr. Morley. Under these circumstances, he thought the reflections which had been passed on Bristol were unjust, and it should be remembered that that city had for some time been placed in a very anomalous and unfair position. He regretted, however, that this Motion had been proposed, for he thought it would be a bad precedent to press such a Motion before the House was in possession of the evidence. If the House divided upon it he should, as Chairman of the Committee, abstain from voting.

Mr. H. BERKELEY said, he concurred in the remarks of the hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Howes). He had always deprecated any transfer of jurisdiction with regard to Election Petitions, and he thought the Committee in the Bristol case had given an illustration of the fairness which characterized the present tribunal. He protested, however, against the Act of Parliament under which Election Petitions were tried, and according to which it was almost impossible to fix any blame upon the candidate. The poorer classes were dealt with readily enough; not so with the classes above them. If the poorer classes bribed and received bribes, where did the money come from? Still he felt convinced that Mr. Miles, and all the family of the Mileses, were incapable of countenancing bribery. He hoped Her Majesty's Government were not making a party move of this question. He thought Her Majesty's Government ought not to countenance the issue of a Writ for Bristol. Nothing could be gained by having a Member in the

House for only three weeks. No reason had been given for the Motion, while there were many reasons against it. Great excitement prevailed in the city, and violence such as was only to be found in a Bristol mob—he did not even except the "lambs" of Nottingham. It was therefore impossible to calculate the mischief and disturbance which might ensue if an election were held now.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that while hoping to see Mr. Miles returned on a future occasion, he thought it was unreasonable to expect that he should go through a contest in order to fill the seat for two or three weeks. He should therefore vote for the Amendment.

Mr. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE said, he was willing, in deference to the opinion of hon. Members, to withdraw his Motion. He denied, however, the existence in Bristol of violence or Saturnalia.

Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 6, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading—* Burials (Ireland) * (212); Land Writs Registration (Scotland) * (213); Registration * (218).

*Second Reading—*Medway Regulation Act Continuance * (199); Bank of Bombay * (196); County General Assessment (Scotland) * (190); Courts of Law Fees, &c. (Scotland) * (189).

*Committee—*County Courts Admiralty Jurisdiction * (108-219); Vagrant Act Amendment * (138); Boundary (170).

*Report—*Army Chaplains * (146); Vagrant Act Amendment * (138); Boundary (170); Representation of the People (Scotland) (192-220).

*Third Reading—*Liquidation * (181), and *passed.*

*Withdrawn—*Metropolitan Regulations * (149); Industrial Schools Act (1866) Amendment * (151); Metropolis Local Management Acts Amendment * (169).

NOVA SCOTIA—PETITIONS.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Lord CAMPBELL: My Lords, I have two Petitions—one from the Delegates, one from the Inhabitants of Nova Scotia, both for the same object—namely, the withdrawal of that colony from the operation of the recent Act on British North America—a withdrawal which would bring it into the same position as Prince Edward's Island and Newfoundland, since these are both attached to Great Britain as before, and able to join Canada whenever it seems good to them. Such is the aim of the Petitioners, but such is not the object of the Motion which I have the honour to submit. It is for inquiry on the spot into the alleged dissatisfaction of the colony, with a view to avert risks which are not distant but immediate; above all, with a view to save Confederation from the blow which threatens its existence. Having last Session taken an humble part in supporting the demand of Nova Scotia for a respite until their General Election had occurred, I have been asked to bring the subject forward. Delays have taken place for which I am not in any way responsible. However trying to myself, they have this compensation—that we have still the freedom to deliberate upon the affairs of Nova Scotia; that it is not too late to guard against an error which might have been beyond the power of recalling. My Lords, amidst many circumstances of a nature to depress anyone who brings this question under the notice of the House, there is one at least of hope and of encouragement. It is that no one is committed against the line of action I am going to recommend. The despatch of the noble Duke the Secretary for the Colonies contains arguments against the Repeal of the Act on British North America, but none against inquiry. Neither the late Government nor the present, nor the noble Earl who introduced the Act, nor the noble Marquess who used to govern Nova Scotia, in the debates of last year advanced the startling proposition, that if discontent arose in any part of British North America which had been confederated, it should not be an object of inquiry by Great Britain. It is clear that where Confederation leads to discontent, its partizans are rather bound by self-respect to court inquiry than resist it. Even if some weeks ago the Government concurred in a Vote of the House of Commons to withhold it, the aspect of the subject is now still graver than it was; and the well-known fact that such a Vote has aggravated the bitter feelings which existed in the colony, releases them from any obligation to demand its weak, subservient, and impolitic renewal of your Lordships. My Lords, it will greatly shorten the task I have before me, and thus diminish the fatigue which might arise from it, to place before the House the real issue in debate, and disengage it from the false issues which are too frequently confounded with it. Indeed, were this effectually done, my duty would be over; for if the proper issue is acknowledged, there can hardly remain a doubt as to the answer which it merits. My Lords, I therefore anxiously maintain that the issue is not as to whether British North America ought to be confederated. I am ready to concede anything which noble Lords desire upon the subject. It may be a sagacious policy to lay materials for balancing excessive power on the other side of the Atlantic. Such instances as the Achæan League, the Swiss Cantons, the United Provinces of Holland, the great Republic of America, may show that, against considerable risks, a federated system can defend itself. As an exit to the difficulties which for some time hung over Canada, within certain limits, no doubt, Confederation is entitled to applause. And if the object of our statesmanship is to pave the way for independence in British North America, Confederation very likely will accelerate it. But let not this House be ensnared into a debate upon a question which is not now before them. So, too, with regard to the preliminary circumstances by which Nova Scotia was included in the measure. How far their people have been steady in their objects — how far their politicians have been uniform in language — are points just now entirely irrelevant. Let it be granted, if you will, that, in the face of a petition from 30,000 men for reference to the opinion of the colony, the Bill was not precipitately carried. Your Lordships have not met to-day to explore the wisdom of the scheme, or to investigate its origin, or criticize its authors, but to consider how to meet an actual emergency. Does the existing discontent of Nova Scotia require conciliatory treatment—not from justice, but from prudence? If it does, what treatment would be adequate is the only point which comes under the legitimate attention of your Lordships. It will be incumbent upon me to give proofs of the existing discontent, and to place on a firm ground the necessity of meeting it at present; but it is better first perhaps to answer the question which must occur to every noble Lord—namely, what is the exact danger to be associated with it? The answer to that question is too easy—the discontent points to separation, not from Canada, but from the Empire. Supposing that coercion was endorsed by public feeling in Great Britain—supposing it was not actually prohibited in the United States it would be certain to cause a flame of sympathy with the insurgents. New Brunswick, adjoining Nova Scotia, would be most likely drawn into the current. Maine is conterminous with the greater portion of New Brunswick. Irregular support might very quickly pass over the boundary. The Government of Washington, however much it is esteemed abroad, at home is far from being omnipotent. With the best intentions, they may soon become an object of remonstrance. Remonstrance between Cabinets may end in war, and must in further alienation. War with the United States on many grounds is deprecated by Great Britain, but more especially on this one, that, unlike other wars, in whatever manner it results, it can never raise our influence among the countries which surround us. But if Nova Scotia is abandoned Halifax is lost. On its value as a maritime and military post it would be presumptuous on my part to venture an opinion. But on this vital point I have felt bound to refer to one of the most interesting documents colonial literature furnishes—the Report of the Select Committee on the Defence of the Colonies, appointed by the House of Commons in 1861, and for which the world is indebted to the labours of Mr. Arthur Mills. Before that Committee, the most distinguished men, political and military, united in a chorus on the necessity of retaining Halifax; and to that chorus I may give to the noble Earl who generally sits on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) what may seem in his case the unaccustomed office of a Leader. Earl Grey, in his evidence, assigned Halifax to the same category as Malta and Gibralta, a place important to our naval power, because fleets could be re-fitted there. The Duke of Newcastle, who a short time before had travelled in America, regarded it as valuable in the light of a military post, but still more in the light of a naval station, inasmuch as it is one of the finest, if not the finest, harbour in the world. Mr. Herman Merivale, whose name has been so long familiar to the public as a great Colonial authority, referred to Halifax as a stronghold for the protection of our commerce, and used that remarkable expression, that he deemed it a kind of insurance against war with the United States. These are politicians. But Rear Admiral Erskine held that in the event of war with the United States, Bermuda and Halifax would be both of them essential. Rear Admiral Sir Charles Elliot thought Halifax the most important naval station of the Empire. Sir John Burgoyne considered the Mauritius, Bermuda, and Halifax, as all essential to our power, and acknowledged the importance which the navy habitually attribute to the latter. The loss of Halifax, under embarrassments which tend to involve us with the United States, might fairly be accepted as a second element of danger. The third is obvious in a moment. If Nova Scotia violently left us, and became absorbed into another State, the rest of British America would not be easily defended. At least Confederation would receive a blow which could not be repaired. So long as she is yours, she can always form a part of any system you combine; when she has ceased to belong to you the combination cannot be restored, and the disruption is not temporary but eternal.

My Lords, I have given a rough outline of the hazard we incur should the existing discontent become more serious and active. I will now attempt to place the discontent beyond the range of incredulity. The necessity of meeting it in no way depends upon the adequacy or inadequacy of its causes. But by glancing at them for a moment, the House is better qualified, perhaps, to judge of its importance. It appears to have arisen partly from these circumstances. In 1863, a General Election took place in Nova Scotia, at which the question of confederating British North America was never mentioned on the hustings. It was understood to be dismissed, and did not therefore challenge any verdict from the Province. The Assembly, which was thus formed, alone empowered Delegates to come over and assist in London to frame the Act on British North America. But the Delegates exceeded their authority when they committed Nova Scotia to a system which Prince Edward's Island and Newfoundland determined not to enter. Unless supported by these maritime dependencies, Nova Scotia could not join a central body with advantage or with dignity. Another fact might by itself create a deep dissatisfaction. Between 1863 and 1867 an organic change was carried in the right of voting at constituencies. Organic changes of this kind, adopted after full debate, in any country, whether they form a democratic step or one which is not democratic, are an indisputable title to a new election before another great political conclusion is arrived at. But all the sanction, if there be sanction which Nova Scotia ever gave to the Act on British America, emerges from a Parliament whose basis was condemned, while the hostility surrounding it proceeds from the new electoral arrangements, which, in spite of a grave demand, we were not willing to refer to. As regards Canadian legislation, since the Act has worked, the greatest topic of complaint resides in the *ad valorem* duties which have been raised to 15 per cent. Such a measure, however requisite for Canada, whose revenue arises from these sources, is not the less repugnant to a colony, which aspires to Free Trade, which scatters vessels among all the harbours of the world, and which depends on imports and on exports. But there is something deeper than commercial regulations to explain the variance we have to deal with at this moment. To those who have traced its history, however superficially, it is known that Nova Scotia leans towards Great Britain. From the time of James I. the people have been uniformly loyal. In the war which founded the United States, in that of 1812, in all the Canadian rebellions, they have been unmoveable in their allegiance. Not contemplating separate existence, they desire to prolong and strengthen their connection with this country—their views, their objects, and their interests are British. If we may judge it by the language of its founders, the new Dominion has an opposite propensity. If we may judge it by its recent indications, the ties which bind it to this country may dissolve at any moment. The ideas of a dominion in the ordinary course of things would undermine the faith of a dependency. Clinging to the Empire, Nova Scotia cannot easily or quickly be transformed into an harmonious part of an amalgamated whole, which was rather framed to quit, which has not shown at least a disposition to adhere to it. My Lords, the evidence of discontent may very rapidly be stated. The only difficulty is in choosing illustrations or deciding which ought to be first presented to the House. When the Act on British North America was carried, it was necessary to send nineteen Members to the general and thirty-eight to the local Parliament, under the new franchise. Of these only four support Confederation; the remainder, both at Ottawa and Halifax, have actively opposed it. The debates which took place in the latter town last January are the index of what is felt in Nova Scotia. No one who has not read can thoroughly appreciate the unanimity, the indignation, and yet the loyal confidence in British justice which pervades there. Twenty-eight speeches were pronounced in favour of repeal, and one in answer to them. The debates led to Resolutions against the Act on British North America, which have been embodied in an Address to the Crown. They led to the appointment of the Delegates who have been in London since the spring to demand redress for Nova Scotia. After referring to these regular and constitutional expressions of opinion, it is superfluous to mention the public meetings which have taken place against Confederation in every county of the Province. Agitation does little to enhance the facts I have adduced, but it is sufficient proof that the new Parliament has not misrepresented the opinions which surround it. The existing sentiment is forcibly betrayed by this remarkable occurrence — the Canadian Government during the present year, are not prepared to call out the Nova Scotian Militia. But if your Lordships want a crowning proof of discontent, you have it in this manner. Although for months the Delegates have been in London, using every effort which was open to them to enlist on the side they were commissioned to espouse, the feelings of this country; although their labours have been known to every man in Nova Scotia no kind of counter delegation, or petition, or voice, or whisper has been heard of, and there has been no attempt to interrupt their progress or to balance their authority. By every form of Parliamentary and public demonstration the undivided feeling of the colony has been pronounced against the union with Canada. But in point of fact, my Lords, the dissatisfaction will not be contested, and there is no occasion to bring it in its full proportions under the notice of the House. The ground invariably taken by the rash advisers who stand in the way of all conciliation at this moment, is that the feeling which sent the Delegates over the Atlantic will pass away so rapidly that it is useless to allay it. No man who is not gifted with the prescience which belongs to the Creator could guarantee such an event, and it would be infatuation therefore, to rely upon it. But will the House permit me to explain to them with what rapidity the discontent must pass away, in order that this arrogant and empty calculation may be a pretext for the conduct it encourages. The local Parliament of Halifax meets again on the 8th of August. With a view to join its proceedings, the Delegates on Saturday embarked for Nova Scotia. The same Members will assemble there whose Resolutions led to their appointment. The twenty-eight speakers, whose language found an echo in the colony, will again be present. The Assembly must again consider its position. It must either turn its back upon conclusions the most solemn, or be forced into reluctant opposition to this country, unless in the meanwhile something has been granted to it. The point to be considered is, will the discontent have passed away before the 8th of August if it has not been assuaged? Will it pass away before that moment, if everything has been done which can be done to aggravate and to embitter it? My Lords, this circumstance suffices to establish the urgent and immediate want of some conciliatory measure to guard against irreparable differences, which a few weeks may bring about, whether the discontent is doomed to last, or springs from causes utterly ephemeral and fugitive. I am not, therefore, bound to measure its duration beyond the moment I have pointed to. At that moment it may lead to steps which cannot be receded from. In the meanwhile we have no neutral path. We act before the world—400,000 men are looking to our sentence. Unless by granting we abate the discontent, we must inflame it by refusing. It is, therefore, unnecessary to show what I have shown incidentally—that its foundations are rather durable than transitory. It is unnecessary to overthrow the idle theory which sciolists have mooted —that populations are always reconciled to unions which they regard with horror at the outset; a theory which may have been suggested to them by a well-known character of Sheridan, in "*The Rivals,*"—Mrs. Malaprop,—who laid down "That the best marriages were those which began with a little mutual aversion." I need not remind the House that in 1830 Holland and Belgium did break loose from one another, and that some centuries before Spain and Portugal were not long combined under one sceptre. I need not maintain either what I should maintain without fear were it incumbent on us that the union of States, and federation of dependencies, do not fall under one law and cannot be confounded in their probable development. A mass of argument may be abandoned, which many of your Lordships would have felt bound in my position to adduce, if you will only bear in mind that the Business of the Empire, with a view to its security, is to remove the state of feeling which pourtrayed itself at Halifax, in January, before it has in August the opportunity of ripening to danger. Without some conciliatory measure you are not entitled to assume, you have not any shadow of a reason to suppose that it will vanish before August. What that measure ought to be is the only further point to be determined by your Lordships.

My Lords, the inquiry which I move for—the repeal which the Petitioners declared are the conciliatory measures which present themselves. And, although, I will not admit that the withdrawal of Nova Scotia from the union could be attended with any greater disadvantages than attach to the present isolation of Prince Edwards Island and Newfoundland, I will admit that the time has not arrived for altering the Act on British North America, however recklessly adopted. Canada has sent a representative to deprecate it; to grant nothing to Canadian views might be as far from prudence and reserve, as to grant everything to Canadian views would be remote from magnanimity and justice. When two colonial interests are rivals before Parliament it is not desirable that either should be allowed to trample on the other. To guard as far as possible against Canadian resentment or Canadian embarrassment, inquiry on the spot may be a requisite preliminary to any alteration in the Act on British North America. We know because the delegates assured us that Nova Scotia would accept it as a guarantee for the removal of the evils under which they labour at this moment. Indeed, an instant change in the Act on British North America could not be effected. It can only be brought about by an Imperial enactment which the present state of Public Business in the Houses would forbid. Inquiry is therefore the alternative. But I am far from wishing to contend that inquiry in any shape whatever would be equal to the danger which impends so nearly; or meet the agitated feelings of the colony as a substitute for the repeal which their Petition has demanded. An inquiry conducted by a new Governor General of Canada—and something of the kind has been alluded to—passing Halifax upon his route to Ottawa, would no doubt be taken rather as a mockery than a consession. He could only be regarded as the living organ of the power against which Nova Scotia is inflamed. Whatever labour he employed, he must either come to one conclusion or encounter a resenting interest in Canada, to paralyze the very functions he was sent out to discharge. If superhuman virtue rendered him impartial, impartiality would never be ascribed to him. And supposing him, on just and proper grounds, to hold that Nova Scotia ought not to share the independence of Prince Edward's Island and Newfoundland, his report would simply excite distrust, while our object is not only to arrive at truth, but recommend it to the colony. The presence at Halifax of such a man with such a duty would be more likely to accelerate a riot than prevent one. But a Commission sent out from this country for the *bonâ fide* purpose of inquiry, and not identified with Canada, would have several distinct effects which ought to be presented to your Lordships. It would at once create a breathing time and respite. It would at once suspend the animosity which threatens us. We should no longer have to fear a hostile resolution from the Parliament at Halifax, of such a kind as to produce a grave Imperial dilemma. No disaster could arise until inquiry was exhausted. So far the Delegates assure us. Another practical effect of such a measure would be to draw out, if it exists, from the hiding-places which conceal it, the Nova Scotian party who support Confederation. The apparent unanimity against it would be severely tested. It would also have a salutary influence in Canada. Whatever can be done by the Canadian Legislature to remedy the discontent of Nova Scotia, would be done with zeal where Great Britain had determined to examine it. Inquiry of this nature, therefore, tends at once to disperse the cloud which hangs over a portion of the Empire and to elicit all the agencies by which the Act on British North America may possibly be vindicated. The kind of objections with which it has hitherto been met are such as I hope to hear tonight, because objections of a certain character do more than anything to confirm impartial men in favour of the course which they endeavour to disparage. They are nothing but a delicate avowal of logical resistance in extremes, and rather signals of distress than tokens of hostility. It has been said that an inquiry into the discontent of Nova Scotia would disturb the Government of Ottawa, and it might have been alleged at the same time, perhaps, the Government of Pekin. The Government of Ottawa must be frail indeed if such a measure would endanger it. The inquiry would first take place in Nova Scotia; it might be useful to extend it to New Brunswick. Canadian views might be effectually sounded at Toronto and Quebec, and the Commission need not go to Ottawa at all, if it was dreaded as the nurse of factions hostile to the Government. It has been said that Great Britain has renounced her title to examine the complaints of her dependencies, even when they call on her to do so; but it has never been pointed out at what time or in what manner: to such shadows are men driven when they oppose a course of which they see the policy and justice. We are sometimes warned that an inquiry would inflame or agitate the colony: as if it could be more unsettled than it is, when all its constitutional authorities protest against the system you impose; and when you cannot arm its population with impunity. The most ingenuous and startling objection is that inquiry must lead to the withdrawal of Nova Scotia from the Union. The supporters of that Union betray a modest estimate of their production, when they avow that the moment you explore, Nova Scotia must be separated from it, and that to probe their wrongs is but another term for acquiescing in their remedy. My Lords, I disclaim the admission that repeal would be the unavoidable conclusion of inquiry. But if it is, what are we to think of those who venture to withhold it, and yet maintain the act they think it certain to expose, so far as it governs the relations of Nova Scotia and Canada? What objection can remain, then, to a course so moderate, so constitutional, so necessary? Shall we be told it is unprecedented? I am not quite certain that it is, or that when the troubles of America began between 1765 and 1795 a Commission of some kind was not appointed to compose them. But if the measure is unprecedented, it is because at that conjuncture it was wanting. And ought that to be regarded as a final argument against it? My Lords, had it been resorted to, blood might never have been shed at Lexington, or Congress met at Philadelphia, or the name of Bunker's Hill have become familiar to the world. Had it been resorted to, we might not have now observed a stream of bitterness directed towards Ireland, a rival on the ocean, and in the torn remnant of our North American possessions a greater source of danger than of power. If, indeed, the measure is unprecedented, and if the absence of the precedent has led to these results, what fact could lend a weight more tragic and convincing to the case of those who urged it now upon the Legislature? My Lords, I ask your Lordships to adopt it, not because its omission in former times has been the source of griefs impossible to number and evils yet to come, but because it meets the exigency of the moment—because it involves the imminence of action where inaction would be fatal—because you cannot do less to encounter Nova Scotian discontent; and you must do something to encounter it, or be prepared to add the burden of a colonial and international embarrassment to the tasks of an exhausted Government and deeply agitated time. Beyond this, I recommend it to your Lordships because, as far as I can judge, you have two objects—to uphold Confederation, to keep Nova Scotia in the Empire; and because it is the single path by which those objects can be compassed. The noble Lord concluded by moving—

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to appoint a Commission to proceed to Nova Scotia for the Purpose of examining the Causes of the alleged Dissatisfaction, with a View to their Removal."—(*The Lord Stratheden.*)

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM: My Lords, I cannot refrain from expressing my regret that the Motion of the noble Lord, which has been so long on the Notice Paper of the House, has not been brought to an issue at an earlier period after the discussion on the question in "another place," and before the Delegates from Nova Scotia and the other Provinces, who came over to watch the proceedings in this country on behalf of their respective interests had departed. It would have been much better that this question should have been discussed, as I expected it would have been, almost simultaneously in both Houses, rather than that a long time should have been allowed to elapse between the two discussions, and that opportunity should thus have been afforded for the continuance of popular agitation and excitement on the subject. But in asking your Lordships to dissent from the Motion and to leave the matter in the hands of the Government my task is rendered easier by finding from the speech of the noble Lord that the course which has been taken hitherto by the Government has not been altogether unattended with beneficial results. The noble Lord pointed out—and justly pointed out—the danger of any policy which should not be shaped by the policy of conciliation. The noble Lord has omitted to point out the only strong demand made in the Petitions laid before the Parliament of this country by the Delegates who came from Nova Scotia to call attention to the injuries they apprehended from the measure of last Session; and the noble Lord, speaking as the advocate of those who placed their case in his hands, admits that the demand for the repeal of the Confederation Act, which alone was asked for in the Petitions first presented to this House, may now be dismissed from consideration. The noble Lord says the question is now one of inquiry into the depth, the extent, and the causes of the discontent which now prevails—as I admit it does; but I think the measures to be adopted depend greatly upon the grounds of that discontent and upon the extent of it. It seemed to me that the noble Lord avoided pointing out the full state of the case, as regards Nova Scotia. He omitted to notice a prominent fact which it is right should be brought under your notice. It is, that many of the grievances which had been anticipated from the union of the Provinces, and which did actually arise from the first action of the Canadian Parliament, and which were strongly dwelt upon in the Petitions first presented to this House, have been entirely removed by the action of the succeeding Parliament. Some of those who in the recent election for Nova Scotia were returned avowedly to oppose Confederation, yet took a wise and politic course in announcing to their constituents that they would go to Ottawa and see what the result of Confederation was. One grievance strongly dwelt upon was the increase of taxation in Nova Scotia from interference with its revenues; but the noble Lord did not point out that at the time of the Confederation, such was the financial condition of Nova Scotia from the pressure of loans becoming due, that it would have been necessary to increase taxation in order to meet its liabilities quite as much as it had been augmented by the Confederation with Canada. Nor has the noble Lord pointed out that the Confederation has resulted in the entire freedom of commerce from lighthouse and Customs' duties, and other restrictions to which it was formerly subjected. Noble Lords will find that the Parliament of Canada, so far from acting in a spirit of hostility or indifference to the Parliament of Nova Scotia or the maritime Provinces, has, in point of fact, laid down for itself a policy entirely to the contrary effect. It approached the subject of the Dominion with no indication of a reckless desire to involve itself in a large expenditure for the benefit of Canada alone; but, on the contrary, the policy indicated by the Canadian Parliament was conciliatory to the maritime Provinces, and favourable to the interests of shipping and commerce. Indeed it seems to me that Parliament has, as far as it has gone, met the question in a fair and just spirit, and certainly up to the present time there has been no proceeding on its part which would justify the demand in Nova Scotia for inquiry. It is said, however, that the whole Province of Nova Scotia now demands an inquiry, and that it did at one time demand repeal of the Confederation. But this I cannot admit to be the fact. My judgment on this question is not based merely upon the representations of active and able Delegates, but I have endeavoured to ascertain, as well as I can, the real facts of the case. Now, it is a striking fact that, notwithstanding the complaints which have proceeded from Nova Scotia, at the General Election which occurred after the Confederation had been entered into, not one half of the votes in the Province of Nova Scotia were given in favour of the repeal of the Confederation. This circumstance is the more remarkable when it is remembered that there had been a great agitation on the subject going on for a considerable period. The whole constituency under the limited franchise recently introduced was 48,000 or more, while for the successful candidates who were opposed to Confederation only about 22,500 out of the entire number of 48,000 votes were polled. Thus, it seems that, although there was a great change in the representation, there are no facts to show that the feeling in the Province against Confederation was by any means unanimous. Looking at the nature of the alleged grievances, I think the proper course to pursue was to allow the Canadian Parliament the opportunity of showing their determination to remove any grievances that might exist, and that they duly appreciated the importance to themselves of the hearty co-operation of the maritime Provinces, especially Nova Scotia, in establishing the Union. I believe as time goes on the people of Nova Scotia will themselves doubtless arrive at the conclusion that, under the system of government that has now been inaugurated in regard to every branch of their commerce they are more favourably treated and better off than they would have been had they remained independent, or entered into a separate Confederation with Newfoundland or New Brunswick. The noble Lord has referred to a point which I believe was not very strongly dwelt upon by the Delegates themselves—namely, that the authority given to the Delegates by the Province of Nova Scotia, if given at all, was given only in respect of a Confederation in which they were to be one in five, and not one in three. It is hardly necessary to dwell upon that point, because, whatever may have been the instruction originally given to the Delegates, the Government of Nova Scotia expressed their satisfaction at the Confederation Act after it had been introduced into the Imperial Parliament, knowing of course, that it would effect only a Confederation of a limited kind, in which neither Newfoundland nor Prince Edward's Island was included. I understand, however, that the only question now to be decided is what course ought to be pursued in order to allay the discontent which prevails among a large number of the people of Nova Scotia. Now, under the circumstances I should deprecate such an inquiry as has been proposed by the noble Lord—not because there may not be a precedent for the adoption of such a course or because I am opposed to inquiry into grievances wherever a fair ground for it has been established, but because, in my opinion, the Nova Scotians will find that their true interest lies in their union with Canada, and that they are not suffering from the grievances so strongly set forth in their Petition which was presented at the commencement of this Session. The action of the Dominion Parliament will, I think, have very much altered their opinion on this point, and I trust the agitation will to some extent have subsided. It is most important that the people of Nova Scotia should feel at as early a date as possible the beneficial effect of the various measures of relief passed by the Dominion Parliament. I cannot but think that a Commission to inquire into these questions now, before any experience has been arrived at of the operation of the measure, would be calculated to excite false hopes, and to stimulate that discontent which no doubt exists, but for which, I think, there is no good reason—at all events, on the grounds now put forward. There has been another reason alleged why Nova Scotia is an unwilling party to the Confederation—namely, her ancient history and well-known loyalty towards England. That, no doubt, is a feeling which ought not to be disregarded —a feeling which ought not to be lightly passed over; but in affairs of this kind we must look to the course of events generally. In that Province the subject of Confederation was mooted several years ago; and her Parliament debated it, and confirmed the scheme of Confederation which was ultimately passed. I think, therefore, we should pause before we take any steps which would cause hesitation in the minds of persons in Canada or other parts of North America who may be embarking in undertakings in Nova Scotia The policy of Her Majesty's Government has been to point out to the Province the various steps that have been taken to meet the grievances which have been alleged. I cannot but think your Lordships will be of opinion that this is the more prudent course to pursue, and that you will refuse your consent to the Motion of the noble Lord for the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry into those grievances. For Her Majesty's Government I can only say that we shall proceed in a spirit of conciliation towards the Province, and use our influence with Canada in favour of a similar policy on the part of the Dominion Government.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, if any special responsibility in so great a measure as this can be said to attach to any individual, I presume that in this case that responsibility would attach to me; because it fell to my lot, when I filled the same position as that which my noble Friend who has just spoken now holds, to negotiate with the Delegates from North America the terms of the Union which was concluded by the Act of Confederation, and to submit that Act for the approval of the Imperial Parliament. My Lords, I think I may say there has rarely been any settlement so large in its operation which has more completely commanded the assent of all parties in this country. The Act passed through both Houses of Parliament—I cannot say without a dissentient voice, but with very few dissentient voices indeed. At the same time I cannot for a moment allow that it passed without full consideration. The question had occupied the attention of successive Governments here, as it had been fully discussed in the North American Provinces. It is no wonder that this should have been so, because the real question was whether a great country, ruled by the same Sovereign, animated by one feeling of loyalty towards that Sovereign, and—as the noble Duke has remarked — united by natural bonds of interest and designed by nature as one — whether that country should henceforward be consolidated, or should continue to be divided by those artificial divisions which man had set up. I hope I never disguised from Parliament that there was a considerable party in Nova Scotia opposed to the Confederation. I did not conceal anything; I printed every statement on the subject, and even invited the attention of your Lordships to such opposition as did exist. What the character and extent of the opposition were was another question. Parliament, having heard and seen all that had been said on the subject, decided in favour of the measure by no faltering vote; and I think the reasons on which Parliament decided were good and valid reasons. If your Lordships allow me I will refer to dates in order to make the matter clearer. In 1861—the question had been mooted before then, but I shall not go further back than 1861—the House of Assembly in Nova Scotia declared in general terms its assent to a scheme of Confederation. Two years after, in 1863, a new Parliament was convened; and in the following year, 1864, there was a conference of Delegates. First, Delegates of all the maritime Provinces met at Charlottetown, in Prince Edward's Island, to consider the question of a union of the maritime Provinces alone. Subsequently the Canadian Delegates joined in; the conference was transferred to Quebec, and the Quebec Resolutions were the basis on which it was agreed that not one, two, or three, but all the five colonies should be united in a Confederation. In two years afterwards—namely, in 1866, the Parliament of Nova Scotia agreed to the Confederation, not in general, but in explicit and precise terms, and sent over Delegates to settle with Her Majesty's Ministers the terms of the Act. Those Delegates came to this country, and it was my duty to confer with them. In 1867 I introduced the Bill which your Lordships were pleased to pass, and which received the approval of the House of Commons also. When the Act passed and went out to Nova Scotia, it was solemnly ratified by the Parliament of that Province. Immediately, however, on this another dissolution took place and another Parliament was convened in Nova Scotia, and it passed Resolutions against the Act — Resolutions on which the Petitions presented by the noble Lord are founded. That was the course of proceeding. But the noble Lord has said this evening, as he said last year, that knowing there was a certain amount of opposition to the measure, though the character and extent of that opposition were unknown, it was our duty to have tested the feeling of the Province by a dissolution. On constitutional grounds, no doubt, I readily agree that it is never right to take any country or any body by surprise; but I should wholly demur to the doctrine that it is necessary to refer back to the constituencies each particular point, even though important, as it arises. If that were necessary Members of Parliament would not be representatives of the people; they would be simply delegates. This has been repeatedly held by the highest Parliamentary authorities, from Mr. Pitt to Sir Robert Peel. Parliaments that had sat several years, and had been originally called together for the discussion of other questions passed the Act of Union, Roman Catholic Emancipation, and the Repeal of the Corn Laws. But if you look to the peculiar circumstances of these colonies, I think you will find—I say it without any intention of offence — that these changes in public opinion, rapid in all popularly governed countries, are very rapid there; and on no subject have they been more rapid than on this question of Confederation. In 1864 Newfoundland and Prince Edward's Island were favourable to some Confederation. They assented to the Quebec Resolutions, which was a practical embodiment of the Confederation scheme, and which afterwards formed the basis of the Act. Two years later those colonies opposed this principle, to which they had previously declared themselves to be favourable. In 1865 the colony of New Brunswick was opposed to Confederation. In 1866 — the year afterwards — that colony having passed through one of those phases of opinion which frequently set in, was in favour of Confederation, and was incorporated under the Act of last Session. Therefore, I say it was not competent for Parliament last year to look behind the vote of those authorities who had agreed to the scheme of Confederation; it was not our business to disregard or put on one side the accredited envoys from those colonies to us. If there be one thing more than another which representative self-government of the colonies means, it is this—that the Home Government and the Imperial Parliament will only deal with the duly accredited agents of those colonies as representing the local authority, and the adoption of any other principle will lead us into very serious difficulties. The position of affairs last year was a very peculiar one. Your Lordships will, doubtless, remember the Constitution by which Upper and Lower Canada were united. No doubt, that proved in many respects very successful; but in other respects it had run itself out, and when Parliament passed that Act of last year it was perfectly evident to all parties that a dead-lock had arisen in the legislative machinery which governed the relations of Upper and Lower Canada, and that unless some remedy were applied great inconvenience must result. Nor let the House forget that just about the same time there was open and aggressive manifestation of Fenianism upon the border, and that the Fenians had carried fire and sword into an unoffending Province, and were keeping all things in a state of difficulty and disturbance. And therefore it was that parties within the colony—men of all shades of political opinion, holding the most different views, and who for years, had been opposed upon questions of vital importance, made great sacrifices—sacrifices national, political, even religious in their character—and combined in one general policy which they believed to be for the safety and general welfare of the country. I think your Lordships cannot fail to perceive that if at such a moment we had allowed any delay in giving effect to what was the common desire, it must have had the effect of indefinitely postponing any settlement of this question. What is the demand put forward by the noble Lord opposite? The noble Lord says it is the issue of a Commission of Inquiry. But if your Lordships look at the Resolution of the Nova Scotian Parliament upon which that demand is based, you will see that it goes a long way in the direction of guiding the Commission to a conclusion, and indicates that Nova Scotia will be satisfied with nothing less than the repeal of the Confederation by which they are bound to Canada. We must all do justice to the ancient loyalty and high feeling of the Nova Scotians. The noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) did no more than justice when he spoke of Nova Scotia as one of our most ancient and valued colonies, whose feelings towards this country have never for a moment been doubted or questioned; and I feel sure that Parliament, in dealing with a question in which their feelings are so deeply interested would wish to deal, not alone in the most kindly, but in the most respectful manner. At the same time, the Nova Scotians will well understand that in treating this question and arguing upon it we must deal with them as men of sense—not, I hope, giving them offence, but putting before them those solid arguments upon which the question rests. Let it not for a moment be supposed that I contemplate the employment of coercion; I hold that such a word has no place whatever in the vocabulary of the relations that should exist between this country and the colonies. But, at the same time, speaking with perfect frankness and sincerity, I say that from one point of view the demand is premature, and from another point of view that it comes too late. It is premature, because the Confederation which is complained of has not yet been in existence for a single twelvemonth, and, as the noble Duke pointed out, not one-half of the total electors have expressed their opinion upon it. The total constituency amounts to 48,000 electors, and those voting for the repeal of the Confederation only amounted to 22,000 — there being, moreover, a very large minority of not less than 15,000 who threw their votes in favour of the maintenance of the Union. No Union, as far as I know, in the history of the world has ever worked quite smoothly in its commencement. It could not, in the nature of things, be possible that it should do so. More than once, certainly, after the Union of England and Scotland Motions were made for the repeal of that Union. Yet no one doubts now with what incalculable blessings that Union was fraught to both countries, or how wise those statesmen were who turned a deaf ear to the temporary desires of the people. But in another point of view, this demand comes too late, for the Nova Scotians have elected their Members and sent them to the Parliament at Ottawa, upon a distinct promise that fair play should be given to the new constitutional Act. It could scarcely be said that fair play had been given to it if, before twelve months are out, you are asked to repeal the measure. And it cannot be forgotten that there would be the most serious practical difficulties in doing anything of the kind. To begin with, Nova Scotia has already obtained a great many of the advantages of union; and even if she were ready to relinquish these, they are of a kind that cannot easily be put off. For instance, a sum of money has been already expended upon public works, not less, I believe, than 30,000 dollars upon the survey and location of the railroad. Again, the money securities of Nova Scotia, which before the Union were at a discount, have been so enhanced in value that they now — including discount and premium — equal a total rise of 10 per cent. If, then, you attempt to repeal that Act, you at once involve yourself in difficulties of a very serious character. Again, I say the Nova Scotians must forgive me for speaking with perfect frankness; I do not think that their present demand is a reasonable one. What is the claim which Nova Scotia and all the British North American colonies have invariably made upon this country? It is that they shall be viewed and treated as integral parts of this great Empire. And what has been the answer of one English statesman after another? They have said to the colonies, "As long as you continue true to your allegiance — as long as you desire to retain your connection with this country —so long will we stand by you; no open aggression shall be made upon you, and not even the breath of insult shall pass over you." But, on the other hand, this promise was never made without an implied and tacit understanding on the part of the colonies that they should do their part in the matter; they have been told over and over again that they must organize and place themselves in a position which would be tenable and defensible in case of war. Well, what is that position? All the authorities, military and civilian, are agreed in this—that the best and almost the only military organization which it is possible for these colonies to adopt is Confederation. If that policy be applicable to any one of the colonies more than another, it is to Nova Scotia, which has been described by one of their own most able advocates as the frontage of the whole British North American Continent, whose harbours, citadel, and arsenal were not made for Nova Scotia alone; but were designed by nature for the common benefit of herself and of her sister Provinces. But I know very well that it is said by some persons in Nova Scotia, "Nova Scotia has a peculiar geographical formation, of which, if she were disposed to take advantage"— I deny that she is disposed to take advantage it—"she could strengthen herself within that peninsula, and remain careless and secure while the lands of her sister colonies were desolated by war." I do not believe for one moment that the Nova Scotians—as loyal, as true, and as generous a people as ever lived—would recognize or admit such an argument, still less that they would stoop to so unworthy a policy. But it is an argument which has been put forward by a narrow section, and it deserves to be met. There was such a case before in the world's history about 3,000 years ago; it is one of the earliest wars that has been described, but its record still kindles enthusiasm when it is read. When the liberty and the civilization of Greece broke the whole force of the Persian invader, there was a peninsula within which it was proposed by a section, arguing in the same narrow spirit that the section of to-day argues, to intrench themselves, leaving the remainder of their countrymen to be decimated by war, and their lands to be wasted by a foreign enemy. Happily for the liberties of men, that fatal proposal was over-ruled: they fought and they conquered, and whom does history now delight to honour? Those who made common cause with the rest of Greece and refused to be sharers in an ungenerous, unworthy, and selfish policy, or those whose conduct had then, and has been since, branded as false to the interests of Greece, of liberty, and of civilization? I am satisfied that the same will be the case with Nova Scotia; that selfish considerations will not prevail, and that the arguments of a narrow section will not find favour. It is unwise, it is unreasonable, for the colonies to expect us to make sacrifices for them if they are prepared in return to make no sacrifices for us. I was glad to hear what fell from the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) when he told us that the Parliament of Canada have shown every inclination to deal in the most gentle and conciliatory spirit with Nova Scotia. In my opinion, in so doing they act rightly and wisely. Your Lordships and Parliament may do something, but the Canadian Parliament can do a great deal more in this matter. The burdens they have struck off and the disposition they have shown to make allowance for the present feeling and irritation of the Nova Scotians evince a desire to do full justice to all Nova Scotian interests. But the question remains for us—can we agree to such a proposition as the noble Baron (Lord Stratheden) has brought forward? I submit that you cannot do so. In fairness to the whole Dominion of Canada you cannot re-open at the end of one year a question which would break up the Union. In the next place there is no precedent for such a Motion as this. We are now asked to recommend the issue of a Commission of Inquiry to repeal a great constitutional measure which has not been in existence twelve months. There is no precedent for this. More than this, what we are asked to do is to place the Parliament and this country in a position of unparallelled indignity, and to confess that our whole colonial Empire is one gigantic failure. Time, which changes so many things, also heals many things, and I trust that it will heal the irritation which is felt in parts of Nova Scotia. Of one thing I am satisfied, that we cannot take any hasty and precipitate step, and on the other hand, the Nova Scotians must remember that none can be exempt from difficulties, trials, burdens, and sacrifices who desire to maintain their position in that Imperial commonwealth to which they belong, and in the glory of which we are all common sharers. I hope your Lordships will reject the prayer of this Petition.

THE MARQUESS OF NORMANBY said, that with the personal feelings he entertained towards Nova Scotia no one could be more ready than himself to adopt any measure calculated to allay the irritation that existed, and to promote the interests of that colony. The noble Lord who brought forward the subject (Lord Stratheden) had greatly narrowed it by admitting that the repeal of the Union was not now the question to be discussed; but still he (the Marquess of Normanby) should not be doing his duty if he gave a silent vote on this Motion. The Petition was one of so extraordinary a character, having been signed by nearly all the Members of the local Legislature of Nova Scotia, that if he simply considered the interests of the Nova Scotians he should not hesitate, however much he might regret such a decision, to vote for the repeal of the Union. But it was not the interests of Nova Scotia alone which their Lordships had now to consider, and he believed that the appointment of a Commission would only tend to increase the dissatisfaction and irritation now existing in Nova Scotia. What he hoped would occur to allay that irritation was a change of opinion on the part of the Nova Scotians themselves. In small communities, where local interests were concerned, opinions were apt to be taken up suddenly, and these opinions were liable to sudden changes. The noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) had referred to the case of New Brunswick. The elections in 1855 resulted in an overwhelming majority against the Union; but within a year a large majority was returned in favour of the Union. Taking everything into consideration, and knowing the energy shown by the opponents of the Union; and how they had agitated the country from one end to the other—how they had predicted evils of every kind, and declared that the trade of Nova Scotia would be ruined by a hostile tariff, and that their Militia would be moved to the frontiers of Canada, to protect that Province—he was by no means surprised at what had occurred. But he believed that as soon as the Nova Scotians found that these predictions had not been fulfilled, they would themselves acknowledge the wisdom of their Lordships in rejecting their present demand, and would be thankful for the opportunity of re-considering the matter more calmly. He believed that the Canadian Parliament would be found willing and ready to redress any grievances of Nova Scotia which might be pointed out. He had foundation for this belief; for during the last Session several duties which peculiarly affected Nova Scotia were taken off; the duty on corn was modified; the tonnage dues for lights on the coast, and taxes on all the articles used in shipbuilding were repealed—burdens which affected Nova Scotia as a maritime Province. Steps had also been taken to encourage the direct trade with the West Indies. Seeing what had already occurred in the Canadian Parliament, he was justified in believing that in future the Nova Scotians would be treated with generosity, with justice, and as an integral portion of the Canadian Dominion, and that in a short time they would themselves wonder at the opposition they had offered to the Union. As in his opinion the issue of a Commission would only aggravate the evil, he should vote against the Motion.

LORD LYVEDEN said, he in a great measure attributed the discontent that existed to the haste with which the Confederation Act was pressed forward by the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) last year. Objection had been taken to the Irish Church being dealt with by a moribund Parliament. Now, it was a moribund Parliament in Nova Scotia which sanctioned Confederation, and he last year pressed upon the noble Earl the important consideration that the elections were just coming on, and that it would be much better to delay the consideration of the subject until the opinions of the constituencies had been ascertained. That result proved to be adverse to the measure, but he thought the elections turned less upon Confederation than on another question on which a strong feeling prevailed. He had always advocated Confederation, but such a measure should be based upon consent, and though he admitted that technially there had been consent, it would have been better to wait for the decision of the new Parliament, which he believed would not in that case have been so adverse. The discontent which existed was not to be allayed by telling the colonists that they were in the wrong and that the Canadian Parliament would hereafter grant them everything they required. In conversation with the Delegates, he found that they complained especially of the want of sympathy manifested by the British Parliament, and he regretted that the noble Duke did not take advantage of their visit to this country to propose an Inquiry by a Committee of this House, for the Delegates would have gone away much better satisfied if their opinions had been put on record. They also complained that only ten Peers were present when the Confederation Act passed. He had no doubt of the loyalty of the Nova Scotians, but he feared that unless they found themselves objects of sympathy and interest on the part of the mother-country they would turn their eyes to the United States. Now, while thinking that if our North American colonies chose to separate from us they should be allowed to do so amicably, he had no wish that they should throw themselves into the arms of the United States. He regretted that the noble Duke had not uttered a word of conciliation. Had he promised a Committee of Inquiry next Session, or given some assurance that their case would be considered, the colonists would have been more disposed to weigh the points which had been urged by him. To look to the Confederate Parliament for redress was the very thing to which they objected; for, while not disinclined to Confederation with the maritime Provinces, they protested against union with Canada, on the ground that the interests and feelings of Canada were hostile to their own. They held, moreover, that an undue burden would fall upon them with regard to the defence of Canada, which, in case of war, would be the first point of attack. The experiment of Confederation must now be tried, and he trusted it would succeed; but it would have had a better chance of success had the language, not so much of the noble Duke as of his Under Secretary in the House of Commons, been more sympathetic and conciliatory.

LORD LYTTELTON said, that bearing in mind the disclosures which had recently been made with regard to the Union with Ireland, and in other similar cases, he could not help suspecting that something occurred during the Session of the colonial Parliament in 1866 of which we were not cognizant. It would be impossible, however, to inquire into secret proceedings, —if there had been any; and it would be contrary to the principles of our colonial policy to refer the question of Confederation to a Commission at the very commencement of its operation. He thought the colonists had cried out before they were hurt, for, with the exception of a slight increase in certain duties, they did not appear to have actually suffered, while they would no doubt be benefited by future legislation. As to the argument that the colonial Legislature had no right to overthrow its own Constitution, it did not do so, but simply expressed an opinion in favour of Confederation, while the Imperial Parliament decided upon the measure. He must again express his regret that sufficient discussion had not taken place before the passing of the Confederation Act, and that a greater desire to conciliate had not been manifested. He trusted that every expression of sympathy would be used towards the people of Nova Scotia; and he, for his part, would not say that at no future time and under no possible circumstances should an independent Inquiry be undertaken by this country in the sense the people of Nova Scotia wished. He did not see any ground for supposing that the Parliament of Canada would not do justice to Nova Scotia, and therefore he would remit the petitioners to that authority. As far as expressions of our sympathy went we should give them; but he would say that it was impossible for us at the present moment to consent to the prayer of the Petition.

THE EARL OF AIRLIE said, the noble Lord who had spoken last but one (Lord Lyveden) had blamed his noble Friend opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon) for having been in so great a hurry, and stated that, as far as Nova Scotia was concerned, the Act of Confederation was passed by a moribund Parliament. But he begged to point out that the Parliament which had decided on the Act had been elected on a much wider franchise than the Parliament which now existed, and, therefore, as far as a wider franchise was a test, the late Parliament ought to be regarded as a better index of the popular will than the present. This Act of Confederation had been in force only a few months, and he could not imagine why their Lordships should so stultify themselves as to re-open the whole question, or do that which the Province by its Delegates regarded as a preliminary step to a repeal of the Union. There never was an Act of Union which at once satisfied the people affected by it. Let their Lordships take the Union of Scotland with England, and consider how much opposed to it the most patriotic Scotchmen of the day were. The same was the case with the Union of North Germany, which had been the dream of the most patriotic Germans for centuries, but which a great many Germans at present were not satisfied with. His noble Friend (Lord Lyveden) said he feared that if their Lordships did not immediately comply with the wishes of the Nova Scotians they would annex themselves to the United States. He (the Earl of Airlie) could not conceive that the Nova Scotians would be so blind to their own interests. Did not his noble Friend know that the Nova Scotians were, above all things, a maritime and commercial people; that the trade of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was largely a shipbuilding trade; and what was the condition to which those interests were reduced in the United States? The United States, partly from financial necessity, partly from a sneaking regard for Protection, had piled duty upon duty upon copper, iron, hemp, and everything that enters into the construction of ships? He believed that in New York there was not a single ship building at present, nor in Massachusetts, nor in almost any part of the Union. They all knew that at this moment the shipbuilding trade of the United States had been transferred to the maritime Provinces. Well, then, did his noble Friend believe that a people who were so much interested in shipbuilding as the Nova Scotians would annex themselves to the United Sates, and so ruin their trade? But it was not shipbuilding only, but almost every kind of manufacture that was in distress in the United States. The iron manufacture of Pennsylvania, the woollen manufacture and the cotton manufacture of the New England States, were all reduced to the greatest state of depression; and did his noble Friend think that in such circumstances the people of Nova Scotia would throw themselves into the arms of the United States and reduce themselves to ruin? He agreed with his noble Friend and all who had spoken on the subject, that it was the duty of the Canadian Government as far as possible to conciliate the people of Nova Scotia. Her Majesty's Government ought to make them clearly understand that the consolidation of the new Dominion must be the work of the Canadian Government much more than of Her Majesty's Government. That new Dominion must be consolidated much more by affection from within than by pressure from without. He hoped the Canadian Government would have the wisdom to see this, and also that if they were to become a great people they must disregard provincial prejudices. In London people never thought of inquiring whether a man had been born in Scotland, Ireland, or Wales; so in Ottawa he trusted that, provided a man had sufficient capacity to fill a public office, they would never inquire whether he came from the maritime Provinces or otherwise. He believed the Canadians had the means of making their position so strong and so powerful as not only to overcome the discontent of Nova Scotia, but even to induce the people of Prince Edward's Island and Newfoundland to gravitate towards the new Dominion.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said, he should be glad if Nova Scotians would attend to the advice that had been given them by their Lordships, and admit that they were entirely in the wrong; but if the noble Duke the Secretary for the Colonies had read the protest which the Delegates who had lately gone from this country had left behind, he would not think that they would lightly abandon the pretensions which they had put forth. His noble Friend opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon) had vindicated his own conduct in passing the measure; but a little delay would probably have been found wiser in the end. The noble Duke the Secretary for the Colonies had talked a good deal of the good that would hereafter result from Confederation; but neither his noble Friend nor the noble Duke had dealt with the discontent which, notwithstanding all that had been said, was almost universal in Nova Scotia. Now, how did they intend to deal with this discontent? His noble Friend opposite had said, with that wisdom which he possessed in so high a degree, that coercion was a word he did not like to use between England and her colonies. Both his noble Friend's historical recollections and his own inclinations would have made him averse from employing coercion towards the Nova Scotians; but his noble Friend could not deny that we had in a way coerced them into this union, and that we were now coercing them to remain in it. Now there could be no doubt that if anything in addition to the eloquence of noble Lords could convince the Nova Scotians how much they were in the wrong it would be a new inquiry. The votes of the late elections showed what discontent existed. Out of thirty-eight persons elected to the Provincial Parliament thirty-six had sent to this country an Address praying, not for inquiry but for repeal; and of the nineteen elected to represent the Province of Canada, seventeen were in favour, at all events, of a suspension of the Act of Confederation. Great importance must be attached to the possession of Nova Scotia, not only as a colony, but as containing at Halifax an important naval and military station, and as being, therefore, like Gibraltar and Malta, not a mere territorial possession, but a position essential to the maintenance of our maritime supremacy. We should be very cautious how we alienated the affections of these people. It was very well to lay down what we considered was good for them; but the question was rather what they thought was good for themselves. They believed that this Union would injure them. They might be excessively foolish in entertaining that idea; but as they did entertain it we should be exceedingly unwise to irritate them by disregarding their opinions. We might need, sooner than we expected, the help of Nova Scotia in order to maintain our position in North America, and we should take care to retain her good-will and friendship. In the reign of George III. no doubt his Ministers thought the people of Boston unwise in objecting to the imposition of the tea duty; but that was not the way to deal with such a question. He thought, therefore, that however difficult such an Inquiry as was asked for, it ought to be instituted. The expense would not be great; and if it were true that the arguments were so strong in favour of Confederation, these would be elicited and would prevail; and we might hope to have a loyal colony instead of a discontented one.

EARL RUSSELL: Feeling that this question is one of the gravest importance, I wish to say a few words respecting it. It appears to me that whatever mistakes may have been made hitherto—and mistakes there have been—what we have to consider is the present state of affairs, and the best thing to be done upon the noble Lord's Motion. Now, looking at the facts of the case, I find that in 1863 the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia came to a Resolution that—

> "In the opinion of this House it is desirable that a Confederation of the British North American Colonies should take place."

That, of course, implies a Confederation including Canada. It is, therefore, too late now to say that they objected altogether to union with Canada. Acting in conformity with precedent and with reason, I cannot say that that Resolution was not sufficient to proceed upon, and that there ought to have been a special Assembly called for the purpose of considering this question. The Legislative Council were fully entitled to adopt the Resolutions to which they came, and their Resolutions are binding. But then came a further Resolution, that it is desirable—

> "To arrange with the Imperial Government a scheme of union which will effectually insure just provision for the rights and interests of this Province."

The question arises whether we have made sufficient provision for the rights and interests of the Province of Nova Scotia. The colony has made a representation to the Imperial Parliament—and we all know that this has been an exceedingly loyal colony, and that it had rights and interests which it desired to preserve; and I think we shall all feel also that those rights and interests ought to be effectually provided for. The Province of Lower Canada had certain rights and interests which were guaranteed by the Act of the Imperial Legislature, and these rights and interests were provided for in the Act of Confederation; and, in like manner, the Act of Confederation should have provided, and I trust did provide, for the rights and interests of the people of Nova Scotia. But then, when I am asked what is to be the remedy for any grievance which may be felt by the colony, and whether we should ask Her Majesty to send out a Commission for the purpose of inquiring into this matter, I should say that the Confederation having been made under the sanction of the Assembly and Council of Nova Scotia itself, the sending out of a Commission in order to inquire, in effect whether the Act of Confederation should be repealed and the Confederation altogether dissolved, would not be for the benefit of Nova Scotia or for the benefit of any of Her Majesty's subjects in British North America, but would merely be the introduction of new discord and new confusion into the Province. If that be the case, the only remedy I can see is that Her Majesty's Government, through the Secretary of State, should inquire most carefully into the complaints that are made by these loyal subjects of the Crown. I myself have the greatest respect for the people of Nova Scotia. We have seen how their industry has tended to the prosperity of that colony; we have seen, when parts of Canada were in insurrection, how true and how loyal the people of Nova Scotia were. I trust, therefore, that the noble Duke the Secretary for the Colonies will take pains to inquire into all these grievances and into all provisions which the colonists may think injurious to their interests; that having done so he will lay before Parliament the result of the inquiry; that Nova Scotia will understand that, having adopted the Confederation, we cannot depart from it; but that everything which concerns the rights and interests of Nova Scotia shall be abundantly provided for. I am sure that the Government, and all parties in this country, sincerely desire the welfare of Nova Scotia. We desire nothing that can be incompatible or inconconsistent with the prosperity of the colony; our wish is that such grievances as she can show to exist should be speedily and completely redressed; and that Nova Scotia may remain, as she has heretofore been, a loyal and contented Province, a source of strength and an ornament to the Empire.

LORD CAMPBELL, in reply, said, that as in the course of the debate there had been no arguments adduced against inquiry he had little to reply to. The noble Earl the former Secretary of State had entered into a defence of what he regarded as his policy. The only remark which it suggested was, *Quis vituperavit Herculem?* The policy of the noble Earl was not the subject which their Lordships were considering. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Normanby) had indeed asserted that a Commission would aggravate the discontent in Nova Scotia. It became, therefore, a balance between the authority of the noble Marquess and that of the Delegates, who, with local knowledge yet more recent, held an opposite opinion. The House had one conclusive reason for acquiescing in the judgment of the Delegates. As they were to a great extent the leaders of the colony they had an obviously considerable power to influence its temper and proceedings. Was it supposed that if their mission was entirely defeated and all their labours scattered to the winds, that power would be strongly exercised in favour of Great Britain, whose decision in the case supposed they could not possibly extenuate. At the same time as the Government had determined to oppose the Motion, and as the noble Earl (Earl Russell) had not determined to support it, he (Lord Campbell) did not insist upon dividing. It might not tend to the solution of the difficulty or the peace of British North America to show that when argument had been entirely on one side, numbers were almost entirely on the other.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

BOUNDARY BILL—(No. 170.)

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

COMMITTEE. REPORT.

House again in Committee (according to Order).

The Amendment *moved* on Thursday last (*Earl Beauchamp*) (by Leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported*, without Amendment.

LORD RAVENSWORTH rose to move his Amendment, which was that Jarrow should be included in the borough of South Shields. He considered that a great public wrong had been done by the action of the Government in this matter of the Boundary Bill. The question of the boundaries having been removed out of the arena of party conflict by the appointment of a Royal Commission, the Government, without any just ground, instead of adhering faithfully and steadfastly to the Report of the Commission, referred the matter to a Select Committee of the other House, by whom the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners were completely upset, and in consequence of the delay thus occasioned their Lordships were precluded from the opportunity of considering the details of the Bill. Why the recommendations of the Commissioners should not have been adopted he was at a loss to understand. The name of the Chairman of the Royal Commission was alone a sufficient guarantee to the public of the impartiality of its decisions. The Bill had been sent up to this House at a time when it was almost impossible to consider it in its details. Whatever interpretation might be put upon the language of the Prime Minister —and a very forced interpretation was put upon it—it was admitted that any private Member of their Lordships' House might take up the question. His noble Friend (the Earl of Beauchamp) gave Notice of an Amendment, which would have given their Lordships an opportunity of considering some of the details of the Bill; but, upon being appealed to by the Government, the noble Earl withdrew his Motion. He (Lord Ravensworth) then, on the spur of the moment, gave Notice of his intention to call attention to one portion of the Bill. There were many boroughs which, no doubt, presented a strong case for the extension of their boundary, that of South Shields was as strong as any. Its population in 1861 was 35,000, and the Commissioners proposed to add to it Jarrow, which contained a population of 15,000 industrious men, chiefly engaged in shipbuilding. Jarrow was a place of great antiquity, and was in every respect identified with South Shields; yet the recommendation of the Commission was overthrown by the Committee, the grounds of whose decision were not stated in their Report. He had presented a petition signed by 440 of the most influential inhabitants, manufacturers and others in South Shields, praying that the Report of the Commission might be sustained. Much more depended upon their Lordships considering this question than the satisfaction of South Shields and of Jarrow. Unless steps were taken to include such places as Jarrow within the limits of the Parliamentary boroughs next to them, very grave questions would arise in future, for it was impossible to suppose a system of representation could continue which excluded from the franchise the population on one side of the street and admitted the householders on the other side. Yet this description at present applied to many boroughs, and particularly to Nottingham, Birmingham, and South Shields. He feared the next demand would be to have the county mapped out into equal electoral districts; and this, no doubt, would be followed by the equalization of the county and borough franchises. It was because he was desirous to avoid such demands, and to effect a real settlement of this question for a generation at least, that, in spite of adverse circumstances, he begged to move that the Parliamentary limits of the borough of South Shields be extended, in accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners.

An Amendment *moved*, Clause 4, after ("Salisbury") insert ("South Shields.") —(*The Lord Ravensworth*).

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, he was anxious that there should not be a repetition of the scene witnessed by their Lordships the other evening, and hoped the discussion on this subject would terminate in a way very different from that in which it had been begun. He would, therefore, not follow his noble Friend in his history of what occurred in the House of Commons, but would be content to refer to the reasons which he gave the other evening to his noble Friend, Lord Beauchamp—who was now absent from the House—when, on behalf of the Government, he begged his noble Friend to withdraw the Amendments which stood in his name. He would not repeat those reasons, but must ask his noble Friend (Lord Ravensworth) not to persist in the Motion he had just made. His noble Friend, however, would not infer from this request that he at all dissented from the arguments just addressed to their Lordships. Indeed, from the very commencement of the discussions in the other House the Government had always been of opinion that the decision of the Royal Commissioners was on the whole the best. Under the circumstances, however, he must ask his noble Friend to withdraw the Amendment, and allow the Bill to pass in its present form.

Lord REDESDALE said, he wished to state why he should support the Amendment. He had not entered into the debate the other night because it was carried on in a tone which he did not desire to adopt; but on the present occasion he deemed it necessary to make some remarks on the manner in which the House had been treated in regard to this Bill and the Scotch Reform Bill, which were two of the most important measures that ever came under the consideration of Parliament. They related to the Constitution of the country, and yet their Lordships were told they were not to introduce any Amendments into them. Now, why had not the Boundary Bill been sent up from the House of Commons at an earlier period? Because, he would reply, the Opposition had taken up the time of the House with the consideration of another uncalled-for and totally useless measure. Their Lordships were now told, however, that the Bill could not be altered, because it was of great importance that the elections should occur in November; but was that object of such vital importance as to call for the passing through their Lordships' House without any discussion of a measure effecting the representation of the people? To compare the two things was what no statesman ought to do, and what no man, with any regard for the country, could do. Why should not this Bill be amended? The Scotch Bill had been amended, and there would nevertheless be time for its being re-discussed in the other House. It seemed to him that the question of passing a good Boundary Bill was of much more importance than whether the elections took place in November or not. He could not understand, therefore, why the Amendment of the noble Duke the Postmaster General with regard to Glasgow was not to be entertained. The addition of it would not lead to more than a couple of hours' discussion, which would cause no delay whatever. He hoped that on the third reading that Amendment would be moved; for he believed that the arguments in favour of extending the boundary of Glasgow were unanswerable. The independence of their Lordships' House was concerned in this matter. Even now Amendments might be introduced into the Bill, and yet they were told not to make them, as there might be some hazard about the proceeding. Now, the House of Commons might discuss the Amendments in the same time their Lordships would probably take in inserting them. If the House of Commons accepted them, well and good; if they rejected them it would then be the duty of their Lordships to determine whether they would insist upon them, or whether they would consent to withdraw them in order to prevent further delay. For these reasons he should certainly vote in favour of the Amendment of the noble Lord.

Lord COLCHESTER said, that a most important constitutional principle was involved in this question; and if the noble Lord pressed his Amendment to a division he should feel it his duty to vote in favour of it.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, the proposal of the Government that no alteration should be introduced into the Boundary Bill was made simply because it was desired to have the dissolution in November; and the 20th July was the last day for sending in claims for the county votes. Under the circumstances the Government felt bound to abide by the pledge which they gave to the House the other evening.

Earl GRANVILLE: Nobody can complain of the course which the three independent Peers have taken this evening. Although, in discussions which were certainly carried on with great spirit, to say the least of it, on both sides, we complained of the course which Her Majesty's Government seemed inclined to take, we never pretended to impugn the right of the House to act as it thought fit. To-night Her Majesty's Government have behaved in a most honourable way; and I may add that I believe my noble Friends opposite are incapable of intentionally acting in any other way.

On Question? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents, 9; Not-Contents, 27: Majority, 18.

Resolved in the *Negative*.

Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow*.

CONTENTS.

Bristol, M.

Colchester, L.
Denman, L.
Fitzwalter, L.
Ravensworth, L. [*Teller.*]

Redesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Sondes, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Walsingham, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.

Normanby, M.

Airlie, E.
Camperdown, E.
Clarendon, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lichfield, E. [*Teller.*]
Malmesbury, E.

Halifax, V.
Hawarden, V.

Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Clinton, L.
Colonsay, L
Colville of Culross, L.
Crofton, L.
Farnham, L.
Foley, L.
Lyveden, L.
Monson, L. [*Teller.*]
Seaton, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Stratheden, L.
Sundridge, L (*D. Argyll*)

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL.—(No. 192.)

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL explained that the Amendments for which he was responsible had been introduced with the sanction of the noble and learned Lord upon the Woolsack, and were not intended to delay in any way the passing of the Bill.

LORD REDESDALE said, that if any Amendments whatever were introduced the effect must be to send back the Bill for re-consideration to the House of Commons. He was unable to see any difference in principle between the consideration of one Amendment and another; and therefore he begged to give Notice that upon the third reading he should move the Amendment of which Notice had been given with regard to the city of Glasgow.

Further Amendments made: Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow*; and to be *printed* as amended. (No .220.)

House adjourned at a Quarter before Nine o'clock, till To-morrow, Half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 6, 1868.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* — Grand Jury Presentments (Ireland) Committee [No. 392]; Extradition [No. 393].

SUPPLY — *considered in Committee—Resolutions* [July 3] *reported*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class V.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — Public Departments Payments *; Registration (Ireland) *.

First Reading—Public Departments Payments * [212]; Registration (Ireland) [213].

Second Reading—Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies [201]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment * [206].

Committee — Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-comm.*) [63]—R.P.; Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) * [150]; Court of Justiciary (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) * [174]; Municipal Elections (Scotland) * [189]; Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment * [193]; Petit Juries (Ireland) (*re-comm.*) * [209]; Indorsing of Warrants * [208].

Report — Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) * [150]; Court of Justiciary (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) * [174]; Municipal Elections (Scotland) * [189-211]; Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment * [193]; Petit Juries (Ireland) (*re-comm.*) * [209]; Indorsing of Warrants * [208].

Considered as amended — Metropolitan Police Funds* [132]; Assignees of Marine Policies * [203].

Third Reading — Registration [190]; Ecclesiastical Commissioners * [168]; Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland) * [183]; Fairs (Metropolis) * [205]; Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland) * [194], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Lands Clauses Consolidation Act (1845] Amendment * [176].

PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.—QUESTION.

MR. PARRY said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether it be the intention of the Government to take any steps, during the present Session of Parliament, to carry out the recommendations in the Report of the Commissioners appointed in November 1866, to inquire into the question of the accommodation of Public Departments?

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, in reply, that it was not the intention of the Government to take any steps during the remainder of the Session to carry out the recommendations of the Commission appointed to inquire in 1866 into the subject of the accommodation of Public Departments. It was, however, intended to give at the proper time the usual notices for the acquisition of property in order that there might be legislation in the ensuing Session.

METROPOLIS—HYDE PARK IMPROVEMENTS.—QUESTION.

MR. W. B. BEAUMONT said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he proposes to cut down any more trees near the monument to the late Prince Consort; if so, how many; and generally what are his intentions as to laying out Hyde Park in that neighbourhood?

LORD JOHN MANNERS stated, in reply, that he did not propose to cut down any more trees of the slightest importance in order to make a drive to the south of the Albert Memorial in Hyde Park this year. As to what was intended to be done generally with respect to the laying out of the Park in that neighbourhood, he could only repeat the answer he had already given to the right hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. Cowper). It was proposed to make this year a drive to the south of the Albert Memorial, and it would be necessary to build a new lodge at the Exhibition Road Gate, as well as at the other side of Queen's Gate. There would, also, be a drive made from the Serpentine to the Exhibition Road. Those were the entire of the works with which it was intended to proceed this year. Next year it would, he thought, be necessary to take a Vote for the purpose of re-laying and re-forming the ground to the north of the Albert Memorial.

IRELAND—IRISH RECORDS.

QUESTION.

MR. MONSELL said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, When the volumes of original Orders of the Lord Lieutenant and Council, 1592-1615, and of Kings' Letters, obtained from the Philadelphia Public Library, will be sent to Dublin; and, whether these Papers are to be calendared in the series of Calendars of Irish State Papers, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that the volumes of original Orders of the Lord Lieutenant and Council, 1592-1615, and of Kings' Letters obtained from the Philadelphia Public Library, were now in the hands of the bookbinders for the purpose of being handsomely bound. They would, he hoped, be ready to be sent to the Public Record Office in Dublin in a very short time. Copies would be taken for the use of students in this country. There were other Papers of great importance relating to Ireland being calendared, and these would take precedence of the Papers to which the right hon. Gentleman's Question referred in that respect.

METROPOLIS—FINSBURY PARK.

QUESTION.

MR. TORRENS said, he wished to ask the hon. Member for Bath, Whether the Metropolitan Board of Works, having power under "The Finsbury Park Act, 1857," to purchase 250 acres of land, have purchased only 130 acres; and, whether the said Board propose to sell for building purposes twenty acres of the reduced quantity—being nearly the whole of the frontages—whereby the benefit and use intended for the public will be further and most seriously prejudiced?

MR. TITE said, in reply, that at the time when the Act was passed the Metropolitan Board were in rather happier circumstances than now appeared to be the case, inasmuch as Government had undertaken to defray half the cost of the Park. A very charming site was pointed out at Hornsey Wood House, where there was a beautiful lake with a very fine view. In consequence of the opposition of the House of Commons to the first Vote of £50,000 for the Park, the Board of Works had an extremely difficult task cast upon them in the creation of a Park of such extent, as well as the keeping it up, as the whole expense fell upon the ratepayers. The subject was discussed at great length by the Board, and the result was that they determined to "cut their coat according to their cloth," and to purchase 130 instead of 250 acres. That they had done, and the ground was now being enclosed. The total expense incurred up to the present was £94,000, and the cost would exceed over £100,000 before the scheme was completed; in addition to which the Park would have to be kept up. Under these circumstances the Board had deemed it right to utilize portions of the land which lay at the lower part of the Park, and that might, he thought, be done without damage to the large area remaining, and the burdens on the ratepayers thus diminished.

TURKEY—RAILWAYS.—QUESTION.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What steps Her Majesty's Government are taking in support of the claims of English shareholders in Turkish Railways for the arrears of interest due under the guarantee of the Turkish Government?

LORD STANLEY replied that requisitions had been addressed to the Porte at various dates on the subject. The latest of those representations bore the date of the 11th of June last, and to that there had not been yet time to receive an answer.

ARMY—WINDSOR CAVALRY BARRACKS.

QUESTION.

COLONEL LESLIE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has seen the Report in the papers of the Sanitary Commissioners of the *Lancet* on the Windsor Cavalry Barracks, and whether there is any truth in that Report as to the bad state of the Barracks?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, he had seen the Report in question, which made very favourable mention of the Windsor Cavalry Barracks in some, although it complained of their condition in other respects. The chief points of complaint were the failure of certain modern inventions for the promotion of cleanliness, the absence of sufficient accommodation for the families of married men, and the want of water. As to the first point, he could only say that the inventions to which reference was made were not, he believed, always found to be successful. There were complaints on the subject last winter, and a medical officer, in conjunction with an officer of Engineers, had been sent to visit the different barracks to ascertain the real state of the case. The Report of those gentlemen had not, however, yet been received, and he could not, therefore, give a decided answer with respect to those mentioned. The complaint in reference to the accommodation provided for married soldiers he must say he looked upon as somewhat unreasonable. It was well to bear in mind the position occupied by married soldiers ten or twelve years ago, when they and their wives were obliged to occupy the same rooms with single men. During the last twelve years £240,000 had been expended in providing quarters for them; and the expenditure for the purpose of providing the married soldiers and their wives with separate rooms was going on at the rate of £30,000 or £40,000 per annum. It was now, however, made matter of complaint that a married soldier with a family of five or six children was not provided with two rooms; but he thought that single rooms ought to be provided before such complaints could fairly be indulged in. As to the want of water, he had merely to to state that the Windsor Barracks had a water company to supply them, and that he could not understand why they should suffer any inconvenience in that respect.

ARMY—ARTILLERY PRACTICE AT DOVER, &c.—QUESTION.

Major DICKSON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true that a Schooner had been struck in Dover Roads by a 68-pounder shot?

Colonel Leslie

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he would cause inquiries to be made on the subject. He would also take the present opportunity of informing the House, with regard to what was reported to have occurred at Portsmouth a few days ago that a strict investigation was now going on under the superintendence of a General Officer.

ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS BILL.

QUESTION.

Colonel FRENCH said, in the absence of his hon. Friend Mr. Dillwyn, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is true that negotiations, contingent upon the passing of the Telegraphs Bill either in this or the next Session of Parliament, for the purchase of their interest in Telegraph Companies by the Government have been entered into by the Post Office authorities with certain Railway and other Companies, notwithstanding that a Select Committee of this House is now conducting an inquiry into the whole question of the expediency of the Government's taking up the Telegraphs; and, if so, whether he will lay a Copy of the suggested form of Agreement upon the Table of the House?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER replied that agreements had been entered into with the telegraph and railway companies who were opposing the Bill, subject to the approval of the Select Committee. These agreements would be scrutinized by the Committee, and should they recommend the Bill the House would then, of course, have an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon them.

REGISTRATION BILL—[Bill 190.]

(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy.*)

Mr. CANDLISH said, that he did not wish to retard the progress of the Bill; but he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department a Question touching a decision given by the Court of Common Pleas on Saturday last. It would be in the remembrance of the House, that the

Representation of the People Bill was intended to enfranchise a very large class of persons who occupied parts of dwelling houses. By the decision which had been come to, it now appeared that a great number of those people were not liable to be rated nor entitled to the franchise. The effect of the decision would be to disfranchise not fewer than from 100,000 to 200,000 persons whom it was intended to enfranchise by the Act. In the borough which he represented, from 3,000 to 4,000 persons who had been rated, but who the decision stated had been illegally rated, would be disfranchised; and at Newcastle-on-Tyne, he believed, from 5,000 to 6,000 would be disfranchised in this way. Probably not more than half those who were to be enfranchised by the Act of last year would get the franchise within these boroughs. He presumed that it would be impossible to deal with the matter by the Bill now before the House, but to-morrow he would ask whether the Government would introduce a short Bill to give effect to what was undoubtedly the intention of the House when they passed the Reform Act last year, namely, to confer the franchise on the occupiers of parts of houses when separately occupied.

MR. NEWDEGATE asked whether there was any limit to the number of persons resident in one house who might be enfranchised under the provisions of the Reform Act of last year relating to lodgers? He was informed that in some places attempts were made unnaturally to crowd houses with a number of families which the houses were quite unable to contain properly, and this was supposed to be done with the view of giving the franchise to the residents in those houses.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he conceived that the question to be decided would not be how many persons were in a house, but whether the persons in it were or were not *bonâ fide* lodgers, and the only limitation was that each occupancy must be of the value of £10 a year.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, he regretted that the Select Committee on this Bill, of which he was a Member, had not taken evidence as to the possibility of it being carried into execution without great inconvenience. He had suggested that some Revising Barristers, election agents, and other persons officially connected with the matter, should be examined; but this was negatived, and they had to proceed with very imperfect information. The question was whether this Bill would work properly. If it did not they would have a House returned that did not represent the country; and this would probably lead to there being an early dissolution. There would be an enormous crop of Election Petitions. He had heard Revising Barristers, returning officers, and election agents say that the system contained in this Bill would break down. A few nights ago he had a conversation with the town clerk of one of the great towns, and he said that the list could be prepared, no doubt, but it could not be done properly. He (Sir George Bowyer) also thought that it should be fully considered whether time should not be given for appeals to the Court of Common Pleas before the elections took place. November was the time for Municipal Elections all over the country; and the two kinds of elections taking place about the same time would produce much inconvenience and disturbance. The Municipal Elections would no doubt all be party fights, and the Parliamentary Elections would most probably be conducted with more than the usual bitterness. He should not, however, vote against the third reading of the Bill.

Bill read a third time, and *passed.*

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 63.]

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 25th June.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 5 (To whom and by whom Election Petition may be presented).

Question again proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

MR. BOUVERIE said, he strongly objected to the new procedure with regard to Election Petitions sketched out in this Bill. The remedy proposed with respect to corrupt practices was simply as to the mode of proceeding. It entirely destroyed the existing system, which retained the jurisdiction in Committees of the House, subject to the general supervision of the House itself, and gave it to a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. The remedy proposed was utterly incomplete. The Bill did not deal either with Scotch or Irish Election Petitions. With regard to about three-fourths of the Election Petitions—those relating to England—the new procedure would be established, but all Irish and Scotch Election Petitions would continue to be tried by the same machinery which had been employed during the last 100 years. As regarded Ireland and Scotland, therefore, the grievance now complained of would remain unredressed. He had heard no answer to that objection. It went to the very root of the Bill. Surely if the Bill were good at all it would be good for the whole of the United Kingdom. If the present procedure was radically bad—if the Committees were incompetent, and justice was not fairly administered, how could they maintain such a tribunal for the trial of Election Petitions from Scotland and Ireland? It was, indeed, said, to the credit of Scotland, that very few Election Petitions had come from that part of the country; but this did not hold true with regard to Ireland. So far as he recollected there had never been a General Election without several important Election Petitions from Ireland, and to avoid dealing with the Irish part of the case was really to shirk the whole question. The proposal in the Bill was to transfer the jurisdiction to a single irresponsible Judge unassisted by a jury and without appeal; but how would that work in Ireland? Would anybody propose that a single Irish Judge, an Orangeman, should decide as to the seat of a Roman Catholic Member, or that a Roman Catholic Judge should decide as to the seat of an Orange Member? What were the objections to the present tribunal? It was not alleged by anybody well acquainted with the facts that it was partial; during the last twenty years he had been Chairman of a very great number of such Committees, and he had a strong opinion that they did their best to try the question submitted to them with the greatest impartiality. Indeed, he believed their decision was very often against the party feeling of the majority. Since the numbers of the Committee had been reduced to five, speaking on the whole, there was no party colour in their decisions. Then what was the objection? It was not that they were partial or corrupt, but that they were more or less incompetent. They were often presided over by Gentlemen who had no legal training—who were not skilled in the law of evidence, or capable of dealing with questions of complicated law and fact. Within moderate limits that was more or less true. No doubt there was a very powerful and vigorous Bar practising before Committees, and unless a Committee was presided over by one competent to deal with the case, the Bar, unfortunately, might prove too strong for it. But what was the remedy? Not to destroy the jurisdiction altogether—not to take it out of the House — not to abandon one of the privileges to which in old times their fathers attached the greatest value, and which hereafter might be of the utmost importance if it were maintained — but to try and improve the tribunal, and this was the object of the Amendment of which he had given Notice. The suggestion he had to make to the Committee was not one of his own devising. At his request a plan had been drawn up by an eminent Member of the Northern Circuit, Mr. Pickering, who had had large experience before Election Committees. Mr. Pickering said, "Don't take away the jurisdiction from the House, for the public has confidence in the honesty of the decisions of the Committees; but they distrust the skill and ability of those Committees to deal with the legal questions that come before them. Therefore make your remedy co-extensive with your want, by placing a skilled president at the head of a Committee of Members of the House, to be chosen by the Committee of Selection. Leave the decision of questions of fact still with the Committee. Let it consist of five Members without a Chairman, instead of four with a Chairman as at present. In order to abbreviate the duration of the proceedings, let the formal Notices necessary to enable them to get under way be shortened. When the Committee is appointed, call on one of the Judges from the Superior Courts to preside over it precisely as he would do at a trial at *Nisi Prius,* directing the Committee as to the law, and stating to them the issues they have to try, but leaving them to determine the question of fact precisely as if they were a jury. The decision of a tribunal so constituted would be received with respect." That was the scheme which he (Mr. Bouverie) ventured to set up in opposition to the proposal of the Government, which had been so many times altered since it was first laid before the House. He objected most strongly to the Government scheme, in the first place, because it proposed to leave the determination of these questions in the hands of a single irresponsible Judge. The questions which arose upon Election Petitions were not such as, under any circumstances, ought to be submitted to the decision of one mind, however skilled or however impartial. If the questions of fact could be submitted to a jury he should not so much object to the Government plan; and he did not see whence a better jury could be selected than from among their own body. A tribunal like that he had suggested would prove far more deadly to the Member petitioned against than that proposed by the Government, because Members of that House, when sitting on Election Committees, were in the habit of accepting, as proof of agency, connections between the principal and the agent which were too slight to be regarded as evidence by a strictly legal tribunal. The effect of passing this measure might be to make the practice less stringent than it was at present. It would be a grave matter to leave decisions in these cases to one man; for even if he were an angel of light his impartiality would be sure to be called into question. But we knew that Judges were not impeccable beings living in an etherial atmosphere, and never subject to motives, feelings, and partialities. The history of that country ought to satisfy hon. Members how dangerous it was to trust their privileges to the decision of one Judge. They should recollect that once having parted with their authority, however much they might impugn the decisions of the Judge, they would have no power to remove him. A Committee, on the other hand, after deciding one particular case, was re-absorbed into the body of the House; and if its decision had been influenced by bias, possibly the next Committee might have a bias the other way, and so set matters straight. He once knew a distinguished member of the Western Circuit who, on retiring from the scene of his professional labours, said—

> "I have lost a great many cases I ought to have won, and won a great many I ought to have lost; and therefore, upon the whole, I think that justice has been fairly administered."

Such a balance might, however, well be struck with reference to the political results of the decisions of Election Committees; whereas, if a Judge appointed to determine these cases were to permit his political feelings to influence his judgment it might be twenty or twenty-five years before he could be succeeded by a more impartial person. Every person necessarily held the English Judges of the present day in the highest respect; but what did those eminent persons themselves say with reference to the Government proposal. They all said, "Don't give us this jurisdiction—it would lead to our impartiality being impugned; we dread being intrusted with power like this, which we tell you we are not fitted to hold; and if you do intrust us with it, the character of the Bench for impartiality will be injured." But had there not been times when the impartiality of the Bench had been suspected, at all events in Scotland? He held in his hand an extract from the late Lord Cockburn's *Memorials*, which referred to the trials for sedition which occurred seventy or eighty years ago. That extract was as follows:—

> "I fear that no impartial censor can avoid detecting, throughout the whole course of the trials, not mere casual indications of bias, but absolute straining for convictions. . . . If ever there was an occasion when a Judge might have shone simply by being just, this was one. But the Bench was the place upon which political passions, not aggravated by the prosecution, and distressing to many of the jurymen, settled and operated. . . If, instead of a supreme Court of Justice sitting for the trial of guilt or of innocence, it had been an ancient Commission appointed by the Crown to procure convictions, little of its judicial manner would have required to be changed."

That was the opinion of a man of mature judgment upon the Bench. The Judge who presided over the Bench of Scotland at that time said on one occasion, "Let them find me the prisoners, and I will find them the law." They must not judge of the effect of the proposed change by what was likely to occur in ordinary times. The measure should be tested by the more trying occasions which had often occurred in Parliamentary history, and would assuredly occur again; he therefore asked the Committee to consider whether, under trying circumstances, it could rely on the unrestrained action of a single Judge inquiring into the question as to whether a given Member was entitled to his seat, for the Bill proposed to do nothing less than give power to a single man to expel a Member of the House, however distinguished he might be, and to incapacitate such a Gentleman from again sitting in that House for a period of twenty-one years. What would have been Mr. Fox's fate in 1794 if his return had been subject to the decision of Lord Braxfield, the Scotch Judge? Did they think he would have had the slightest chance of obtaining justice from the hands of that Judge, however good his title to the seat? He would have been excluded from the House. Another objection to the proposed change of jurisdiction was that it did not afford any increased means of protection against corruption. Royal Commissioners had power to extract truth from unwilling witnesses, and in that way to try the borough, but the Judges under the Bill would simply try a case as between plaintiff and defendant, and as soon as the Petitioner found enough had come out as against his opponent he would cease to produce evidence for fear of blackening the borough which he hoped to represent. This was what happened before the Committee now, and this was what would happen before the single Judge who would sit simply as a Judge at *Nisi Prius.* Was it, then, worth while giving up the jurisdiction only to change the Committee for a Judge? At present it was acknowledged that the worst cases of corruption never came before the House, and this desire for concealment would increase in the future, now that Totnes and its companion boroughs had been dealt with so severely. It was questionable, by the way, whether the House would have learnt as much of the corruption of Totnes as it had but for one peculiar circumstance. It happened that the competing candidate, instead of having the seat in view, was determined to ruin the borough; he accordingly produced witnesses who, under ordinary circumstances, would have been kept out of the way, and thus the Commission was informed in the freest manner of past corruption and the political condition of the borough. But the great *cheval de bataille* of those who supported the Bill had been the local inquiry. "Let us go to the spot and have a local inquiry" was in every one's mouth. But "local inquiry" was a phrase often used without consideration. If the Judge were empowered to act as an inquisitor, and able to hunt up every case smelling of corruption, a local inquiry would be worth something; but he had already shown that the Judge had no more power than a Committee, and would, therefore, be able to conduct as searching an inquiry in London as on the spot. Then, again, in many cases a local inquiry was not needed, and in many others it would be idle to attempt it. Of what use would local inquiry be when purely technical or legal points were to be discussed; and how could a county or a borough such as Shoreham be subjected to a searching local inquiry unless the Court perambulated and took evidence at each polling-place? It would be as expensive to bring witnesses to the country town as to London. A suggestion of the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill) deserved attention. Designing, he presumed, to secure inquiry as to the purity of a borough, the hon. Member proposed that every Election should be followed by a regular scrutiny of the poll-books by the Revising Barrister, and that the said Barrister should make a Return to that House. But was that a practical suggestion? Could such a scrutiny be carried out consistently with the speedy return of Members to the House? The hon. Member doubtless remembered the famous Westminster scrutiny in 1783 after Mr. Fox had been returned at the head of the poll. After two years' labour the scrutiny was declared incomplete, and it was said it would take another two years to finish it. Considering how many constituencies we have larger than Westminster then was, it would be at once apparent that if a scrutiny were to follow a General Election no one would know for years who was to sit in the House and who not. In conclusion, he looked with great dread on this proposal to sacrifice part of the ancient and valued privileges of the House; and this reluctance to part with a time-honoured jurisdiction was increased when he remembered that the present Parliament was about to come to an end. He deprecated the diminution of an inheritance which the House had received ungrudgingly from its predecessors, as if, forsooth, the Parliament of the future were to be deemed unworthy of privileges which this Parliament in its wisdom had used on the whole successfully. On these grounds he would vote against the clause with a view, if possible, to move the insertion of clauses embodying his scheme.

SIR ROBERT COLLIER said, he could not help thinking the greater part of his right hon. Friend's speech would have come more appropriately on the Motion for the second reading. The main objections to the proposal of his right hon. Friend were—first, that he made no provision whatever for a local inquiry, and, next, that he made no provision for an inquiry when the House was not sitting. Now, those two provisions appeared to him to be the main points of the Bill, and a measure which omitted them would hardly be worth passing. The House generally, he believed, was in favour of a local inquiry, and those who differed on many other points were agreed upon that one. A local inquiry was the most potent instrument for eliciting the truth, and, with such an inquiry, if a witness made a false statement he might be immediately contradicted, because another witness might be called on the spot. Many men who did not mind forswearing themselves before a Committee of that House would shrink from doing so before their fellow-townsmen. Moreover, a local inquiry would be attended with a diminished expense, because it would obviate the necessity of bringing witnesses to London, where they had a sort of Saturnalia. The expense of taking counsel to the spot would be very moderate. The fees of counsel formed but a small item of the cost. Anyone who looked through an attorney's bill would find the fact to be as he stated it. It had been said that it would be beneath the dignity of the House to part with that jurisdiction; but if they were to stand on the question of dignity he thought they would make about as great a sacrifice in consenting to be deposed from the position of Judges to that of juries as in being ousted of that jurisdiction altogether. Again, it was very doubtful whether the plan of his right hon. Friend would work; and, even if it would, it would not be worth while making so great a change unless they were to have a local inquiry, and also an inquiry when the House was not sitting. If, however, there was to be an inquiry on the spot, he held that that inquiry ought to be final, otherwise they would have two inquiries instead of one, with, of course, a double expense. If the inquiry was not to be final, to whom was the appeal to lie? If to a Committee of that House, the Committee would have the power of reversing, upon written evidence, a decision founded upon oral evidence —a result which would be most unsatisfactory. But if the local inquiry was to be final, it could not be intrusted to any tribunal but the highest. It ought not to be intrusted to barristers of ten years' standing, nor to County Court Judges, nor to Commissioners. It was said the Judges, in determining those questions, would not have the confidence of the country. But if the Judges would not have the confidence of the country, he should like to know what tribunal would? The question resolved itself into this—either the House must retain its jurisdiction, in which case he could see material improvement of which it was capable, or the House must part with that jurisdiction; and he thought it should part with it only to the highest tribunal. It was asked, was a Judge to be the judge of a matter of fact? They all knew that Chancery Judges were judges of matters of fact. The Common Law Judges also had the power of deciding matters of fact, which they exercised occasionally, and exercised it, as far as his own observation went, very satisfactorily. In the Probate Court and County Courts Judges decided matters of fact daily. He believed that the inquiries to be instituted under that Bill would be the most searching ever yet instituted, and would prove a better instrument for checking corruption at elections than any which now existed. And why did he say so? Because they had been told by the hon. Member for Armagh (Mr. Vance) that no corrupt place could stand such an investigation. A place that could not stand it ought not to return Members. If, therefore, they refused to adopt such a measure the public might well question the sincerity of their desire to suppress electoral corruption. He wished that the inquiry should be made as stringent as possible, so that those boroughs which could not stand the test might be known. As to the objection that the Bill did not apply to Scotland and Ireland, let it be extended, if it was a good measure, to both those countries as well as to England. It appeared to him that this was an important clause in a valuable Bill. Its rejection would be fatal to the measure, and he therefore hoped the Committee would adhere to it.

MR. LOPES said, he objected to the Bill as introduced by the Government, because it was an abdication of the jurisdiction which the House had exercised so long and so efficiently, and also because it was proposed to intrust that jurisdiction to a tribunal which, he believed, would be very inefficient. The right hon. Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) argued that the House had abdicated its jurisdiction 100 years ago; but did the right hon. Gentleman mean to say, because the House had thought fit to intrust that power to a component part of its own body, controlled by the House, elected by the House, and making its Report to the House, that was the same thing as intrusting it to a person over whom the House had no control, and who was, in fact, nothing less than a nominee of the Crown? He presumed the House was to some extent committed to the principle of the Bill, and therefore he would record his vote for the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie). It might be said that there was a great objection to the present system, because the Chairmen of the Committees were not trained lawyers. He was prepared to admit that there was ground for that objection — that the law was laid down in one Committee-room differently from what it was laid down in other Committee-rooms, and that evidence which would be accepted by one Committee would be rejected by another; but these objections would, he believed, be removed by the Amendment now under consideration, because that Amendment, as he understood, proposed that questions of law should be decided by the assessors, matters of fact being left to a Jury of that House. He denied that all Judges entertained a willingness to be made judges of fact. He had the authority of an Equity Judge, recently a Member of that House, for saying that nothing more perplexed him than to have to decide questions of fact. It had been urged that by doing away with the proposed system of local inquiry the best portion of this Bill would be lost; but, for his part, he failed to perceive the advantages which were to be derived from local inquiries, which were generally, as they could see from what occurred at arbitrations, prolonged and expensive in their character. In favour of that proposal, however, it had been urged that the witnesses examined would be certain to tell the truth in the presence of their fellow-townsmen, and that they would be deterred by the gestures and murmurs of the bystanders—and he could scarcely refrain from smiling when he heard the Solicitor General employ that phrase — from stating that which was untrue. But at present in the County Courts, Bankruptcy Courts, and examinations before magistrates, we had these local inquiries, and it was not found in practice that the gestures and murmurs of the bystanders deterred the witnesses from committing perjury. He doubted, too, whether the advantages which would result from a speedy inquiry were so great as some hon. Members appeared to imagine, because experience had proved that bribery and corruption were more easily traced after the lapse of some time, when political excitement had subsided and opportunity had been afforded for the passions aroused by electioneering contests to cool. For those reasons he should support the Amendment, believing that the alteration it proposed would remove the defects which existed in the present system, preserving in its integrity that portion of the present system which commanded the confidence of the House and the respect of the public.

Mr. KNATCHBULL - HUGESSEN said, he would not detain the Committee, but having taken the initiative in the Select Committee in endeavouring to prevent the total transfer of the jurisdiction of the House over these matters, he wished to state the course which he was prepared to take. He had certainly desired that the House should preserve its jurisdiction, and hand over its privileges unimpaired to the Parliament which was about to be elected by the enlarged constituencies; but both the Select Committee and the Committee of the House, having decided that the jurisdiction should be transferred, he was not prepared to imperil and delay the Bill by voting for any one of the numerous Amendments which were intended practically to reverse the decision at which the Committee had arrived. He thought there was something more important to the character of the House than the preservation of its jurisdiction — namely, that it should show the country that it was really in earnest in desiring to repress that bribery and corruption against which the Bill was aimed. In that view he should support the present clause, and should do all in his power to strengthen the hands of Government in passing as stringent a Bill as possible against those corrupt practices which were a scandal to the country.

Mr. HENLEY said, he adhered to the objections which he originally entertained against this measure, objections which had been exceedingly strengthened by what had fallen from the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Plymouth (Sir Robert Collier). The hon. and learned Gentleman had argued that there must be one tribunal to decide those questions finally, and that it would never do to have any of the schemes by which the local inquiries were to be instituted subject to revision. The hon. and learned Gentleman had next said, "Why should not a single Judge decide all matters of fact?" and had then gone over pretty nearly the whole list of our judicial tribunals; but in no one of the cases referred to by the hon. and learned Gentleman were important matters decided without there being a power of appeal. [Sir ROBERT COLLIER explained that he had intended there should be no appeal to the House.] Well, that was a very pretty question indeed. For the last fifty years the object of the Legislature had been to remove these decisions from that House, and to bring them to be decided by a limited tribunal; because if they once came to the floor of that House, as sure as six and six made twelve they would be affected by political and party feelings. It was, no doubt, very possible to pick holes in any scheme, but the plan suggested by his right hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Bouverie), at least, gave a jury, and he was in favour of such a plan, because he believed that its advantages would over-ride the advantages to be derived from any system of local inquiry. The fact was that their minds had been run away with; owing to the results which had attended certain local inquiries held by barristers who had gone to the spot with indemnities in their hands. No doubt the expenses of witnesses coming to London were very heavy, but he should like to know what the cost would be of taking down to those places gentlemen learned in the law and Parliamentary agents? He had never had the pleasure of going through even a London inquiry, and therefore he did not feel himself competent to speak on the question of expense; he did, however, know that when high professional men were taken from the spot where they ordinarily pursued their avocations and were carried miles away, for an indefinite time, their charges were not apt to be light. And, more than that, those charges were not taxable. It was possible to confine the expenses of witnesses within reasonable limits, but the other gentlemen to whom he had referred were above all law, though they themselves were agents of the law. He had always expressed a strong opinion, and everything that had happened tended to confirm him in that conviction, that it was against the whole principle of our law to leave questions so important as these to be decided by a single man. He believed there was no precedent for it. He should, therefore, support the proposal of the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie). This was a difficult subject, and notwithstanding what the hon. Member for Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) had said, he considered it was the duty of the Committee to discuss and re-discuss the point until they arrived at a safe and satisfactory conclusion. He must again state that he preferred a jury to a single Judge with power by his decision to brand a man with infamy.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he thought it was desirable that the discussion should not be complicated by a reference to all the various plans which had been suggested; and he should therefore address himself to the Amendment of his right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) as compared with the provisions of the Bill. His right hon. Friend contended that Committees of the House, as at present constituted, gave their decisions in Election cases with great impartiality, and he was not prepared to deny that such was the fact as far as the decision with respect to the seat and the existence of corrupt practices was concerned. Did a Committee of that House, however, he should like to know, ever find a Member guilty of bribery? ["Yes."] Not once in fifty years. But if it were proved that a candidate had deposited a large sum at his bankers, that he made no inquiry as to how it was expended, and that his recognized agents had laid out portions of it in bribing, would not any tribunal, except one composed of Members of the same class as himself, and who were liable to the same temptations, find him guilty of some kind of corruption? What he desired to see was a tribunal which would consider bribery which was tolerated by a candidate as if it had been committed by him, and that would not be done, he believed, so long as the decision rested with the House itself. The Amendment of his right hon. Friend would be an improvement on the existing state of things, but it failed in the essential condition of providing a local inquiry, and one that could be pursued when Parliament was not sitting. By means of a local inquiry the commission of offences could be much more easily detected than if the investigation were conducted at a distance. If local inquiry was of no advantage, what was the use of the Judges going circuit? The cases were precisely analogous. Although he thought that the plan of the Government possessed a great advantage over that of his right hon. Friend, yet he was far from being disposed to place implicit confidence in the Judges. He could not forget that they had been politicians, and that they were sometimes thought to be politicians still. There was reason to believe that a recent charge in the Court of Queen's Bench would cost the Government several votes on the present Bill, though it would not cost them his. If, however, the Bill were passed as it stood, it would not be in the power of the House—as they had been reminded at an earlier stage of the debate by the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley)—after trying the experiment, to discontinue it without the consent of the other branch of the Legislature. Now, he thought it very important that the House should be able to put a stop to the experiment without any consent but its own, and he should therefore suggest that the operation of the Act be limited to two years. Under ordinary circumstances he should say five years, but having regard to the experience which they would at once have of the working of the Act, he thought two years sufficient. In the meantime we should have a most important General Election, and there would, in all probability, be a sufficient number of Election Petitions to give an ample trial of the experiment.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he would not repeat the usual formula that he had no wish to prolong the debate; but he rose with a sincere desire to expedite, as much as possible, the proceedings in connection with the Bill. On a former night he had voted against the Motion for transferring the jurisdiction. As between the two propositions before the Committee, though he was prepared to vote for the Amendment of his right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie), he had no desire to see a division take place. The question was not what was best in the abstract, but what was best under the circumstances, and the wisest scheme under all the circumstances of the case was, in his opinion, that which stood on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton). That plan provided for a local inquiry by means of attorneys of the House of Commons to be appointed by the Speaker, while it proposed but a very small innovation on the existing system. It also had the advantage of being easily revocable. There would be no great inconvenience arising from its adoption or in receding from it afterwards in the event of its not being found to answer the purpose which the House had in view. He hoped, therefore, the Government would be disposed to look upon it with favour. If, however, they too strongly approved their own scheme to allow the adoption of that of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets in its stead, then arose the question on what terms and conditions the Government proposal ought to be accepted. In answering that question the plan suggested by his hon. Friend the Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill) was, in his opinion, well worthy of consideration. If the operation of the Bill were limited to two years, time would be given to see how it worked, and, if it did not work satisfactorily, the House of Commons would at the end of that time be enabled to re-consider its position with perfect independence. He trusted, under those circumstances, the Government would look upon the proposal of his hon. Friend as one which would tend very materially to diminish the difficulties of the case and one to which it would be well to assent. As to the apparent inconsistency which had been pointed out by his right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock in legislating as the Bill proposed for England and not for Scotland and Ireland, he would only say that the force of that objection would be greatly mitigated if the Bill were to have only a temporary operation. Besides it was quite plain that, in legislating, for England the House was legislating for that part of the United Kingdom in which the chief dangers and difficulties against which it was intended to guard must be held to lie; for in Scotland, be it said to her honour, bribery and intimidation were comparatively unknown, while in Ireland there was comparatively a narrow field with which to deal. If the Bill were limited in its operation to two years, a serious question would no doubt arise with respect to the appointment of the Judges under its provisions, and to provide for the absorption of those gentlemen on the first vacancies which might occur after a General Election, even within the term of two years, would, of course, be the absolute duty of the Government of the day, for it would be preposterous to appoint Judges with vested interests and entitled to pensions for life only for so short a period. He could not see why they should not be absorbed into the ordinary tribunals, for the judicial appointments under this Bill would be made from the same class of men, and for the same qualities of character, capacity, and learning as the ordinary appointments of Judges. He had, in conclusion, simply to repeat the hope that the Government would consider favourably the proposals which he had mentioned, for it was desirable to get through the Bill with as little delay as possible, and to save it from the risk of miscarriage.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he hoped that the Government would be inclined favourably to consider the overture made to them by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone). The real pith of the matter would consist in the limited time now proposed by the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill). But rather than not have any improvement, he would consent to adopt the plan of the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie).

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he wished to know whether it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill relating to Election Petitions from Ireland? If not, there would be two separate systems in operation with regard to the trial of Election Petitions; but he would seriously object to the application to Ireland of such a scheme as that under consideration. He was opposed to the principle of transferring the jurisdiction in Election matters from that House to any other tribunal.

MR. DISRAELI said, that the real question before the Committee was the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie); and, if that were carried, the Government would consider that the Bill had received a very considerable blow, which would be fatal, in his mind, to the whole Government proposition. It appeared to him that the best course to pursue would be to come to a decision on that Amendment. The suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) to limit the period during which the Bill should be in force, was one which deserved the consideration of the House; but it would be far more convenient if that question should be discussed on the Amendment of which the hon. Member for Westminster had given Notice. It would receive from the Government a candid consideration, but he was not prepared, upon the moment, to accept a proposal which really required much consideration. It would be a matter, open to discussion, whether it was advisable to limit the duration of the Bill at all; and, if it were thought proper to do so, it would still be a question, whether the limit should be two years or the end of the next Parliament.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he preferred the Amendment of the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) to the clause in the Bill; but if he had an assurance from the Government that they would adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill), he would then willingly vote for the clause.

MR. WHITBREAD said, he felt disappointed at the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury; and he thought it incumbent on him distinctly to declare that he should vote against the Amendment of the hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) with the intention of afterwards supporting the suggestion of the hon. Member for Westminster.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he wished to have a distinct answer to the question whether or not the Bill was to apply to Ireland? The Bill, as altered from the shape in which it was introduced, was an exceedingly bad one, and he should give it his decided opposition..

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 204; Noes 127: Majority 77.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Regulations as to Presentation of Election Petition).

MR. AYRTON said, he wished to have some explanation. The clause proposed that the Petition must be presented within twenty-one days after the return, unless it specifically alleged payment of the money subsequent to that period; and the Petition might then be presented within twenty-eight days after the date of such payment. The important question, therefore, would arise, whether a Member's seat should be questioned at any time during the continuance of the Parliament to which he was elected. But that was not the only question that would arise. Any number of Petitions might be presented — one after the other had been disposed of. First, there might be the general Petition, to be presented within twenty-one days; and when that was disposed of, another Petition might be presented, making some distinct charge of corruption within twenty-eight days of the time of presenting the Petition; and that might be followed by a third Petition in reference to another corrupt payment, and so on. If a Member was thus liable to have his seat questioned, he would be in rather an unfortunate position as regarded his independence. There was no provision in the Bill which directed that after one Petition was tried no other should be presented. With the view of more distinctly raising the question, he should propose to omit in Section 2, from the word "unless" to the end of the clause.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the hon. and learned Member had alluded to the provision in this clause, as though it was of a novel character; but, in fact, that proposition was an exact copy, in a statutory form, of the ordinary Sessional Order, passed at the commencement of each Session. It was introduced for the purpose of meeting the case where the sitting Member, in order to avoid being unseated, had deferred the corrupt payment until after the time for presenting an ordinary Petition had expired. It was most desirable that there should be nothing in the Bill to preclude the inquiry which could at present be made under the jurisdiction of the House, where those guilty of corrupt practices had deferred their payments.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, he must beg to point out that, while the usual Sessional Order permitted Petitions to be presented from the date of the General Election to fourteen days after the next meeting of Parliament, the present clause limited the time for presenting them to twenty-one days after the return of the Writ, so that however gross the corruption and bribery might have been, if the means of exposing it were not discovered within twenty-one days of the date of the return, it would be impossible to present a Petition, unless some subsequent corrupt payment was alleged. That confirmed him in the belief that the effect of the Bill would not be to promote the discovery of bribery and corruption, but quite the reverse; that considerable additional discouragement would be thrown in the way of its discovery and exposure. No doubt the chances of compromise would be lessened, but the question was whether such an advantage would be a compensation.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that in cases where the right to a seat was involved the clause directed that the Petition must be presented within twenty-one days after the return to the Writ. This was in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, who thought that the time now allowed—namely, fourteen days, was too short for the presentation of Petitions which simply claimed the seat. Where corrupt payments, however, were alleged, the Petition must be presented within twenty-eight days after the alleged corrupt payment was made. The clause did not deal with another class of Petitions, in which the question of the right to a seat was not involved, but merely the question of the existence of general corruption in a borough. Nothing that was contained in the Bill would affect the right of that House to appoint at any time a Commission to inquire into the existence of such general corruption; but as some doubt had been expressed as to the power of Commissioners appointed in such case, he intended to bring up a clause that evening to confirm the power of the House to appoint Commissioners for that purpose.

MR. AYRTON said, he was at a loss to know what were the views of the Solicitor General with reference to the Bill. If they repealed the 5 & 6 *Vict.* c. 102, would they not give up the jurisdiction which they had by the law of Parliament, over questions of corruption at elections? If the House preserved its general jurisdiction in such cases, they ought to consider what would be the position of the Judges. He should like to know how much law the Judges on the one hand were to administer under this Bill, and how much jurisdiction the Members of the House were, on the other, to retain under their general laws? No doubt if, as the Solicitor General stated, the House reserved all its own power in the case of corrupt practices, and only gave a limited jurisdiction to the Judges, much of the objection to the Bill would be removed, but unless it was distinctly laid down in what cases the House would use its jurisdiction, the Judges would be placed in some difficulty.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that the Select Committee had come to the conclusion that it was advisable to repeal the Act to which the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) had referred, because it had proved in operation to be futile with reference to inquiry into general corrupt practices; and it was therefore inserted in the Schedule. He proposed, in order to meet the objection which he had mentioned, to bring up a clause which he believed would be found to meet all objections—

> "If, upon a Petition to the House of Commons presented within 21 days after the return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of a Member to serve in Parliament for any borough or county, or within 14 days after the meeting of Parliament, and signed by any two or more electors of such borough or county, and alleging that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the then last election for such borough or county, and that there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have there so prevailed, an Address be presented by both Houses of Parliament praying that such allegations may be inquired into; the Crown may appoint Commissioners to inquire into the same, and if such Commissioners in such case be appointed they shall inquire in the same manner, and with the same powers, and subject to all the provisions of the statute 15th and 16th of Victoria cap. 57."

MR. WHITBREAD said, he could confirm the statement of the Solicitor General as to the Act referred to by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets being inoperative. The Committee thought it hardly worth while to retain it on the statute book. Whether it were repealed or not was immaterial as regarded the inquiry under this Bill.

MR. AYRTON said, he must still contend for the accuracy of the view which he had expressed. He maintained that if they repealed the Act they would shut the door against all general inquiry into corrupt practices. He thought it should be struck out of the Schedule, otherwise more harm than good would be the result of the Bill.

MR. GOLDNEY said, he would beg to remind the Committee that they were discussing matters which did not properly come under consideration at this time. If they desired to progress in this matter, it would be much better to confine themselves to the question immediately under consideration, which was whether twenty-one days were a sufficient time for the presentation of a Petition after a General Election, and twenty-eight days for a Petition complaining of undue influence and corruption. It was necessary to shorten the time if they expected two Judges to get through the work.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he believed that the time allowed was quite sufficient, inasmuch as the existence of bribery was pretty well known at the time at which it was committed. With reference to what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), it was scarcely advisable to retain a statute which never could work. His hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General had, however, promised to bring up a clause on the subject, and that clause could be discussed at the proper time. He thought it would be better to postpone further discussion on the point until they came to the Schedules.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he thought a longer time than twenty-one days was necessary; because facts leaked out from the vexation and disputes which usually followed an election, and ample time should be given for them to come to a head. He was of this opinion, although he admitted that in some instances more than twenty-one days was practically given.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, his experience had led him to believe that neither twenty-one nor twenty-eight days produced knowledge of bribery; whether bribery existed or not was always very well known while the election was in progress. Agents were on the watch, and kept their eyes on the forty thieves to be found in every borough [Mr. BOUVERIE: Not in every borough.], and the agents soon knew whether any of the forty thieves had been bribed. What remained unknown was the time and place when the bribery was committed, and that was only divulged in the committee-room, and very often not there.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. J. STUART MILL stated that as his three Amendments on this clause had been virtually disposed of, he did not propose to move them.

MR. POWELL said, he thought that Notice of a Petition having been presented, should be required to be given to the constituency. He therefore moved, in line 16, after "prescribed," to insert—

> "And by sending a copy thereof, within the prescribed time, to the Returning Officer of the Borough or County to which the Petition relates, who shall forthwith publish the same."

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL objected to the Amendment on the ground that it was inexpedient to multiply conditions precedent to a prosecution. The more they multiplied such conditions, the more opportunities they afforded for evading the jurisdiction of the Judges. There could, however, be no objection to a separate clause embodying the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, he considered that it was essential that the constituency should be informed that a Petition was presented, because otherwise the thing might be kept perfectly quiet and the constituency might know nothing about it.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he approved of the Amendment, but thought it should be proposed as a new clause.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. POWELL said, he thought the amount of security mentioned in the clause might be too small in many cases. He desired to give power to increase the security required of the petitioner above £1,000, and, therefore, he moved in line 27, after the word "of," to insert the words "not less than."

Mr. CLAY said, he thought the suggestion a good one, but doubted whether it could be carried out by the Amendment.

Mr. POWELL said, that his proposal involved another Amendment in the next clause.

Mr. NEATE thought £1,000 sufficient security.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he felt there was danger of preventing Petitions if too high a security were required.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he hoped the Government would insert "£2,000." He spoke feelingly on that subject. He had no idea of men of straw being allowed to harass Members by attacking their seats without the slightest excuse for doing so. That system was practised in order to carry on that great abuse the pairing off of one Petition against another.

Sir ROBERT COLLIER said, that in the case of men of straw it would be all the same whether they were made answerable for £1,000 or £2,000.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, that if the object of the Bill was to prevent bribery and corruption, they ought not to impose these penalties—for they were nothing else but penalties—upon petitioners who might be poor electors, who had themselves suffered from such corrupt practices. It ought not to go forth to the world that unless such persons could produce £1,000, or could get somebody else to be answerable for that amount — supposing they should fail in establishing bribery —they would be precluded from coming forward to expose or punish it. There ought to be some public officer whose duty it should be to investigate in the first instance whether there had been bribery and corruption in any particular constituency. Provision ought to be made to punish the man who got up a Petition to serve private purposes.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Recognizance may be objected to).

Mr. J. STUART MILL moved, to add at the end of the clause the words—

> "And the respondent making any such objection shall be required to serve notice of it, precisely describing the ground of it, on the Petitioner, or on all the Petitioners, if more than one, within the said prescribed time, not exceeding five days."

They ought not to discourage, but rather to facilitate the presentation of Petitions, and petitioners ought to have such warning of any objection taken to their sureties as would enable them, if any mistakes had been made, to rectify them.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Clause, to add the words—

> "And the respondent making any such objection shall be required to serve notice of it on the Petitioner, or on all the Petitioners if more than one, within the prescribed time not exceeding five days."—(*Mr. Mill.*)

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, the present practice in that matter worked very well, and he thought the use of the word "precisely" in the Amendment would not add much to its efficacy, while it might raise numerous questions in regard to every one of the notices served.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, he had no objection to omit from his Amendment the words "precisely describing the ground of it," but he thought that notice of objection ought to be given.

After a few remarks from Mr. Candlish, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee, and Mr. Neate,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL observed, that all the practice was to be prescribed by rule of Court, and he thought they might trust to the Court to see that proper notice was given.

Mr. P. WYKEHAM-MARTIN said, that while hon. Members were anxious to give facilities for presenting Petitions in every possible way, they ought not to forget that there were such things as poor candidates. He would mention the instance of a former Member of that House who had been petitioned against, and who rose in his place and stated upon his honour that he had a good defence to make, but that he was unable to raise the necessary £1,000 for the purpose. The consequence was that he was obliged to give up his seat.

MR. DENMAN said, he was also of opinion that too great facilities should not be given to men of straw, low attorneys, and villains of all kinds, who might desire to get up Petitions against men who might have been returned by a good majority. For his own part he looked upon bribery as a most heinous offence, and would not allow a single farthing to be expended on his behalf that might not appear in the auditor's books; but then he knew from his experience how vexatiously Petitions were sometimes presented against particular returns. The House should bear in mind that there was such a thing as an honest candidate, and should not seek to favour only petitioners and sureties, who very often were men of straw. In his own case, a Petition had been presented against him by two persons, one of whom became bankrupt, and the other went to the Continent in order to avoid being mulcted in costs. An offer was made to withdraw the Petition if he would not insist upon costs; but to that he refused to assent. Ultimately the Petition was not prosecuted. The costs in that case amounted to between £200 and £300, which was no light sum for a man of moderate means to lose through being called upon to defend his seat before a Committee. How much greater the expense might be if a man were called upon to defend his seat at a distance from London he was not prepared to say. He thought that the proposed Amendment too much lost sight of the case of the honest candidate.

SIR ROBERT COLLIER thought the object of the hon Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill) a very excellent one, but it was met by the clause as it stood.

VISCOUNT AMBERLEY said, that though there was great force in what had been stated by the hon. and learned Member for Tiverton (Mr. Denman), yet it must be remembered that there was also a great hardship on the other side; and it appeared to him that the hon. Member for Westminster was right in proposing to facilitate as much as possible the presentation of Petitions.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he was fully aware of the evil to which his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Tiverton (Mr. Denman) referred. He believed that there were nearly as many dishonest Petitions as there were corrupt elections. But the remedy for this evil must be taught independently, and not by rendering *bonâ fide* Petitions expensive and difficult.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 31; Noes 85: Majority 54.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Determination of Objection to Recognizance).

MR. POWELL proposed to insert the following words after "mentioned," in line 12—

> "Or if proof be not given in manner prescribed that the notice of the presentation of the Petition and of the nature of the proposed security has been duly served as hereinbefore provided."

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he thought facilities ought not to be given by which men of straw might, from improper motives, present Petitions against the return of Members. The effect of this clause would be where the security required was insufficient that a London Club would be got to advance the £1,000. Now, as the money would be spent in that locality, and the Judge would bring a train with him, it would be the direct interest of those living on the spot to get up such an inquiry. He moved the omission of the words relating to the deposit of the money.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER did not see that any injustice would be done by allowing the petitioner, instead of giving security, to deposit a sum of money.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he hoped the House would not encourage frivolous Petitions. He intended to move a Resolution requiring that a certain number of persons should unite in every Petition.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he must point out to hon. Members who talked so much about men of straw, that the clause was framed to provide against such persons coming forward with Petitions, by requiring them to deposit a considerable amount of money by way of security. By the law, as it at present stood, a candidate might enter into his recognizances with a sum of money.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, he thought that the proposal of the Bill was in point of fact equivalent to a revival of the old custom of straw bail. With a view to prevent unjust and frivolous Petitions being fomented, he should support the Amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he must oppose the Amendment. The object was that the party petitioned against should have good security, and no security could be so good as the actual deposit of the money.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 9 *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Clause A.—Appointment of Judges for Trial of Election Petitions).

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER said, that the time had now come when the Committee would expect to hear from the Prime Minister whether he agreed with the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill) that the Bill should be in operation for a limited period only. He (Sir Roundell Palmer) had always doubted the wisdom and policy of the Bill. Those who, like himself, regarded the Bill with disfavour would prefer its being looked upon in the light of an experiment; but, on the other hand, there was no disguising the fact that if at the end of the time determined on it were not thought advisable to continue the measure, the two Judges who were to be appointed under the Bill would be left without any functions to perform, and must, of course, be ultimately merged in the general body of the Judges. Whether or not an increase in the number of our Judges was necessary was a very important question, but one which it was scarcely their province at that moment to determine. A Royal Commission had been recently appointed to inquire into the subject, and it would not be right to anticipate their decision by something incidentally arising in this Bill. He hoped the Commission would recommend something acceptable to the country. He had a great objection to special jurisdictions, and he thought that if new Judges were to be appointed they should form part of the present body. If two Judges were to be appointed specially for this jurisdiction, he doubted whether two men could be found who would in every respect command the confidence of the public; and if, by any chance, the Judges elected should not prove acceptable to the country, if their decisions should not be viewed with public favour, Parliament would be in the unfortunate position of having intrusted to these gentlemen the power, without the intervention of a jury, and without appeal, of dealing with matters of the highest importance, and of attaching by their decisions in many cases a stigma which must last for seven years, and which at the least amounted to political disfranchisement for that period. The Judges chosen for this purpose would not be taken from the general body in rotation. However incompetent or unqualified for the duty they might be, when once they were appointed to the post their decisions must be submitted to without chance of redress. All the Judges were not held in equal regard by the public. They did not all in an equal degree give satisfaction to the public. Moreover, the defects and infirmities of particular men selected for the discharge of special duties would appear more prominently and be more remarked than those of men who had to perform only ordinary duties. There should therefore, be an interchange of this special work with the ordinary duties. The one would, as now, act as a set off against the other. Honesty and integrity were the characteristics of our Judges, and he hoped nothing would be done that would tend to impair public confidence in them. He had, also, some objections to the wording of the clause, which, for instance, empowered Her Majesty to appoint "any number of persons not exceeding two." These "Honorary" Justices would be in the same position as to salary as the other Judges, and they were to be styled "the Honorary Justices of the Court of Common Pleas," with which Court they were to have nothing to do except in name. Why the Bill should fix them in a Court to which they did not belong, and probably take them out of their own Court to do so, he could not understand. They were to be in other respects in a higher position than the other Puisne Judges, because they were to be Privy Councillors, and they were to sit as Judges in the Court of Exchequer Chamber or in any other Court of Error or Appeal from the superior Courts of Common Law at Westminster. It appeared to him that, if Parliament were about to make a superior order of Judges to exercise a higher jurisdiction, it would be better to call them by a name that would distinguish them in conformity with the duties given to them. It might be said that the Petitions were to be presented to the Court of Common Pleas, and that therefore the Honorary Justices ought to be called Judges of that Court. But he denied the consequence. If these Judges were not numerous enough, and it became necessary to take other Judges to assist them who were not Justices of the Court of Common Pleas, it would be absurd to call them so.

MR. KNATCHBULL - HUGESSEN said, he thought they ought to be Judges who had held the office of Judge for five years.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, it was always contemplated that they should be Judges of this standing.

MR. AYRTON said, it would be better to add two Judges to the number of the present Judicial Bench, or to the Court of Common Pleas, if that were thought preferable, leaving for after selection the two Judges for the particular duty under this Bill; so that if the system should not be found to work well, those Judges would merge into the Court as vacancies occurred, and we should return to our present starting point. This plan would involve no disturbance of the ordinary organization. The new Judges would sit at chambers, go circuit, and take the usual part in the Exchequer Chamber. They would act as Assessors to the House of Lords, or assist in the Court of Probate and Divorce, the Court of Chancery, &c. When an Election Petition was presented to the Court of Common Pleas, there would be the advantage of seven Judges to choose from instead of two. Then comes a larger question. He wished the Committee to ask themselves how the Judges were going to try these Petitions? According to past experience the number of Petitions after a General Election would be about forty. Many hon. Members who were favourable to the Reform Bill of last year believed there would be a great many more Petitions in the next Parliament; and the present measure appeared to have originated in the fear and belief that corruption would be increased, and that the next House of Commons could not safely be intrusted to discharge the duties which the present House performed. Supposing that there were as many Election Petitions at the next election as in times past, how were these two Judges to try forty cases? How long must they sit to enable them to do so? It would be necessary to have have-a-dozen Judges or more to conduct these inquiries, and it was therefore better that there should be no distinction between the Judges. There was something very objectionable in the selection by the Crown, on the eve of a General Election, of Judges who were to sit upon Petitions against the return of Members of that House. He hoped the Government would repudiate the invidious position which would be given them under the Bill. He hoped that, instead of having a special tribunal, they would give jurisdiction to all the Judges indiscriminately, and leave it to them to decide who should try these petitions, as they now decided in regard to circuits. In order to raise the question, he would move the omission of all the words after "exceeding," in page 4, line 26, leaving it to the Solicitor General to make such an addition to the clause as would carry out the object he had in view.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 26, to leave out from the word "exceeding" to the end of the Clause. — (*Mr. Ayrton.*)

MR. KARSLAKE said, he concurred in the opinion that the two Judges to be appointed should be added to the judicial Bench and exercise a general jurisdiction, it being undesirable that they should have special and exclusive functions. He would suggest a proviso that they should take office subject to the future determination of the House as to what their duties should be. This would not interfere with any of the very valuable provisions of the Bill.

MR. SANDFORD said, that as the transfer of jurisdiction had been determined upon, all that remained was to carry it out in the best manner. He did not think it would be desirable to give the two additional Judges to the Court of Common Pleas; because if such a course were adopted the Judges of that Court might appear to be selected exclusively for that office. In his opinion it would be better that an additional Judge should be appointed both in the Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, and if it should be thought necessary in the Court of Exchequer also, so as to assist the present judicial Bench in their ordinary duties, and the Puisne Judges should take these Election Petitions in turn.

MR. DENMAN pointed out that if no two of the fifteen Judges could be found to undertake this jurisdiction—a contingency not unlikely to be realized—the whole thing would come to a dead-lock, the Bill containing no compulsory powers. It was only on the two Judges who undertook the office not being able to get through the work that the other part of the Bill came into play. He shared in the objection that had been made to the establishment of a separate Court; but if they did not take that course, they would impose duties on the Judges which they did not desire to accept. He objected to a single Judge deciding these cases, and also to the 19th clause, which allowed evidence of bribery to be gone into prior to proof of agency. He recommended the Government to postpone the clauses for a day or two, and then bring in a better scheme.

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, that if the Committee were compelled to listen to long speeches on subjects already decided on, very little hope of making Progress could be entertained. He rose simply to disclaim the notion suggested by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) as that which prompted supporters of the Bill. As a Member of the Select Committee which considered the Bill of last Session, he assured the Committee that the recommendations made were founded, not on fears for the future, but on experience of the past. The Select Committee was satisfied a change was needed, but that no change would be effectual unless the jurisdiction were removed from the House. He was bound to say he preferred the scheme of his hon. and learned Friend to the scheme of the Bill, which he would support merely as superior to the present system. He thought there were great objections to the Minister of the day choosing the Judges who were to fill the office. He was in favour of adding to the Judges, and leaving the work with them as a body, on the understanding that the Judge for the occasion would be selected by a *rota*. The only objection he could conceive to the scheme was the antipathy to it expressed on the part of the Judges themselves. But if that proposal were not adopted he should support the Bill, because he was unwilling to lose the chance of effecting a great reform from a desire to carry a still larger reform. They were all aware that the Bench was at present under-manned, and independently of any considerations connected with that subject, it was desirable that its strength should be increased. Perhaps some changes in that respect would be suggested by the Commission now inquiring into the subject; this question, however, could not be postponed until that Commission had reported.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, that if he could not get a better measure he should support the Bill, because he believed that human ingenuity could not devise anything worse than the system under which Election Petitions were at present tried. He thought, however, that the whole of this jurisdiction ought not to be given to the Court of Common Pleas, but that an additional Judge should be appointed to each of the Common Law Courts. These Judges ought to go circuit, and do all ordinary business. The Judges on whom the trial of Election Petitions should devolve should be appointed by *rota* or ballot. According to the plan of the Government two gentlemen who were distinguished, not for their learning, but for their party spirit, would be appointed to try Election Petitions, and nobody would be satisfied with them. As he had said some months ago, he believed the whole of the Judges would undertake this work if they were coaxed a little. On that point he spoke with some authority, for although he had not the honour to be a Judge himself, he was a Judge's son, and he would say that the Judges were a little underpaid. Till very lately the Judges had £5,500 a year, but now they received only £5,000 a year; that was to say, no more than a Vice Chancellor, who had not to pay the expense of going circuit. If £500 were added to the salaries of the Judges all this difficulty would be overcome.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he would remind the Committee that the Judges objected to the work being thrown on them as a body, because it would entail odium on them and depreciate their authority in matters of greater importance. Everyone was interested in the purity of the Bench and the authority it exercised. It was a strong argument against change of jurisdiction if no one could be found competent to take it. He believed, however, that if special Judges were appointed to the Election Petitions jurisdiction, perfectly qualified persons could be found to fulfil the functions.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that the first objection taken by the hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) was that the Judges whom it was proposed to appoint would be improperly named, and besides this he made a verbal criticism by way of objection that they should be called Judges of the Court of Common Pleas. But inasmuch as the Committee had already determined that the Petitions should be presented to the Court of Common Pleas, as every preliminary step was to be taken in that Court, as the Masters of that Court were the officers who were to carry out the Act, and when a Judge actually tried a Petition he would require to have all the powers of a Judge of that Court at *Nisi Prius*, it was thought better that he should be called a Judge of the Common Pleas, and there was a provision in the Bill to give him all the powers which he would have as a Judge of that Court. Then he came to the main objection, which was that it was proposed to appoint two Judges, and it was said that the original plan recommended by the Select Committee, that the matter should be left to all the Judges, was far preferable. That might be so or it might not, but the Committee ought to consider that if they departed from the plan at present embodied in the Bill and attempted to go back to the scheme against which such strong remonstrances had been made by the Judges—remonstrances which had not been withdrawn—they would be in the greatest possible danger of losing the Bill. It might be all very well to say that they could carry the Bill by majorities in that House; but if the Judges persisted in their remonstrances there would probably be resistance in "another place" at their instigation, and he could not help thinking that it would greatly jeopardize the Bill. Now, what was the great difference between the plan inserted in the Bill and the plan of the Select Committee? It was true that by the Bill as it stood at present two Judges were to be appointed, who were to be peculiarly Election Judges. But by a clause, which, though not forming part of the Bill at present, could be easily introduced, it might be provided that in times of pressure there should be power to call upon the other Judges to assist in the trial of Petitions. In this way, there would be two Judges who would have the management of Election Petitions at ordinary times, and who would be very useful in instituting the forms of procedure, and getting the Court into working gear, a thing which was always very difficult at first; and after a General Election, when the number of Petitions to be tried was very large, the other Judges, or at least a great part of them, might render assistance. The only difference between the two plans was this—that, according to the scheme embodied in the Bill, they would have two Judges specially appointed for the purpose of managing the general business of the Court with regard to Election Petitions, and of trying some of the Petitions. Now it was no fair argument against the plan to mis-state what the consequences would be, as when it was said that the Government would have the power before a General Election of selecting and appointing two Judges. But the Judges were to be appointed, as all Judges were, upon the responsibility of Ministers and by Patent from the Crown, and, according to an Amendment which had been accepted, they were to be persons who had acted as Judges for five years. They would, therefore, have been removed from all political connection for five years, they would be persons in whom the country had learnt to confide, and they would be irremovable. The public would have in their case everything that had given the country confidence in its other Judges, and, therefore, it could not fairly be said that they would be appointed for political purposes, and open to political influences. The only question to be tried was whether a person had been bribed or not, and he did think it a stigma upon the Judges to say that Judges who had been appointed Judges for five years could not be got who would not be liable to the imputations of corrupt motives. ["No, no!"] His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Tiverton (Mr. Denman) said "No." He did not intend to say that his hon. and learned Friend meant to cast such an imputation on the Judges, but his argument went to that extent. It had been objected that when these Judges were not engaged in trying Election Petitions they would be perfectly idle; but the 12th clause provided that when they were not engaged in trying Election Petitions they might be performing other duties most useful to the country, which would give them ample employment and be of material assistsnce to the other Courts. The only duties they would not have to perform would be the going on circuit and sitting in chambers. The only other objection taken by the hon. Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) was that these Judges would be constantly trying Election Petitions, and would have no interchange of duties. But if that was an objection it applied with equal force to a great many other Judges. The Judges in Chancery had no interchange of duties, the Judge of Probate and Divorce, who gave general satisfaction to the country, had no interchange of duties. The question, then, really was whether they would pass this Bill, or now, on the 6th of July, go into some virtually new Bill of which they knew nothing. He would strongly urge on the Committee that they would do well to accept this Bill.

MR. LOWE said, that the speech of the Solicitor General might be divided into two parts—argument and menace. And first as to the argument. He did not think that his hon. and learned Friend could gravely contend, if they were to sit down to devise the best system for trying Election Petitions by Judges, that this Bill would be found to contain it. Her Majesty's Government hardly thought so, and he was very unwilling to press on them, because he thought that in this matter they had shown a great and sincere wish to carry out the Report of the Committee. He wished, therefore, to speak with all moderation of their conduct on this question. Many reasons might have led them to take the course which they had adopted; and he did not mean to say that this scheme, lame and imperfect as it was, would not be better than losing the Bill altogether. But when the scheme was argued on its merits—when it was put as a matter not of threat but of reason—he must demur to what his hon. and learned Friend had said. For what could possibly be worse than to pick out two persons on whom the eyes of all persons likely to have business coming before the Courts would be fixed, and who were inevitably to decide on these matters? Let those persons be ever so moderate—let them be the perfection of carefulness, prudence, and impartiality—they would not escape all manner of censure and cavil. Then there was another question, which was, that when they created a tribunal for a particular purpose there ought to be some reasonable proportion between the powers of the tribunal and the duties it would have to perform. Now, how could it be supposed that two Judges could try a tenth part of the Petitions after a General Election? It was clearly ridiculous to suppose that the means provided had any sort of relation to the end to be attained. Well, that had been foreseen, and it was provided against; because the two Judges who were to be specially marked out from the rest of their brethren as political persons, whenever they found that they had more to do than they could do, which would always be the case after a General Election, were to certify that fact. They might as well be required to certify that they could not lift three tons. And then what would happen? The House objected to Select Committees for the trial of Petitions on the ground that they were appointed by partizans from among partizans, and that, however pure they might be they did not escape suspicion. But what was to happen in this case? These Judges, having certified a notorious fact, Her Majesty's Government—who were of all people in the world those who had the greatest reason to wish Election Petitions to be decided in a particular way—were to appoint other persons to assist them. Now, if you wanted to subject two honest and upright men to suspicion and obloquy, and if you wanted to discredit the Government who appointed them, you could not hit upon a more certain way of attaining this end. He felt confident that every Judge would, to the best of his knowledge and understanding, do his duty; but it was necessary that our tribunals should be not only upright, but unquestioned; and that they could never be if this proposal were persisted in. He appealed to the Government, who had been driven into their present course by circumstances beyond their control, to take into consideration the unanimity which prevailed on this subject both in the House and in the Committee. Such unanimity gave the Government fair reason for re-considering the question. In a matter of this vast constitutional importance neither the Government nor the House could suffer themselves to be influenced by the motives which had been suggested. They were told that they had not got the consent of the Judges. He could only say that the House of Commons must not regard the consent of the Judges. If they were Judges in their Court, this House, as a constituent part of the Parliament of this country, were Judges in this Court; and when Parliament had given its decision, the Judges were bound to obey, just as every litigant was bound to obey their decisions. It was due to the Judges that the most careful consideration should be given to all they alleged, and that they should not be overweighted by duties; at the same time Parliament was bound to consider the public interests, and not allow itself to be swayed by personal considerations. A great evil was to be dealt with. Parliament stood between the present and the future, and must do the best it could to purify our electoral system. It was not to be endured that in discharging this duty they should be prevented from doing what they honestly believed to be right by apprehensions of what might happen "elsewhere." Let this House do what it thought right, and let the other House be responsible for any course it might choose to take. These matters were too important and too sacred to admit of a compromise. This House was bound to act as it thought best for the public interest, and to speak as men entrusted with the consciences of the people, not leaving it to be supposed that they thought so poorly of the rights confided to them by their constituents as to create an inferior machinery for dealing with these questions when they were capable of devising a much better tribunal. He hoped the House would not swerve one hair's-breadth from what they believed to be the right path on account of any such considerations as had been presented to them. They should do their duty, and leave the House of Peers to do theirs. It seemed to him that the proper course would be to authorize the appointment of three new Judges, who should be in no way earmarked or distinguished from the rest of the Judges—who should sink into the general body of Judges, and exercise the same duty as their fellows in the different Courts. Parliament ought to provide that they should in some general way arrange a rotation in which they should perform these duties; and they should be subject to any arrangement Parliament might decide upon hereafter when the Commission for the re-constitution of our judicial system presented their Report. He hoped that the same Judges would not try a number of Petitions. That should be specially avoided. Each Judge should have a Petition to try, so that there should be no pretence for fixing peculiar odium upon any one Judge, but they should return to their respective Courts as little noticed as possible. This was the feeling of the Committee; it was the feeling of the House; and he hoped still that it might be the feeling of the Government.

Mr. DISRAELI: Sir, on the 6th of July the right hon. Gentleman and many Members of the Committee have arrived at a conclusion which was originally adopted by the Select Committee, and which the Government approved in the Bill they brought forward. That was probably on the 6th of February, and I think it is much to be regretted that so long a period should have elapsed without the Committee having expressed in a very distinct manner their opinion on the subject. I cannot agree that my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General addressed any menace to the Committee. I think his suggestions were prudential. If we are anxious to carry a Bill we must consider in what form it will be practicable to carry it. Now, remembering the effect which the manifesto of the Judges had upon the opinion of the House of Commons, I do not think it is to be looked upon in the light of a menace, if we suggest that it is not improbable that their representations may have some influence upon the opinions of the other House of Parliament. I am not prepared to run this risk. I preferred the scheme proposed by the Select Committee, and I preferred the Bill which I submitted to the House. But if not with the unanimous consent, it was with the very general consent of the House that the Government adopted the modified course which they pursued upon this subject. At this period of the Session I am not prepared to adopt the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe). Though I myself am not ready to deny their justice and their propriety, I must look to attaining the greatest amount of benefit I can attain under the difficult circumstances with which we have to contend, and therefore I must ask the Committee to express their opinion upon this clause. As to the inquiries which have been addressed to me, and to which the hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) has referred, whether I would agree to pass this measure for a limited period, one great objection to such a course, if we did not adopt the plan suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne, is this—where should we get the capable officers who would administer this Bill? I must act, therefore, with the greatest reserve before deciding upon this question. But that is not the point we are called upon to decide, which is the clause before us; and, believing that upon the whole the course we are asked to take is a dangerous one, I must ask the opinion of the Committee.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he did not think that the speech of the Solicitor General contained anything like menace. He had merely suggested that if the Bill were altered in a fundamental point the protest of the Judges might induce the Lords to reject the Bill. If two or three months back there had been a Motion in this House to keep to the Bill originally proposed by the Government and disregard the protest of the Judges, he should have agreed to that Motion; but, in acceding to the second reading of the present measure, the House of Commons virtually agreed to the plan of the Government, and he should, therefore, support them in this instance.

Question put, "That the word 'two' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 71; Noes 136: Majority 65.

Mr. DISRAELI: It was originally intended to report Progress about this period of the evening, and the decision which the Committee has arrived at is an additional reason for doing so and affording the Government an opportunity to consider whether they can meet the exigencies of the case. I cannot conceal from myself, although I do not say it by way of menace, that I have great difficulties to contend with.

Mr. BOUVERIE said, there was a clause upon the Paper drawn up by himself which expressly made the provision that three Judges should be appointed. If the Committee adopted that clause, it would give effect to all that was implied in the decision just come to. It would be a great convenience to all those who were most sincerely anxious to support the Government in passing this Bill if a day were fixed for resuming the consideration of it.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, it would be a great convenience to those who wished to support the Government if the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown, would let them know on what day he would go on with the Bill.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, that in his opinion the case presented no difficulty for the Government at all, as the Committee had by its decision reverted to the original Government plan of employing all the Judges. The opinion of the House had been at first unfavourable to this idea, but it now appeared that they were willing to adopt it.

Mr. WHITBREAD said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be kind enough to name the earliest day on which

he would proceed with the Bill. The majority of Members had come to the conclusion that a change was desirable, and they had indicated the direction in which it was desired. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman had nothing to complain of in the conduct of the Opposition or of the House generally. All that was wished was that he should bring in the Bill he originally introduced.

Mr. DISRAELI: I must give the same answer both to the hon. Gentleman opposite and to the hon. Gentleman near me. The Committee has not yet agreed to report Progress, and therefore it is quite premature to make the inquiry.

Mr. CLAY said, he thought the situation a very simple one. The Government paid to the protest made by the Judges the respect to which it was entitled, and they had altered their Bill. The House of Commons also, out of respect to the Judges, offered no objection to the Government bringing forward a new scheme. Its difficulties, however, were apparently so great, as were the disadvantages of any plan except that which the Government first recommended, that the House had wisely determined to revert to the original plan of the Government and to increase the strength of the judicial Bench by the addition of three Judges. He had far too much respect for the Judges of the country to believe that they would persist in the objection they had made.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday.*

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

THE NEW ZEALAND MEDAL.

OBSERVATIONS.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he regretted that he was absent on Friday evening when the noble Lord the Member for Middlesex (Viscount Enfield) drew attention to the propriety of granting a medal to the men who were engaged in the New Zealand War. He wished to take this opportunity of stating that it was their intention to grant a medal to the soldiers and sailors engaged in that war.

ARMY—WARLIKE STORES.

RESOLUTION.

MAJOR ANSON, in rising to move a Resolution on the subject of our Expenditure on Warlike Stores, said, he felt bound to call the attention of the House to this subject in consequence of the enormous amount which our expenditure for Warlike Stores had now reached. Since the close of the Crimean War we had expended on this single item no less than £19,000,000, while £4,000,000 had been voted over and above the amount actually expended. From the confused manner in which the accounts were made up, it was impossible to arrive at any but very indefinite ideas respecting any particular item. In this respect our system of accounts presented a most disadvantageous contrast with that of the French, which stated the expenditure under each head with the greatest accuracy. He had, however, compared our expenditure with that of the French in regard to Warlike Stores during the ten years following the close of the Crimean War, and in instituting this comparison he had classified the Warlike Stores under three heads—1. General stores. 2. Small arms. 3. Gunpowder. He found that during the ten years ending March, 1867, we had spent on general stores £9,875,431, as against £4,920,862 expended by the French in the same period. On small arms we had expended £3,891,779, while the French had only expended £1,679,822. And in respect of the item of gunpowder alone we had in the period referred to spent £1,671,207, as against £535,362 spent by the French. The total expenditure incurred by us during those ten years was, in round numbers, £15,438,000; and by the French £7,136,000; showing a difference against us of £8,302,000. While on this subject he wished to point out to the House that of the loan of £17,000,000 sterling contracted this year by the French the sum of £4,784,000 was taken for the purchase of warlike *matériel* during the years 1867, 1868, and 1869. That loan was contracted with the view of re-arming the whole of the French army with breech-loading rifles, and supplying the French navy with new artillery. Now, while we had voted two-thirds of that sum for 1867-8, we, unlike the French, had not determined what arm should be supplied to our troops, much less calculated what would be the total expenditure incurred. Indeed, the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for War, when bringing forward the Army Estimates, had stated that we were only on the very threshhold of the re-organization of our artillery. He believed he should not be incorrect in stating that it was under the consideration of the War Department to renew the whole of our field artillery. Under such circumstances, he thought himself perfectly justified in saying that great extravagance on our part might be assumed. He would, however, remind the House of the extraordinary causes of expenditure on the two armies during the period of ten years to which he was referring. In regard to our own army there were the Chinese War in 1858, 1859, and 1860, the New Zealand War, and the panic arising out of the Trent affair. During the same period the French were engaged in the Chinese War, conducted constant warlike operations in Cochin China, in Syria, in Algeria, at Rome, in the Italian campaign of 1859, and in Mexico. Taking all these facts into consideration, he believed he was justified in charging this country with being very extravagant in its expenditure on Warlike Stores. There were several causes for this extravagant expenditure, as, for example, the want of control; the separation of the military and civil elements in the army; the bad system adopted of supplying the colonies with stores from this country and returning them to this country at a great loss when they become old and useless, and the craving after unnecessary perfection in regard to guns and *matériel.* The House of Commons was greatly to blame for all this, for after voting large sums to be expended in *matériel,* no pains were taken to ascertain whether the Stores had been wasted or applied in a proper manner. The result was that every one who had any concern in the expenditure for those Warlike Stores was as careless about it as the House of Commons; and, indeed, it was but natural that when the body which set itself up as the guardian of the public purse was so careless in the matter every one else should be the same. What he proposed was that for the future the House of Commons should have an accurate Return each Session of the stock of warlike *matériel* in the Government stores—the Return to show what the consumption had been during the previous year, the quantity used by the troops, the quantity under repair, and the quantity added to the stock. This system had been introduced in France as far back as forty years ago, and had led to great economy in the expenditure for warlike purposes. In a pamphlet published by Major General Balfour the arguments used by the gentleman who had proposed it in the French Chambers will be found stated. That gentleman asked whether public property was precious only when it consisted of monies, and whether 100,000 francs ought not to be looked after when they were transferred to bronze, hemp, or other articles, as well as when they were in specie. He further observed that the Chambers, while holding Ministers responsible for even a centime in money, kept no efficient control over the vast sums expended in Warlike Stores. Major General Balfour himself expressed a strong opinion as to the necessity for a regular Return to Parliament of the consumption and stock of Stores. Last year he brought forward a Motion on the subject of the conversion of guns. At that time we had 30,000 cast-iron guns rotting in our stores, which guns had for several years previously been treated as so much rubbish. The officers of the Government had done everything to prevent them from being regarded as anything else. If year after year those guns had appeared in a Return presented to Parliament was it at all likely that the House of Commons would have gone on voting large sums for new guns without making an effort to have those old ones utilized in some way. Again, if such a Return was laid before Parliament, the House of Commons would not allow the War Department to fling in their face its inefficiency in respect of accounting for certain items of military expenditure in the colonies. This was done now in a note stating—

> "This is exclusive of the army accoutrements, barrack, hospital, and other stores, a great portion of which is supplied from this country, and the value of which cannot be stated."

The Department might just as well say that the cost of the food and clothing of soldiers in the colonies could not be stated. He had now to call attention to the manufacturing establishments. During the last Parliament those establishments were the subject of very great anxiety to the House of Commons; but the present Parliament had taken little or no notice of those establishments. It had allowed them to increase without making any inquiry or putting any check upon them. He ventured to remind the House of the arguments used in favour of those establishments. They were to give the Government the power of manufacturing for themselves in times of emergency, and also, he might say, to give them a certain efficiency in manufacturing. The second object in view was to have a check over trade prices in times of emergency. The third was, by having large manufacturing establishments, to enable the War Department to do with only a small stock on hand in times of peace. In his evidence before the Ordnance Select Committee Colonel Boxer adduced the last-mentioned argument in favour of those establishments. He now ventured to ask what had been the result of setting up those large manufacturing establishments? He admitted that in point of execution the gun-carriages and other work were perfection. With regard to our manufacturing establishments being a check over trade prices, he was afraid they had never shot the mark; because so effectual had been their check over trade prices that we had almost ceased to have any trade prices as a check over the prices of our manufacturing establishments. He thought this position was a worse one than would have been even that of our having no check over trade prices. It was true that for small articles, such as small arms, we went to the trade; but speaking as regarded the heavier articles, he was correct in saying that we had now no trade prices. With regard to the third expected advantage—the decrease of our stock of stores in times of peace, having no Return to go by he was unable to give a correct statement of facts; but he would venture to say that in neither this country nor any other were there to be found any establishments so filled to repletion as our Government establishments were with every kind of Warlike Stores. Though the last Parliament was of opinion that manufacturing establishments were desirable, that was only to a moderate extent. Sir Benjamin Hawes and Mr. Godley both stated their opinion that the Government should not carry the system of manufacturing in public establishments too far. The former Gentleman said he thought that we should rely more on private enterprize. The country had gone on increasing its establishments to such an extent that they had come at last to believe that they had a vested right, not only to manufacture but to invent; and that if any man dared to enter the field against them he was to be opposed by every means. To such an extent had the system been carried, that he no longer felt any faith in figures which might be placed in the mouth of any Secretary of State for War, or any Estimates which might be laid before a Select Committee — when comparison was made between Government work and that of an outsider. These were grave charges, but he was prepared to substantiate them. Last year, when he had raised the question as to the conversion of guns, the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State replied that it was chiefly a question of expense, and the difference in price between the new 6½-ton gun as made at Woolwich, and the converted gun, was the difference between £405 and £263, or £142. This was while the Gun Factories were opposing the work; but by a Report of the Ordnance Select Committee, recently laid on the table, he found from an Estimate of the Royal Gun Factories, for the same work, that the difference was put at £268 instead of £142—this change in the price being mainly owing to the Ordnance Select Committee having reported favourably. He had further been informed that when the Royal Gun Factories heard that there was a chance of the conversion of these guns being given to the trade, they immediately reduced their estimates by £23 a gun. In 1864, the question of heavy ordnance was mooted; but the expense of their manufacture was so heavy that the Ordnance Select Committee were—

> "Instructed to give their early and best attention to the question of providing some cheaper mode of construction for heavy guns, looking to the probable introduction of a large number of such guns for coast defences, and to the importance of reducing the expense which would attend their supply as made at present."

With such directions as these, the servants of the Government to whom the Committee had to refer for information, ought to have taken especial care that their figures were correct, or as nearly so as possible. There were three proposals submitted—two by the Royal Gun Factories, and one by Major Palliser; but, according to the existing practice, the Gun Factories had to estimate for all three. The proposals made by the Royal Gun Factories were a wrought iron gun with a wrought-iron barrel, or a wrought-iron gun with a steel barrel. Major Palliser's proposal was a cast-iron gun with a wrought-iron barrel. The respective estimates sent in by the Royal Gun Factories were — Wrought-iron gun, with steel barrel, £684; ditto, with wrought-iron barrel, £482; cast-iron gun with wrought-iron barrel, £600. The glaring injustice of asserting that to make a gun two-thirds of cast-iron and one-third of wrought-iron would cost £118 more than to make one wholly of wrought-iron would at once be evident; but the Ordnance Select Committee were bound to take the Estimates furnished to them, and upon these Estimates they reported as follows:—

> "The Committee do not at present recommend experiments to test the efficiency of Major Palliser's method, on the ground that it appears to be less economical than the gun constructed wholly of wrought iron."

There was an end of the outsider, of course. This Report went forth to the War Office, and was acted upon, and not till he himself agitated this question and moved for the Return was there any suspicion of a mistake in the estimates. As soon, however, as the question was referred to the Royal Gun Factories, they appended the following Note to their Return:—

> "This does not include an estimate of the cost of the 12½-ton gun made of cast-iron with a wrought-iron barrel. The Superintendent, Royal Gun Factories, states that when called upon by the Ordnance Select Committee for such an estimate, he explained to them his inability to furnish it, and that the estimate he did lay before that body (and which appears in their Report) was one of a compound gun, constructed on a general principle, in accordance with Major Palliser's views, as expressed in a (published) Letter to Captain Heyman, Secretary to the Ordnance Select Committee, on the 18th of May, 1864, and illustrated by a drawing; but, finding that this was not the description of gun they desired, he withdrew it."

The Ordnance Select Committee appended the following Note to their Report:—

> "In this Report the estimates sent in by the Superintendent of the Royal Gun Factories have been taken into consideration, as well as that of the Palliser gun, handed in by the Superintendent, and withdrawn by him, as before stated. The Ordnance Select Committee, in their Report, have treated the latter as if it were an estimate for a cast-iron gun with a wrought-iron barrel; and now state that, as far as their records show, it stands as given in their Report, and they were not aware the estimate had been withdrawn. They see no reason, however, to doubt the fact."

This transaction called for no remark whatever from him; the facts spoke for themselves. He sincerely trusted the Secretary of State for War would look upon them in their true light, and not treat them, as he did in November, as mere matters of account. He proposed to trace the history of these guns somewhat further. In consequence of the Report of the Ordnance Select Committee a sample gun was made in 1864 on the cheap construction pattern, with a steel tube, the cost, which he had taken from the manufacturing accounts, being — for labour, £156; material, £516; percentage, £72; making a total of £744, or £61 more than the original estimate. In 1866 the gallant General the late Secretary of State for War (General Peel) adopted the cheap construction principle; and twenty-five guns of that class were ordered. The manufacturing accounts laid before the House this year showed that these cheap construction guns cost in each case—labour, £194; material, £554; percentage, £82; making a total of £830, or £76 more than the sample gun, and £147 more than the original estimate. The difference between the gun of 1866 and the sample gun, in labour alone, was £38, although in 1866 there were greater facilities in the shape of heavy steam cranes and hammers, and although the sample gun was made in seven pieces and the gun of 1866 in six pieces. Moreover, they had acquired greater experience in 1866; and it was always cheaper to make a number of guns than to make only one. With regard, again, to material, the steel in the gun of 1866 cost £48 less than in the gun of 1864; while the total material was represented as costing £38 more. Upon this calculation the iron and coal of the gun of 1866 would have cost £86 more than the iron and coal of the sample gun of 1864; but in point of fact iron had fallen £1 per ton meanwhile, and the material used was absolutely less than that used in the sample gun of 1864. He trusted that these statements of his would be thoroughly investigated, and for that purpose he was ready to lay them before a Select Committee. He had no personal interest to serve or to promote; his only object was to point out the system which this country had raised up, and the powerful influence which it brought to bear against both manufacturers and inventors in this country. The right hon. Baronet, when he brought forward the Army Estimates, admitted that they ought to be a subject of very great anxiety to the House of Commons, and that the House had little or no control over them; and he also proposed, as some improvement in the organization of those establishments, to set up one man as the head of the Arsenal at Woolwich. If, however, the man they appointed merely represented the different interests of those manufacturing establishments in the War Office, where they were already sufficiently powerful, he could not be of the slightest use in looking after their economical working. To what were the evils to which he referred due? Simply to the enormous increase of those establishments. The House voted, year after year, large sums of money for the increase of the capital account of those establishments; and yet they were unable to tell whether that outlay would be remunerative or not. Nay, more; there was no man in the War Department who was able to give an opinion on that point. The evidence given by Mr. Anderson, chief engineer of the Royal Gun Factory, before the Committee of 1860, with respect to an increased outlay of £100,000 upon that establishment, showed that no man but Mr. Anderson himself was able to give an opinion whether that increased outlay would be remunerative. Again, with the facilities which those manufacturing establishments now had for coming to the House and increasing their capital account it was no wonder that they should do so. And that they did, not only in the Estimates brought before the House, but by the various applications they made after the Vote was passed to the War Office and the Treasury for the transfer of money from one item to another. Never in one single instance had the head of those manufacturing Departments asked for a transfer from capital account to wages, but it was invariably from wages to material and from material to capital account. In 1864-5 no less than £45,000 was transferred from wages to materials in the Royal Gun Factories alone. In 1865-66 the Royal Gun Factories applied for £4,100 for increasing the machinery; and it was said that it would be more than covered by the saving in material. On the 17th of October an application was made for £14,000 for increasing the material, to be paid for out of the savings in wages. In December, in consequence of the great pressure of work at the Royal Gun Factories, it was necessary to spend a large sum of money for furnaces. In spite of the Appropriation Act passed every year, the House had no control whatever over the money it voted for those manufacturing establishments. In the expenditure for the year ending the 31st of March, 1867, there was an excess over the grants made by that House of £41,129 for the Royal Gun-carriage Department; also an excess of £53,820. for the Royal Gun Factories; all that being for machinery, new works, and materials; for the Royal Laboratory the excess was £54,415; and the excess for the Royal Small Arms Factories was £89,065—making an excess, in those four Departments only, of £238,429; or with the surplus on other Votes, a total excess of £274,661 upon Estimates of £970,000. The House did not know how many guns or gun-carriages they had for that money. If £100,000 were voted for machinery for the manufacture of large guns the money was spread over every article they made in the Gun Factories, so that the House could not know the actual cost of the guns, or make any comparison of the prices with those of the private trade. Another objection to the present system was that they were unable to separate their naval and military accounts for raw material. Everybody who wished for economy in the army expenditure had always felt the importance of having a separation between their naval and military accounts; but such a thing was impossible as long as they maintained the present system with regard to those manufacturing establishments. They had never known in one single year whether they worked those establishments at a profit or a loss. Now, he had a proposal which he wished the House to consider. He said they ought to throw on the man to whom they intrusted a manufacturing establishment the responsibility of proving that any application he made for an increase of the capital account was really necessary. He proposed that they should say to Colonel Boxer or any other person who was placed over those establishments —"We shall set you up with plant, machinery, buildings, and everything that is necessary to carry on your work; that plant, machinery, &c., shall be valued at a certain sum of money, on which you shall pay so much interest in hard cash into the Treasury; the only person you shall have any communication with in the War Department shall be the Director of Contracts or the head of the Control Department; you shall enter with him into contracts in exactly the same way as he enters into contracts with the private trade; the articles you produce in your manufactories shall be subjected to an independent inspection exactly like the articles produced by the private trade; and you shall charge to the Superintendent of Contracts in the War Department such a sum as will not only enable you to produce the article you require, but to pay the interest on your capital, and also to provide for wear and tear and depreciation of machinery." He maintained that by that plan they would place their manufactories on a sound commercial footing; and that was the only way in which they could possibly obtain an accurate account of the articles they produced and their cost. They would thus be able to tell whether the money had been properly expended or not, and the result would be an enormous saving in many items of expenditure which under the present system were wasted. Moreover, instead of interfering, as they did at the present moment, in carrying out experiments with the public money, those establishments would confine themselves to their proper work—namely, that of manufacturing, and doing it in the best and cheapest manner they could. When the responsibility was thus thrown on them for the increase of the capital account, they would take care, before they spent money on new plant, machinery, and new buildings, that they saw their way to its being remunerative. We should also be able, for the first time in the history of this country to separate our naval and military accounts. The establishment could open a separate account with the Admiralty, and the Indian Government would be able to go to them and order what they wanted in exactly the same way they did with private contractors. He had heard it urged as an objection to his proposal that it would be impossible to pit Government manufactories against private trade; but he had the testimony of Colonel Boxer to the effect that the Government Departments possessed many advantages over private establishments, and that it would be a disgrace to them if they did not manufacture much more cheaply than private manufacturers. The result of the adoption of such a plan as he suggested would be to secure a clear system of accounts. He believed there had been gross extravagance in those establishments, and the sooner they were put on a proper footing the better.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in order to ensure economy in our Expenditure on Warlike Stores, it is advisable to have an annual Statement laid upon the Table of this House, showing the quantity and value of each description of Stores in the possession of the Troops, or in the Arsenals and Storehouses, the quantity issued and consumed during each year, and the replacements in consequence of a change of pattern or of the ordinary annual consumption; that in order to prevent the manufacture of Warlike Stores becoming a mere monopoly in the hands of the Government Establishments it is advisable to purchase a certain proportion of the articles required for Military purposes from the private trade; and to ensure accuracy of accounts, economy of production, and fair comparison of Government with trade prices, the Manufacturing Departments shall be treated as private firms, the Government purchasing the articles required at remunerative prices, to be provided from Army and other Votes, and the capital charges of the Establishments (whether for buildings, plant, or working capital,) being provided by advances at interest made by the Public Works Loan Commissioners,"—(*Major Anson*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. HAYTER said, that before the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for War replied, it would be convenient that he should call the attention of the House to what was comparatively a small matter, but nevertheless one of great importance—namely, the advantage of returning to the old practice in respect to the serving out of ball ammunition. The practice up to the year 1827 was to keep the twenty rounds of ball ammunition now carried by all non-commissioned officers and privates of the army in store, to be served out to the men only when going on guard, or when held in readiness for immediate duty. That practice still obtained in the cavalry. It was absurd to suppose that it would be considered a slur upon the army to withdraw this ammunition from the possession of the men. He heard a general complaint expressed of the delicate character of the Snider ammunition, inasmuch as it was apt to break through the paper, and becoming loose was rendered unfit for use. When such an accident occurred the whole expense of re-covering it fell upon the captains of companies, which was viewed by them as unjust. If the practice he suggested were adopted also, they would get rid of the double process which was now required on every field day, when the ball cartridge had to be delivered into store, previous to the issue of the blank. Should it be necessary to hold the troops in readiness, a previous order would be given by the general officers in command, or whole battalions might be served with ball cartridge in twenty minutes. Much greater security would also be obtained against the acts of men of violent and furious temper, or of drunken habits, who in their moments of insanity were tempted to perpetrate crimes of murder or manslaughter, from which they themselves would wish to be guarded against. He need only remind the House that in 1861 there were six cases of military murder to show the importance of adopting some means to prevent the repetition of such offences. In the present year a case had lately occurred at the Horfield Barracks, Bristol, in which a Serjeant Maskell, of the 3rd Buffs, armed with a breech-loader, had fired five successive shots in the barrack-yard and ultimately taken the life of a private soldier, before the guard could close with him, and this murder was also committed with the service ball ammunition. Although happily there had been a considerable diminution of such crimes of late years, they nevertheless occasionally occurred under circumstances to excite the utmost horror and alarm. Military friends of his were in favour of the plan he recommended, and amongst them he would wish to include Lord Penrhyn, who as an old adjutant, and strong Conservative in military matters, gave to this proposal his most strenuous support.

Colonel NORTH said, he trusted that the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for War would not follow the advice of the hon. and gallant Member. Every officer he had spoken with expressed surprise that an officer could be found to make such a suggestion, which, in plain English, meant that our soldiers were such a body of assassins that they ought not to be trusted with ammunition. It was a gross insult to the army. If they could not be trusted with ammunition, they were not fit to be soldiers at all.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, who rose with other hon. Members, said, he had given way to the hon. Member for Wells (Mr. Hayter), as he thought that he was going to address the House on the larger question introduced by the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield (Major Anson). He was ready to admit the great importance of the proposals embraced in the Motion of that hon. and gallant Member who was entitled to thanks for the attention he had given to a subject, which not only involved the interests of the country as regarded our armaments, but also affected in no ordinary degree the expenditure of the country. But the manner in which the hon. and gallant Member had brought that subject before the House was a matter of regret. He (Sir John Pakington) had come down to the House prepared to discuss the Motion which the hon. and gallant Gentleman had placed upon the Paper, but greatly to his surprise the hon. and gallant Member had devoted a great part of his speech to a discussion of the most minute details touching complicated questions respecting the Government Manufacturing Departments. They all knew the state of transition in which they lived. Only a few years ago the largest gun in the service was a 95-cwt. gun, not weighing five tons, and now they had 22-ton guns. There were all sorts of pending questions, involving an endless variety in construction with respect to cast-iron, wrought-iron, wrought-iron linings, steel guns, and various methods of rifling. All these were unsettled questions, and, in addition, there was the most hostile rivalry between the Government Manufacturing Departments and outsiders, and endless inventors contending that they had the power of providing a cheaper and more efficient gun. The speech of the hon. and gallant Member might lead one to suppose that he had been inspired by some of those outsiders and inventors. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had entered on this discussion without any Notice whatever, and with a spirit which showed hostility to some extent, or, at all events, doubt with respect to the honesty of the public Departments. This course of proceeding was hardly fair. The matter brought forward by the hon. and gallant Member was one of great difficulty, and it was the duty of the Government to be impartial with respect to it, and to take the line which to the best of their judgment appeared the most conducive to the public interests. For his own part, he could say that he had no undue leaning to the Government Manufacturing Departments. The hon. and gallant Member began by stating that he had serious charges to make, in that case it was his duty to have given distinct warning of those charges; but the Motion placed upon the Paper certainly did not give such warning. What was to be thought of the spirit in which the hon. and gallant Member made the charges, when he declared that he had no faith in the figures of the public Departments? That was tantamount to saying that when the public Departments stated their case he would not believe them. With reference to the price of guns good reasons could be given, but the hon. and gallant Member never mentioned what was the particular gun of which he spoke, and it must be remembered that there were endless varieties of guns. The hon. and gallant Gentleman talked about Major Palliser and of the comparative prices of guns made in the public arsenals and by the private trade. If the hon. and gallant Gentleman went into the subject with due care, he would find that in almost every instance the guns made at the public arsenals were made at a cheaper and lower rate than those of the private trade. But the hon. and gallant Gentleman would not believe figures. However, he (Sir John Pakington) maintained that until the balance-sheets came out and there had been an opportunity of testing the accuracy of the figures they must be accepted as correct. Having thus met that part of his hon. and gallant Friend's speech which he had no right to expect, he begged now to turn to what he had a right to expect from the Motion which stood on the Paper in his name. He was sorry his hon. and gallant Friend had not been content to deal with it, for it was a very large subject, involving three different propositions, and on each of them he was prepared to state the course which the Government intended to pursue. The first proposal of his hon. and gallant Friend was that we should have an annual statement laid upon the table of this House, showing the quantity and value of each description of stores in the possession of the troops or in the arsenals and storehouses, the quantity issued and consumed during each year, and the re-placements in consequence of a change of pattern or of the ordinary annual consumption. The French Government had adopted the plan of laying a very accurate statement before the Legislature of the state of their stores, and he was quite willing to meet his hon. and gallant Friend by the admission that it was most desirable to have such a statement laid before the House. The only objection he knew to such a statement was that he was afraid it would be impossible to provide it without some not inconsiderable expense in the way of assistance in the Department. But he would endeavour to ascertain—and it could only be done accurately by experience—what the expense would be of conceding that portion of his hon. and gallant Friend's requirement. He was convinced that it would be satisfactory to the House and to the public, and would check the tendency to accumulate an undue amount of stores in our arsenals and elsewhere; but he hoped his hon. and gallant Friend was aware that from the nature of the Return it would be impossible to give it immediately following the year to which it applied. On the French plan a year always intervened. He would have a Return prepared in the shape to which his hon. and gallant Friend referred, showing fairly and honestly the state of our stores; but the House must not expect that the statement of our stores closing, say, on the 31st of March, 1868, could be laid on the table in the course of 1869, but he saw no reason why it should not be presented the year after but one. The next portion of the Motion of his hon. and gallant Friend was—

> "That in order to prevent the manufacture of Warlike Stores becoming a mere monopoly in the hands of the Government Establishments it is advisable to purchase a certain proportion of the articles required for Military purposes from the private trade."

Now, his hon. and gallant Friend could hardly be aware of the extent to which that was already done. If he examined the Estimates of the present year he would see that we now resort to private trade for a very large portion of our stores. He would state to the House exactly how we stood in that respect. Take the article of clothing, to which he referred: there would this year be manufactured and repaired at their own clothing factory to the amount of £509,746, leaving to the amount of £418,288 to be purchased. Of gunpowder there would be manufactured during the year to the amount of £4,382, and £9,700 would be purchased. Of small arms there would be manufactured to the amount of £146,702 while £76,000 would be purchased. Iron ordnance would be manufactured to the value of £203,446, and the value of £10,400 would be purchased. With respect to the Laboratory, he was sorry he could make no such statement. The Laboratory was one of the heaviest sources of expenditure, and there he could show no *per contra* to be derived from the trade; but he quite acceded to the principle that it was very desirable with regard to projectiles as well as arms themselves that private trade should be resorted to. The fact that it was not was to be attributed to the great change occurring in that Department, and particularly the adaptation of the Snider rifle. With regard to gun-carriages, these would be manufactured to the amount of £215,175, and £38,450 would be purchased. The general result was that there would be manufactured and repaired during the present year stores to the amount of £1,661,565, leaving to be purchased £834,838. All this was being done during the current year without any Motion by his hon. and gallant Friend, so that actually they were at the present moment resorting to private trade for one-third of our whole stores. He hoped his hon. and gallant Friend would see from this that there was no indisposition to establish that check on the manufacturing establishments which he desired by resorting largely to private trade for our stores. The most important part of his hon. and gallant Friend's Motion was the last, in which he wished to make a complete change in our whole system of manufacturing establishments. He proposed that—

> "To ensure accuracy of accounts, economy of production, and fair comparison of Government with trade prices, the Manufacturing Departments shall be treated as private firms, the Government purchasing the articles required at remunerative prices, to be provided from Army and other Votes, and the capital charges of the Establishments—whether for buildings, plant, or working capital—being provided by advances at interest made by the Public Works Loan Commissioners."

He wished that instead of dwelling during the greater part of his speech on facts and details his hon. and gallant Friend had devoted his time to a little more explanation of the manner in which he proposed to work out this great and important change. He (Sir John Pakington) was by no means disposed to refuse it. He quite admitted its importance; and if the change were successfully brought about it would tend in a very great degree to simplify the accounts. On the other hand he believed it was a change wholly without precedent, There were, he believed, some precedents in France. The French Government had carried out that system in two respects—with regard to printing and gunpowder; but these were very small precedents. He believed there was no precedent in any country for carrying on a large Government establishment on the principle which his hon. and gallant Friend proposed. There were great difficulties of detail which he wished had been explained. How were the funds to be provided for carrying on these manufacturing establishments? Were these establishments to be removed from Parliamentary control? Then again, if these large Government establishments were to be placed on the same footing with private firms, were they to accept business from all customers that might come for goods, or were they to be restricted to supplying the requirements of the Government? These were questions that required much consideration, and the Government would have to weigh the matter very carefully before it committed itself to the proposition of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, which affected not only the War Department but the Admiralty and Treasury Departments. Under these circumstances he could not say that he was at once prepared to adopt the plan of the hon. and gallant Member, which would effect a complete revolution in that branch of the public service to which it had relation—a revolution, however, that certainly held out great promise of improvement, but he was willing to submit the plan of the hon. and gallant Member to a joint Committee of the War Department, the Admiralty, and the Treasury, for them to inquire into the subject and report upon it. The hon. and gallant Member's first suggestion respecting a Return he thought should be adopted; his second plan, he had shown, was already carried out to a great extent; and with respect to his third plan he could assure the hon. and gallant Gentlemen that it should receive the most careful consideration.

Mr. OTWAY said, he did not think that the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for War had met the charges of the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield (Major Anson), or that he was entitled to shelter himself behind the excuse that, not expecting from the form of the hon. and gallant Gentleman's Notice that the subject of the accounts would be brought forward, he had not prepared himself to enter into the question. His hon. and gallant Friend had referred to the great waste of money which was taking place in the War Department, and that was also a point eminently worthy of consideration. In addition to the cases specified by his hon. and gallant Friend he (Mr. Otway) had some charges to bring against the Department over which the right hon. Gentleman presided. The first was that when an invention had been approved and the inventor had been rewarded by that House, the Committee to which reference had been made took upon themselves so to alter the invention as to render it perfectly worthless. Thus, the rockets invented by Mr. Hale, who had received £8,000 for his invention from that House, had been so altered as to be almost useless. His second charge was that such vast quantities of gunpowder were kept in store for so long a time in the various batteries that it was deteriorating in power. His third charge was that 1,000 rounds of ammunition per gun were despatched to Abyssinia, while probably not two rounds per gun were actually fired, nor was there any possibility of the number of rounds sent being used in any campaign in that country. He hoped that the matters alluded to by his hon. and gallant Friend would be investigated, and that the Government would be prepared with some more satisfactory explanation.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he quite agreed with the right hon. Baronet opposite that it was impossible for him to meet the charges of the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield (Major Anson) without ample notice having been given of them. Instead of wording the Notice as his hon. and gallant Friend had done, he could not help thinking, if his hon. and gallant Friend had intended to bring such grave charges forward, he ought to have used such language as—"In order to prevent erroneous Estimates, in order to prevent utterly falsified accounts being presented, such and such things ought to be done." He thought, however, that when charges of so grave a character were made it was not sufficient that the right hon. Baronet opposite should come down to that House and content himself with making a counter-statement. The hon. and gallant Member, after making such serious charges against the Department, ought not to be satisfied without moving for a Select Committee, or obtaining a promise from the Secretary of War that the whole matter should be fully inquired into by an independent body. He quite agreed with the right hon. Baronet as to the difficulty which stood in the way of dealing with the proposal made by the hon. and gallant Gentleman. He went even further, and contended that the proposal to work those establishments as private firms was utterly impracticable. He had had some little experience in connection with those establishments, and believed that they had conferred great advantage on the country. It was no doubt expedient to resort as far as possible to private enterprize; but it was, in his opinion, nevertheless of the greatest importance that these establishments should be maintained in a state of thorough efficiency. He had made these few remarks because he thought it of the highest importance that there should be the most perfect honesty and rectitude on the part of those who managed these establishments, and because he thought that the accounts ought to be above the shadow even of suspicion.

Major ANSON desired to say a word in personal explanation of the charge which had been brought against him. The right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for War had complained that he had brought this matter forward without having given sufficient notice of his intention. He certainly was under the impression that the right hon. Baronet knew that he was going to make these charges, and he could only further say that he had not made a single charge which had not been previously brought officially before the Secretary of State.

Colonel ANNESLEY said, that some of the charges brought forward were of a most extraordinary character. The hon. Member for Chatham (Mr. Otway), for instance, had made it a matter of complaint against the Government that they had supplied each of the guns sent to Abyssinia with 1,000 rounds, while not more than two rounds to each gun had actually been expended. [Mr. Otway: Had probably been expended.] The fact, however, was that there had been scarcely any fighting in Abyssinia, and if the reverse had been the case, and the Government had neglected the precaution of providing an ample supply of ammunition, the hon. Member for Chatham would have been only too ready to have charged the Government with their neglect. He ventured to think that the hon. Member for Wells (Mr. Hayter) was incorrect in the opinion which he had expressed, because his belief was that the officers of the army were far from wishing to deprive the soldiers of the ammunition which at present was placed in their care. If that were done, what would be the result when the soldiers were called upon to engage in active service at a moment's notice, a thing to which they were always liable? During the prevalence of the Fenian alarms, for instance, a detachment of troops was telegraphed for at twelve o'clock, and left town for Osborne in consequence of that telegram within an hour, a promptness which could scarcely have been attained if the delay consequent on the distribution of ammunition to each man had had to be incurred.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, he regarded these establishments as resembling to some extent the gardens in which the proprietors cultivated their own vegetables at a cost greater than the price which would have been demanded for them in the market. The Government had not the same motives to economy which were to be found in private establishments. They laboured under no fear of bankruptcy, and consequently did not pay that attention to details which private persons find so necessary to the success of their undertakings. He thought, therefore, that it would be much better for the Government to go into the open market and purchase what they required as cheaply as they could, instead of carrying on those expensive establishments. But if the Government were resolved to maintain the manufacturing establishments, the strictest accounts ought to be kept in order to compare the cost of munitions of war supplied by private manufacturers with those manufactured by the Government. The only sound principle on which public manufactories could be conducted, was that laid down by Sir Henry Parnell in his Work on *Financial Reform*, who said that they ought to be maintained on the same principle as private manufactories, and that there should be an account current of profit and loss between them and the Financial Department.

General PERCY HERBERT said, that when the Government purchased Warlike Stores the quality was almost invariably found inferior. If the Government did not manufacture a large portion of their gunpowder, they would run the risk of getting powder of inferior quality, which would derange all calculations of range and accuracy of firing.

Lord ELCHO said, his hon. and gallant Relative (Major Anson) being unable again to address the House, wished him to express his desire for a searching investigation into the statements he had made, and his intention to move on Thursday next for a Select Committee. He would prefer, however, that the inquiry should be proposed or instituted by the Government.

Major ANSON said, he would withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

PORTPATRICK AND BELFAST AND COUNTY DOWN RAILWAY COMPANIES BILL—[Bill 201.]

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER stated, that the object of this measure was to release the Treasury from an undertaking entered into by them in 1856, to establish a short sea service between the West of Scotland and the North of Ireland, the railway companies being at the same time bound under penalties to construct lines to the ports of Portpatrick and Donaghadee. Those lines had been completed, and nearly £50,000 had been spent on Portpatrick harbour; but it had already begun to silt up, and was found to be unfit for a night, and consequently for a punctual mail service, while the postal accommodation could be provided far more cheaply and equally well by accelerating the mails *viâ* Dublin. If the service were established moreover, the sum it would be worth paying would not satisfy the companies, and there would be the liability to spend large sums on the harbours. Under these circumstances a compromise had seemed to him expedient, and he had effected an arrangement with the County Down Railway Company that it should waive its claim for the establishment of the service in consideration of a loan of £166,000, the amount of its debenture debt, at 3½ per cent for a term of years. The claims of the Portpatrick Company were greater, there being seven miles of line which would be rendered useless; but after nearly two years' negotiations that company had agreed to accept a loan of £153,000 on the same terms and a free grant of £20,000. The companies would have to show that their security was good, and the loan would yield a small profit, which would, he believed, recoup the Treasury the £20,000. The arrangement would, on the whole, be an economical one. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving that the Bill be read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. CHILDERS said, he believed the arrangement to be a judicious one, and the best escape from an impolitic undertaking. When he was at the Treasury, the obstacle to the settlement of the question was a claim set up by the companies, not merely to a short sea service, but to a second express mail communication between London and the North of Ireland by that route. The latter would have been enormously expensive, and he resisted the claim, which had turned out to be unfounded. He thought his right hon. Friend had now very fairly met the legitimate claims of the companies.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Wednesday.*

REGISTRATION (IRELAND) BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

The Earl of MAYO, in moving for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Law of Registration in Ireland, explained that by this measure it was proposed to shorten considerably the period for revision of the electoral lists. The effect of it would be that the Courts for revising the lists would be held between the 8th of September and the 6th of October, so that the register would be in the hands of the sheriff by the 1st of November. The general result would be that the whole of the proceedings would be concluded on or before the 1st of November, instead of the 30th, as at present, and therefore the time for the conclusion of all the proceedings would be nearly the same as under the English Bill. He wished it to be understood that this measure would not at all interfere with the old franchises; but would apply solely to those which would be created under the Irish Reform Bill. Supplemental lists of the persons entitled to the new franchise would be placed before the Revising Barristers at the time of the revision Sessions; but the ordinary register for the old franchise would not be interfered with. There would also be a provision for increasing the number of polling-places, and another for facilitating the representation of Masters of Arts in the University of Dublin.

Bill to amend the Law of Registration in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by The Earl of Mayo and Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 213.]

PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS PAYMENTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Sclater-Booth, Bill to empower certain Public Departments to pay otherwise than to Executors or Administrators small sums due on account of Pay or Allowances to Persons deceased, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Sclater-Booth and Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 212.]

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 7, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Ecclesiastical Commissioners* (221); Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland)* (222); Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland)* (224); Fairs (Metropolis)* (223); Railway Companies* (226); Assignees of Marine Policies* (225).

Second Reading — West Indies [135]; Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts (Lanarkshire) Amendment* (202); New Zealand (Legislative Council)* (197); Admiralty Suits* (182); Renewable Leasehold Conversion (Ireland) Act Extension* (184); Registration (218).

Select Committee — *Report*—Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings [No. 227].

Committee—Fairs* (141); Representation of the People (Ireland) (176); Reformatory Schools (Ireland)* (122); Medway Regulation Act Continuance* (199); Bank of Bombay* (196); County General Assessment (Scotland)* (190); Courts of Law Fees, &c. (Scotland)* (189).

Report — Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings* (93-228); Fairs* (141); Representation of the People (Ireland) (176); Reformatory Schools (Ireland)* (122); County Courts Admiralty Jurisdiction* (108); Medway Regulation Act Continuance* (199); Bank of Bombay* (196); County General Assessment (Scotland)* (190); Courts of Law Fees, &c. (Scotland)* (189).

Third Reading — Army Chaplains* (146); Vagrant Act Amendment* (138); Boundary* (170); Representation of the People (Scotland) (192), and *passed*.

The Earl of Mayo

WEST INDIES BILL—(No. 135.)

(*The Duke of Buckingham.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Duke of BUCKINGHAM: My Lords, I have to ask your Lordships to give a second reading to a Bill for the relief of the Consolidated Fund from an annual payment of £20,300 for purposes connected with the Church of England in the West Indies. That grant originated in 1824, when the condition of the slave population having attracted much attention, among other measures for improving their condition preparatory to emancipation was one introduced on the Motion of Mr. Canning, for increasing the efficiency of the Church of England in those colonies. The Church had been established there for a long series of years, the parochial system having been introduced, and the clergy being subject to the Bishop of London; but the wants of the landowners and white population had been regarded in those arrangements rather than those of the slaves. Under these circumstances an immediate and considerable increase in the numbers of the clergy was necessary, and it was also requisite that ecclesiastical supervision nearer than that of Bishops in this country should be provided. Mr. Canning, in proposing the grant, said—

> "To provide the means of religious instruction and worship is an object first, indeed, in importance, but necessarily subsequent in order to those which I have already mentioned, because it is not till the slave population are raised in the scale of nature that they can be capable of comprehending or fitted to receive the blessings of Christianity. It is intended to increase the amount and widen the basis of the Ecclesiastical Establishment in the West Indies. That Establishment was founded for the benefit of the white population alone. It was no more calculated for the negro than for the brute animal that shares his toils. I am not stating this as a matter of charge, but as a matter of fact."—[2 *Hansard*, x. 1097.]

It was not proposed by Mr. Canning as a permanent grant; but its object was to meet immediate and pressing wants, and from the first it was avowedly subject to such modifications as might be required from time to time, or to entire withdrawal; and, as a matter of course, it has been more than once discussed both with regard to the amount of the sum given and as to the mode of its application. Mr. Canning further said—

> "One of the Episcopal Establishments is intended to be fixed at Jamaica, the other in the Leeward Islands. For the support of these Establishments it will not be necessary, for a time at least"—

Your Lordships will remark these words, "for a time at least"—

> "that any demand should be made on the finances of the Islands."

The grant was accordingly made, and in the first instance £14,000 of it was appropriated to the Bishops and archdeacons, while the remaining £6,300 was distributed among rectors and catechists. An alteration was soon found necessary with regard to the bishoprics, and a third see was constituted, the income originally allotted to two bishoprics being divided among three. Some years later the sees were further increased to five, and the amount paid to each Bishop has therefore been materially reduced, while the payment to the clergy has been distributed among a larger number of persons, new churches and rectors being admitted to a share in it. Among the changes also was a total repeal of the clause which gave pensions to Bishops appointed under the provisions of the Act. The reason why the withdrawal of the grant is now proposed is this — Last year a measure having that object, passed through several stages in the House of Commons without opposition, and that House was evidently of opinion that the grant had done its work, and that, while respecting existing interests, its continuance was unnecessary. That that is a correct view of the case is evident from the fact that when the grant was first made the whole sum appropriated by the various colonies to the maintenance of their clergy did not exceed £14,000 or £15,000 a year, so that the addition of the grant more than doubled the amount; whereas the sum now appropriated by them is about £60,000, so that the Imperial Votes form an augmentation of only a third. Moreover, the slaves were at that time incapable of holding property, and had no means of providing such spiritual ministrations as they might desire; but their descendants are now in many cases landed proprietors, and are not only able to subscribe, but do, in fact, subscribe considerable sums for religious purposes. Circumstances have thus entirely changed, and there is no reason why the Church in the West Indian colonies should be assisted out of the Imperial Revenue any more than those of our other colonies. Now, the provision for the West Indian clergy being made, in most cases, by Ordinances or Acts renewable at intervals of eight or ten years, and it being in some of the islands about to undergo consideration, it is desirable that Parliament should declare its intentions with regard to the grant, in order that the colonies may know, in making their arrangements, whether it will be continued, and whether the appointments which have been allowed to remain vacant will be filled up. Now, as for some years, under the Governments of different parties, it has not been the practice to fill up appointments in the case of the higher order of clergy, it seems to me most desirable that these circumstances should be put an end to, and, therefore, in accordance with the general policy, the Government have come to the determination to propose the withdrawal of the grant, respect being had to vested interests. Before moving the second reading, I think it right to explain to the House that this question of the abolition of the grant has no connection with the question of the suspension of certain appointments in Jamaica, with which the discussion the other night appears to have been to some extent mixed up. On the latter question a correspondence had arisen between my immediate predecessor and the Governor of Jamaica; but the question with which this Bill deals, on the contrary, has arisen altogether since I have had the honour of holding the Seals of the Colonial Office. Although this question has been mooted many years in Parliament as to whether the grant should be repealed, yet my predecessor in Office has not been mixed up with this particular Bill, to which I ask your Lordships now to give a second reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Duke of Buckingham*).

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, I do not rise to offer a single word in opposition to the Bill, the second reading of which has been just moved by my noble Friend. I do not object to the Bill; though I can hardly concur in some of the reasons which he assigned for asking your Lordships to support the Bill. My noble Friend stated, as his first reason, that this measure, or many stages of it, had passed the House of Commons last Session without opposition. That, I hold, would be in itself a very poor and insufficient justification for asking your Lordships to agree to a measure if objectionable on other grounds. Nor do I quite go along with my noble Friend when he says that the second reason which induced him to move the second reading is the great change which has occurred in the character of the population of the West Indies. I am afraid that population — changed possibly as it may be for the better in some respects — is still by no means in such a position as to dispense easily with the annual £20,000 which this Bill will take away from them. But, my Lords, as I said before, I shall not offer the smallest opposition to this Bill; though I am bound to state to the House that it will fall as a very serious loss upon the Church in the West Indies. When I had the honour to hold the Seals of the Colonial Office, I was well aware that some considerable change—the ecclesiastical establishment of the West Indian Church—was coming. I foresaw from the temper of Parliament that it would not be disposed for very long to continue the grants which had been made; and when taking preparatory steps to endeavour to place the Church in the colonies in a somewhat better situation, I incurred at the time considerable reproach—reproach from those who thought this change was distant, but who now find that it is near. My Lords, the Church in the West Indies must fare like almost every other colonial Church. She must stand upon her own resources—so far, at least, as help and aid from this country are concerned; and I do not myself doubt, though her situation is not as favourable to her as in many other colonies, that she may gather strength and extend her ministrations by evoking sources of new latent strength—perhaps by means of Native clergy and Native catechists. My Lords, before I leave this point, I would suggest that when this Bill goes into Committee an Amendment may be introduced which will probably meet with the assent of both sides, to correspond with the clause introduced in the Canadian Clergy Reserves Act, and to enable the holders of life-interests to compound those interests for a gross sum which shall be paid into the hands of some trustees or other authorities. My Lords, I should be glad now to pause; but after the remarks which fell from the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack a few nights ago, when alluding to this Bill, I feel it due to the House and to myself to say a few words. My Lords, I may safely say my whole object, my chief desire whenever I have had the honour to address your Lordships, has been to confine myself as closely and with as much accuracy as possible to any statement of facts which I may have to make, and in return for the constant kindness and indulgence which this House has shown me never to state any fact which, without full care and consideration on my part, I do not believe to be correct. But, my Lords, the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack coming down upon me a few nights since, I must say, with all that forensic skill of which he is so great a master, and with all that long professional training and practice which distinguish him so much in this House and elsewhere—left upon your Lordships the impression that I had grossly exaggerated, not to say misrepresented, certain facts, and that I had endeavoured to mislead your Lordships upon matters on which as having lately had the honour to hold the seals of the Colonial Office I was bound to be especially correct. Now, upon that point I will ask your Lordships' attention for a very few minutes—and I will beg the House to believe that I have no wish whatever to revive any asperities of the past debate or to say one word which can give reasonable offence to Her Majesty's Government or those who supported them on that occasion. My only and my sole controversy is with the statement of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. Now, there are two questions which the noble Duke who has just spoken (the Duke of Buckingham) carefully distinguished at the end of his speech; the first is the question with regard to the suspension of ecclesiastical appointments in the island of Jamaica, and the other is the question of the disendowment of the Church of England in the West Indies under this Bill to the extent of £20,000. My Lords, that first question of the suspension of ecclesiastical appointments requires little notice, because it is, as the noble Duke said, not immediately and directly connected with the Bill before your Lordships, and if it had been that the noble and learned Lord had charged me with an inaccuracy on that point I should not have thought it worth while to allude further to the subject. My noble Friend (Earl Granville) who moved the second reading of the Established Church (Ireland) Bill the other evening stated that a parallel existed between the suspension of ecclesiastical appointments in Jamaica and their proposed suspension in Ireland in the Bill which your Lordships have rejected; and I, following on a subsequent evening, endorsed entirely all that my noble Friend had said on that part of the subject. For this I was taken to task by the noble and learned Lord, who stated that there was nothing whatever parallel between the two cases. Now, my Lords, I, on the contrary, can, without taking up your Lordships' time, show that there is a great deal that is parallel. The Established Church of England in the West Indies, as in Ireland, is the Church of the few; it is also the Church of the rich few; it is a Church whose clergy, as educated men scattered in the midst of a far less educated race, stand in very much the same relation to the population in the West Indies as the clergy of the Established Church do to the population of Ireland. And what was the suspension of these ecclesiastical appointments? In Ireland, the Irish Suspensory Bill provided that the vacancies of sees and certain ecclesiastical offices that occurred should not be filled up for the space of one year—to do what?—to enable Parliament to consider whether, at the end of that time, it should not make modifications, reductions, and, on the admission of Her Majesty's Government itself, even a total abolition of the Ecclesiastical Establishment. And what was the Suspensory measure with regard to Jamaica? It provided that ecclesiastical vacancies among the clergy — not the Bishops — should not be filled up for the space of between two and three years, with the view that at the end of that period Her Majesty's Government might consider whether or not modifications, reductions, and even total abolition should not be enacted. And I say "total abolition" on the authority of a report which I saw in the paper of an Answer given by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Adderley) about ten days since, in which he stated that no steps Her Majesty's Government were taking in this matter would preclude if desirable in the opinion of Parliament, the total abolition of the West Indian Church. My Lords, that, I think, is sufficient to justify the noble Earl and myself in saying that there was a strong parallel in principle between the two cases. But then the noble and learned Lord read a despatch from Sir John Grant, recommending to the Secretary of State this scheme, and he subsequently read a despatch from the Secretary of State approving it; and then he turned round on me, and, in a manner which brought down cheers unnumbered on my head, he said, "Shall I tell the House how the case really stands? Why, can it be possibly believed that the signature appended to that despatch was the signature of the Earl of Carnarvon?" Why, my Lords, I never denied—I never dreamt of denying—that I sanctioned the Suspensory scheme in Jamaica just as I voted for a Suspensory scheme in Ireland. I am at a loss to understand where is the inconsistency. The noble and learned Lord seems to have given me even greater credit for consistency than I ventured to claim for myself. And now I come to the subject really before the House—namely, this Bill—and upon this ground the noble and learned Lord attacked me severely. I had stated that this Bill, which withdraws the £20,000 originally granted to the West Indian Church, was a disendowment. The noble and learned Lord denied the justice of the term so applied. He said—and I will give you his very words—referring to the West Indian Church—

> "Nothing whatever has been done, nothing whatever is proposed to be done altering in any manner the establishment of Bishops, archdeacons, and clergy in the way in which it has subsisted ever since it had any existence."—[3 *Hansard*, cxciii. 261.]

Now, let me ask your Lordships to consider what the real facts are. My noble Friend the noble Duke stated them to your Lordships. Allow me to re-state them in a few words. The West Indian bishoprics had no existence before the year 1824. In that year the Crown, by letters patent, created these bishoprics. In the very next Session Parliament passed the Act which is here repealed, and that Act recited that the Crown had by letters patent constituted these three bishoprics; that the right of appointment was in the Crown; and it then proceeded to assign for the support and sustentation of these bishoprics the sum of £20,000 from the Consolidated Fund; providing, lastly, that if the 4½ per cent duties in the colony should reach a certain point, that sum of £20,000 should be transferred from the Consolidated Fund to the 4½ per cents. In the following year—1826—there was another Act, an amending Act, which simply apportioned part of this £20,000 among some of the minor clergy. From 1826 to 1842 I can find no trace of any legislative action on the subject; but, in 1842, another Act was passed, enabling the Crown to subdivide these dioceses, and diminish the stipends assigned to the clergy and Bishops without any increase of the gross sum of £20,000. Your Lordships will see, therefore, that no bishoprics were in existence prior to 1824, that then they were created by letters patent; that an endowment was provided for them; that that endowment remained untouched up to 1842, though power was given and has been used of re-distributing the grant within the sphere and limits of the West Indian Church, just in the same way as the noble and learned Lord on a former occasion argued that the funds of the Irish Church ought to be re-distributed for the benefit of the Irish Church itself. I say, therefore, that so far as Act of Parliaments are concerned, if this is not the case of an endowment I am really at a loss to understand what an endowment is. But I may make my ground stronger still. In 1842, when my noble Friend Lord Derby, then Lord Stanley, introduced the Bill as Colonial Secretary, what did he state to the House of Commons? Why, that he proposed this measure for the subdivision of the existing dioceses only after consultation with the heads of the Church, and after receiving their approbation; thus clearly implying that the West Indian Church was intimately connected in interests and policy with the Established Church of this country. In the debate which followed Mr. Pakington thanked Lord Stanley for what he had done, and went on to state that for his part he always declared that wherever the authority of the British Crown existed, proper provision should be made for the Established Church. On the other hand, a noble Lord opposite (Lord Lyveden), then Mr. Vernon Smith, warned Lord Stanley not to establish Bishops in every colony, because nothing could be more detrimental, especially to the Church of England itself, than the establishment in all the colonies of the State religion of this country. That, therefore, in general, public, Parliamentary repute was the view taken of this Act. And if you go further you find undoubtedly the same view taken. I find no further allusion to these bishoprics until 1866, when Mr. Remington Mills complained that these Bishops were to be paid out of the Consolidated Fund of this country; and what was the answer of my predecessor, Mr. Cardwell, upon the subject? He said that the general views of Parliament and the country with respect to — what? — with respect to these "ecclesiastical endowments" had very much changed since the passing of the Act imposing the charge upon the Consolidated Fund. Therefore, I think I was warranted in speaking of this Church in the West Indies as an Established Church, and of the money granted to it as an endowment. It is possible that —though I do not stop to argue the point —some persons may attempt to draw a distinction between income derived by the Church from tithe and income derived under statute. I confess I am at a loss to understand the grounds for such a distinction. The tithes rest on the security of the land from which those tithes are derived; money granted out of the Consolidated Fund by Act of Parliament is based on the security, not of one piece of land, but of the whole of the land and property of the country; and I am at a loss to understand what can be more binding or trustworthy than an Act of Parliament passed under such conditions as I have described. But the noble and learned Lord did not content himself with contradicting the accuracy of my statement with regard to the use of the word endowment. He went on to say that this was simply a transfer from Imperial to colonial funds. In order that there may be no mistake he will allow me to read his very words. He said—

> "The colonists are, I believe, perfectly ready to make provision for the payment of the Bishops and parochial clergy; and the whole of this great question of the disendowment of the Church in Jamaica turns out to be simply this—the transfer of the burden of £20,000 from the Imperial Exchequer to the Colonial Exchequer."—[3 *Hansard*, cxciii. 261.]

Now, I have examined these three Acts and I take on myself to say that there is not a word in any one of them with reference to such a transfer; and if it is not effected by virtue of anything in these Acts, how else can the transfer take place? As to the alleged readiness of the colonists to accept these burdens, it is true that I have resigned the Seals of the Colonial Office for a year and a half, and of course can know nothing of what may have passed since then; but so satisfied am I that the noble and learned Lord could have had no warrant for this statement that I will take the responsibility of saying that I am fully satisfied there can be no disposition on the part of these colonists to accept the burden; I am satisfied that there is little power on their part to accept it, even if they were so disposed; and I cannot, therefore, believe the statement which the noble and learned Lord unadvisedly, and I am sure unintentionally, made to this House. I must ask the noble and learned Lord whether he can produce any evidence, direct or indirect, great or small, to show that the colonists have ever expressed in the smallest degree their readiness to accept this burden. I think I might safely go further, and ask the noble and learned Lord to produce a single despatch previous to the debate on the Irish Church in this House, in which the colonists have been even invited by the Government to accept that burden. If I am wrong in this statement which I now make I shall be the first to apologize for it ; but if, on the other hand, the noble and learned Lord has no evidence to produce in support of his statement, I hope that his sense of candour and fairness will lead him to acknowledge that that statement was wholly without foundation. Thirdly, the noble and learned Lord has contradicted me equally pointedly on another question of fact, and I beg the House to pay particular attention to it. He says—

> "From a very early period the dignitaries of the Church were supported by the colonies. The distress in the islands arising from emancipation was so great for the time, that the Parliament of England, as a matter of charity and as an eleemosynary gift, was content to pay out of the funds of the mother country, a sum of £20,000 a year in order to eke out and complete the salaries of some, not all, but a certain number of the Bishops and their archdeacons in those islands."—[3 *Hansard*, cxciii. 261.]

Now I am sorry to say that in these half-dozen lines the noble and learned Lord has fallen into not less than three distinct errors. In the first place, before emancipation, these Bishops as I have shown, were not supported by the colonies at all. In the next place, this sum of £20,000 has not been granted to eke out and complete the salaries. I believe that the Bishops have almost if not wholly and solely depended upon that grant. Thirdly, I deny that the distress arising from emancipation was in any degree or shape the cause of this endowment of the bishoprics. It is obvious it could not be so. Negro emancipation was passed in 1833, and the Act which gave this endowment was passed in 1825. That is my answer to this charge, and I do not care to make any further comment on it. Lastly, the noble and learned Lord told me I was so blinded with anger against the Government that I was ready to make a thrust whenever I could, and therefore that I had magnified what was " a very simple and commonplace transaction " into a matter of great importance. Now, let this question be judged, whether or no it is a very simple and commonplace transaction, not from anything I say, but from the words of a Colleague of the noble and learned Lord. I find that on the 13th of April last year Mr. Remington Mills, a Gentleman I believe of advanced Liberal opinions in the House of Commons, introduced a Bill which, with the exception of a single clause, was substantially the same as the measure now before the House. Mr. Adderley, on behalf of the Government and the Colonial Office, said he should not oppose the Bill, but he pointed out that it was in a very improper state to pass, and he went on to say—

> " The measure ought to be accompanied by considerable safeguards, for anything like a precipitate repeal of the Acts in question might lead to the production of great mischief, to injustice to individuals, and injury to the Church, and might even involve a breach of faith with the colonists of the West Indies. Not only must existing interests be saved, but the power of gradual reduction must be somewhere reserved, as also the power of anticipating vacancies."

That Bill then and this being substantially the same, I must ask the noble and learned Lord whether it is fair to describe a measure which is "fraught with great mischief, injustice to individuals, injury to the Church, and possible breach of faith with the colonists of the West Indies," as a simple and commonplace transaction. I do not care to pursue this any further. I am indebted to your Lordships for the patience with which you have listened to me. I have studiously avoided by any word of mine re-opening any part of the debate on the Irish Church. What I have said has been said in vindication of my own character, which was assailed for inaccuracy. The noble and learned Lord lectured me very severely, and he lamented that he was obliged to point out to me, who had been Colonial Secretary, the errors I had made in the matter of colonial fact. I leave it now to the House and to every impartial person to judge between the noble and learned Lord and myself, and to say which of the two has been most accurate. My Lords, I did not wish to say one word more, but when the noble and learned Lord uses that great skill and forensic power, to which I am the first to pay my tribute of respect, to charge an humble Member of your Lordships' House like myself with attempting to exaggerate and to mislead, and when that individual labours as I did under the disadvantage of being unable from the rules of the House to reply, and feels himself very far inferior to the noble and learned Lord in rhetorical power, I think it would have been fairer and more generous if the noble and learned Lord himself were to measure his own statements of fact by a standard of the most precise accuracy.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I do not rise for the purpose of re-opening the debate on the Irish Church. The noble Earl who has just sat down (the Earl of Carnarvon) laments that statements were made by me when he had not the opportunity of replying. The noble Earl has had an opportunity, not often the lot of those who take part in debate, of replying, after an interval of several days, to the statements which I made. That advantage I do not in the slightest degree grudge the noble Earl. And now first as to the question he has asked me. He has asked me whether the statements I made in reference to the position of the Church in Jamaica were correct. I said that the grant of £20,000 a year had been made by Parliament as an eleemosynary grant in consequence of the state to which the islands had been reduced by emancipation. In point of fact the grant was made some years before emancipation took place. If the noble Lord thinks that material to the argument,—if he thinks it in the slightest degree affects the argument I advanced, he is perfectly welcome to my full admission. Even as to that I must remind the noble Earl that in a speech of Mr. Canning, which has been quoted to-night, he spoke of the ground of the grant as being the condition of the colony, not by reason of emancipation, which had not then been granted, but by reason of the necessity of ameliorating the condition of the people, which was one of the grounds of the subsequent emancipation. The noble Earl asked me further whether I was correct in saying that the grant of £20,000 was for the purpose of eking out the resources of the Church in the Islands. I certainly maintain that it was, and the noble Earl, had he heard the statement of my noble Friend to-night, would have known that the Church in the islands had possessions which brought in something like £50,000 a year, and this £20,000 a year went to eke out and supplement that income. I do not know in what shape the property was, but I think the noble Duke said it was worth something like £50,000 or £60,000 a year. The noble Earl also asked me what authority I had for saying that the colonists were willing to take upon themselves the burden. I said I believed the colonists were prepared to provide for their Bishops and their parochial ministers; I said that, as soon as the present Bill received the Royal Assent, they would be invited by the Home Government so to do; and I added, whether they did or did not, in my opinion it did not matter a pin's point in the argument. I maintained that the donation we gave in aid of the funds of the island was not in any sense establishment or endowment, and that the action which would take effect under the Bill would amount to neither disendowment nor disestablishment. I have already stated that I do not in any respect grudge the noble Earl the advantage of his reply to-night; but with reference to the arguments I advanced and the statements I made, beyond what I have now said I have nothing to retract, qualify, or explain. I am perfectly willing that the statements I made and the arguments I urged should go forth to your Lordships and the country with the reply of the noble Earl to-night, and I leave your Lordships and the public to judge whether that which was the main topic of my observations, the original attack of the noble Earl on Her Majesty's Government, was or was not warranted.

EARL GRANVILLE: I do not rise to re-open the Irish Church debate, but to say that I am most willing on my part to rest what little share of responsibility I have in introducing this matter first to your Lordships' notice upon the statement which was made by the noble Earl opposite, and the reply of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. In reply to the noble and learned Lord, however, there is one other question I should like to ask; and I wish to do it in guarded words, so as not to re-open what is past. Your Lordships may remember the severe censure which was passed upon us by Her Majesty's Ministers for not immediately retracting and apologizing for certain declarations, and it was said that it was usual in this House, when an attack was made on any Member of this House for anything he might have said, and he had completely and fully answered that attack, that a retractation of that charge should be made. I will not go into what might be said to show the difficulties of our position at that moment, but I admit in the fullest degree the general principle which was laid down by noble Lords opposite. I really wish to know what are the peculiar circumstances in which the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) stands that, twice during the last ten days, he has been made a marked exception to this rule? The other day he made a statement, to which he has referred this evening, with regard to the Church in the colonies. He was taunted with being inaccurate; but I think he has proved that he was absolutely correct in what he then stated. And yet no single word of apology has been offered him. On the other occasion I refer to, an opinion was imputed to the noble Earl on quite another subject—that of the Abyssinian War. The noble Earl denied that he had ever held that opinion, and the only excuse or retractation he got was that the noble Earl who made the imputation said that for the future he should never believe his own ears. I should be glad to hear it stated what are the peculiar circumstances which prevent the application of an honourable rule in his case.

The Marquess of BATH: The speech of the noble Earl who has just sat down (Earl Granville) is a most extraordinary one. He says that he brought a totally unfounded charge against Her Majesty's Ministers and refused to retract it; and then, because two perfectly fair charges are brought against my noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon), he complains that those who bring them do not retract them.

Lord CHELMSFORD: I do not wish to continue the criminations and recriminations of the discussion; but I have to offer an explanation in reference to what the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) said the other evening as to the expression made use of by the noble Earl behind me (the Earl of Carnarvon) respecting the Abyssinian War. I have to state that the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) afterwards referred to *Hansard*, in which there was a report of a speech by my noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon) which entirely justified the reference that was made to it. I think it right to make this statement in justification of Lord Derby, who is not now in the House.

The Earl of CARNARVON: I am extremely sorry the noble and learned Lord should have made that statement, because I also referred to *Hansard*, and satisfied myself that I was in the right. I am prepared to submit to any impartial jury the question whether there was the smallest foundation for what my noble Friend said. On the contrary, I totally deny having offered the recommendation imputed to me that a military dash should be made into Abyssinia. I recommended a diplomatic mission, and the two things are wholly inconsistent.

Lord CHELMSFORD: The noble Earl thought that a regiment or a regiment and a half would be quite sufficient to enforce that mission.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I am getting quite accustomed to the character of these debates, and I venture to suggest that we are already travelling in the direction of those warm latitudes to which I alluded the other night. Although I have not long been a Member of your Lordships' House, I diligently read the reports of your Lordships' proceedings in the newspapers, and if my recollection serves me it is quite clear that what my noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Carnarvon) wanted was an Embassy which should be properly protected. Lord Derby, however, understood my noble Friend to say that the Embassy was to fulfil all the purposes of a military expedition. Now I think a little consideration will show that the two things are wholly distinct from each other; but whether my noble Friend was right or wrong, his proposal had nothing to do with the Expedition under Sir Robert Napier. As to the thorny subject which has been brought forward this evening, I think that in reference to one, and that to the smallest part of it, my noble Friend was distinctly right; while in reference to the other, he, in reality, merely begged the question which is at issue between those who are in favour of and those who are opposed to the Irish Church Establishment. As far as the Maynooth Grant and the *Regium Donum* are concerned, I hold that the parallel between Ireland and Jamaica is complete. To withdraw those two grants is exactly the same thing as the withdrawal of the support which Parliament gave to the West Indian Church. In regard, however, to the Irish Church, I think my noble Friend, who alluded contemptuously to certain persons who believe there is a difference between the inherited property of a corporation and sums voted annually by Parliament, thereby indicated the confusion which had arisen in his own mind. We on this side of the House contend, whether rightly or wrongly, that the property of the Irish Church depends on something totally different from the sanction given by Parliament, when sums are voted out of the Consolidated Fund. We contend, in point of fact, that the Church depends on sanctions analogous in character to those by virtue of which my noble Friend holds his own property. That, I believe, constitutes the great difference between us and the noble Lords opposite on the subject of the Irish Church property. It is a difference of principle; and if my noble Friend overlooked that difference of principle, and also the fact that numbers of people hold the views which he thinks absurd, I can easily understand how he imagined that in withdrawing the grant to the West Indian Church the Government were going in an opposite direction to that indicated by the policy which they pursued on the question of the Irish Church. That, I think, was the way in which the confusion of the noble Earl arose. I have ventured to make these few remarks, but, although only a young Member of your Lordships' House, I must earnestly protest against the growing practice of devoting, in the midst of the important questions which we have to decide, and of the serious problems which come up to us for solution, so much valuable time to the discussion of purely personal questions.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND thought the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon) had completely vindicated himself from the charge of inaccuracy that had been brought against him. With respect to the general subject then under their Lordships' consideration he was of opinion that it would not be possible to continue the policy hitherto pursued towards the colonies; and he was therefore prepared to support the Bill.

LORD DENMAN said, that if he might trust to his memory the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) said he thought the noble Earl near him (the Earl of Carnarvon) wished to have a flying squadron sent to Abyssinia, and suggested that perhaps the noble Earl might wish to have the Hampshire Yeomanry Cavalry despatched to that country. ["Question!"]

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, he would not enter into the general question, but wished to ask the noble Duke the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the colonists were ready, or had at any time been invited, to take this increased burden upon themselves?

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM: No application has yet been made to the colonies asking them to assume the charge for the episcopal supervision of those sees, which will be unprovided for, as far as regards the Imperial salaries, on the death of the present holders. The communications which I have had with those who hold the most important sees in the West Indian colonies lead me to believe that there will not be any difficulty on the part of the colonists in providing out of their own resources for episcopal supervision, on the scale which is usual at present in our colonial dioceses. It is true that that is not such a provision as was contemplated years ago, when the grant was established, but still it has been found sufficient throughout our colonial possessions. With regard to the houses, lands, and certain allowances appertaining to the bishops, and which have been granted in the colonies, they will, of course, stand just as they did before the passing of the Bill.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the whole House on *Thursday* next.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 176.)

(*The Earl of Longford.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into a Committee on the said Bill read.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said that, as a measure of Parliamentary Reform, this Bill was a mockery and an absurdity. What was required in Ireland was not an extension of the franchise so much as a re-distribution of seats. Anomalies existed in Ireland which could not be justified on any ground; and it seemed to him that it was precisely because there was so much to be done in that direction that no attempt at re-distribution had been made. It was evident that another Irish Reform Bill would have to be introduced next year. This measure conferred the franchise on the most doubtful class to which it could be extended in Ireland. He would not detain their Lordships by going into statistics on this subject further than to refer to one or two facts which would be found in a Paper laid upon the table of the other House of Parliament, though not communicated to their Lordships' House. He alluded to a Paper showing the population and the number of the electors in the different counties and boroughs in Ireland. It was evident from this Paper that there were very striking anomalies in connection with the representation of Ireland. There were eighteen boroughs, the largest of which, Lisburn, had only 302 electors; of which one, Portarlington, had only ninety-two electors; and most of which had under 200 electors: and yet each of these boroughs returned a Member; while an important county containing 1,000 electors, and having within it no boroughs, returned only two Members. Such anomalies as these showed the absolute necessity of introducing a measure which should deal with the distribution of the seats, so far as Ireland was concerned. Again, it was impossible that the populous, wealthy, and increasing district to the south-east of the city of Dublin could remain without direct representation, and the ninety-two electors of such miserable places as Portarlington continue to return a Member. He had no intention of opposing this Bill; but he protested against the notion that it was a measure which would settle the question of Reform in Ireland, because he foresaw that within a year or two it would be necessary to take up the question of the re-distribution of the representation in that country.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, he had intended to say a few words on the provisions of the Bill, even if the noble Marquess had not thought it necessary to refer to the subject. It was to be remembered that this was not the Bill originally introduced by the Government for the amendment of the representation of the people in Ireland in Parliament. The Government had introduced a Bill, by the provisions of which certain small boroughs in Ireland would have been abolished, and among them Portarlington—which he believed was the smallest borough in the kingdom — whose Member would have been given to the City of Dublin. That Bill, however, met with so small an amount of favour in the House of Commons that the Government were obliged to give up that scheme of re-distribution. Another part of the original scheme for Ireland was a revision of the electoral boundaries by a Commission; but it had since been determined that the boundaries should be settled by the Bill. Though in the Bill before their Lordships the qualification in boroughs was named at £4, practically the borough franchise in Ireland would be the same as that in England—as in the former country premises valued at under £4 were exempted from payment of rates. There was a lodger franchise for Ireland, as well as for England and Scotland. A noble Earl (the Earl of Bandon) had given Notice of two Amendments; but they were not Amendments to which the Government could assent; and he therefore hoped that his noble Friend would not press them.

EARL RUSSELL said, he was disposed to accept this Bill as it stood, because, notwithstanding the anomalies in the Irish representation pointed out by his noble Friend (the Marquess of Clanricarde), he thought the measure was sufficient for the present time. His reason for saying this was that, taking the general question of representation, he thought it could not be said that the Irish boroughs generally had more than a fair proportion of representation in relation to the counties. It therefore seemed to him that it would be better for Parliament to wait for some years and see whether there were not some large and increasing towns, such as Belfast, entitled to additional representation before they made any change in the distribution of seats. With regard to a "hard and fast line," which was so strongly repudiated by the Government last year, he might observe that in England and Scotland we had it in respect of the county and the lodger franchises, and in Ireland it was now to be extended even to the boroughs. He was led to the conclusion, therefore, that either the pretence put forward last year was a false one—which he thought it was—or that the Government had departed from their own principles.

THE EARL OF BANDON said, he would point out one of the anomalies of Parliamentary representation in Ireland, which he desired to see rectified. The large county of Cork in which he resided, contained no less than 15,995 voters, who only returned two Members; while four boroughs in the same county had a collective constituency of only 814 voters, who returned four Members to the House of Commons. Even under the present Bill the whole constituency of these boroughs would not exceed 1,760, and, probably, would not be more than 1,300 or 1,400 voters. The Irish Reform Bill of 1850 had, unfortunately, given up the principle that the county franchise should be based upon property, and he still retained the opinion which he expressed at the time that this was a step in the direction of equal electoral divisions. He looked upon the lodger franchise as applied to Ireland with considerable distrust, for he could not forget that before the Bill of 1850 the great complaint was the swearing on both sides as to the value of the holdings. He had presented a petition that evening from certain influential citizens of Dublin having houses in the neighbourhood, stating that they were much nearer to Dublin than formerly by means of the railway, but that they were still outside the seven-mile line, and urging that they should be allowed to vote within a distance of twelve miles. As to the Amendments, of which he had given Notice, he was willing to withdraw them for the present; but he trusted that at some future time a Bill for the re-distribution of seats in Ireland would be brought before their Lordships' House.

House in Committee; Bill *reported*, without Amendment; and to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next.

REGISTRATION BILL.—(No. 218.)

(*The Lord Chancellor,*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the object of this Bill was to make those arrangements with regard to registration which would allow of the dissolution of Parliament at the earliest possible moment. The contents of the Bill were entirely matters of detail, which would be best discussed in Committee, and he would, therefore simply move that the Bill be read a second time.

Bill read 2ª, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 220.)

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

THIRD READING.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order), with the Amendments.

LORD REDESDALE, in moving the Amendment, of which he had given notice, relative to the Boundaries of Glasgow, said, that the districts which he proposed to add to that place were virtually parts of the city, Govan comprising part of the harbour, and Partick containing the site of the new University, and were so identified in every way with the city that they ought to form part of it for electoral purposes. This could hardly be accounted a party question, for the Corporation of Glasgow, which was, he believed, one of the most liberal Corporations in the country, had petitioned in favour of the extension. It was true that some of the inhabitants of these districts objected to the proposal, their fear being that it would be followed by their inclusion within the municipality, and that they would so become liable to taxation for municipal purposes; but that could only be done by a special Act, when they would have an opportunity of showing cause against it. He believed they would be unable in that case to show any sufficient cause, for it was very important, for drainage, police, and other purposes, that every portion of what was really one city should be comprised in one jurisdiction. At present, however, only the Parliamentary boundary was to be dealt with, and the House of Commons having decided this question by a narrow majority of 5, it seemed to him fair to give them an opportunity of re-considering it. Amendments had been already adopted, the consideration of which would probably occupy the House of Commons only a few minutes, and he did not anticipate that there would be any protracted discussion on this point—so that the progress of the Bill would not be delayed; for, in the event of the other House refusing to agree to the Amendment, he should not ask their Lordships to insist upon it.

Moved, at the end of the Bill to add the following clause:—

> "That the Boundaries of the City of Glasgow shall, until otherwise directed by Parliament, be those specified in Schedule (K.) hereunto annexed."—(*The Lord Redesdale.*)

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL said, he was not sorry that the noble Lord had given him an opportunity of discussing the general bearings of the Bill, on which hitherto no observations had been offered in their Lordships' House, it not being usual to debate the principles of a measure brought in by the Government and accepted with trifling alterations by the Opposition. He regarded it as, on the whole, a very satisfactory solution of the Reform question with regard to Scotland. On some points, indeed, the Liberal party had been unsuccessful in the other House; but on others the Government had been defeated, and the Bill he thought might be regarded as very much of the nature of a compromise. He was glad that the Government had as regards Scotland been obliged to give way on the question of a rating franchise in counties. A rating franchise had two meanings; in counties its object was to take the rateable instead of the value column, while in boroughs its object was to make the payment of rates a condition of the suffrage — and this was quite a different question from rateable value in the other sense. In Scotland a rating franchise in counties would have been quite unworkable; and after full discussion the Government had agreed to a franchise founded upon actual value, which was the basis of almost all rates in Scotland except the poor rate, and was, he believed, the best system. Had it been necessary to raise the question in this House, it could have been shown that the anomalies and absurdities of a rating qualification would have been greater in Scotland than in England; and the Government, by accepting a £14 rental instead of a £12 rating franchise, had shown that they could easily have accepted a similar basis in the case of England, and that no "principle" is involved except that of public convenience. In England the tenant might pay through his landlord or any other person, but must pay the full rate, compounding being abolished; whereas in Scotland the practice was for the tenant and the landlord to pay half the rate each — and this system would continue in force. As regards the borough franchise he thought the Bill had satisfactorily settled the question, for he did not deny the expediency of excluding from the borough franchise those who were unable to pay even half the poor rates. A noble Earl (the Earl of Harrowby) complained a few nights ago of the English Act of last Session having been tampered with, and of Scotland having invaded England and carried off blackmail in the shape of seven seats. Now, he (the Duke of Argyll) had never contended for a re-distribution of political power as between the two countries, founded either on taxation or population, for he did not consider that Scotchmen had any special grievances, and they were allowed by their English friends to manage their own affairs very much as they pleased. He wished, therefore, for no re-distribution founded on taxation or population, though if such grounds were considered Scotland could make out a fair claim for additional seats. The only claim he had ever made was that particular constituencies of such magnitude and importance that were they in England they would be allotted a second or third seat, ought not to be denied that privilege simply because they were in Scotland. He did not think the independent Members of their Lordships' House had any great reason to complain because seven seats were taken from England. He did not believe there was anyone who in his heart supposed that it would be possible in the next Parliament that all the small boroughs in England should retain their Members. Up to the present time no county in Scotland had had two representatives, while several of the smallest in England had two Members, and some of them had more. It could hardly be considered unreasonable, therefore, to give a second representative to a few counties in Scotland which had made such enormous advances in wealth and commercial importance. Many Conservatives thought it a point of policy that county constituencies should be composed almost exclusively of landed proprietors and tenant farmers, and that the urban element should be eliminated. It was on that principle that the Amendment to extend the boundaries of Glasgow was sustained. But that was a very dangerous policy, even from a Conservative point of view; because it should not be forgotten that there were many boroughs which were called town constituencies, but which were nothing in reality but small counties and belonged as exclusively to the agricultural interest as any county in England. If, therefore, they were to have a revision of boundaries, any Commission that might be appointed should be left perfectly free to deal with these so-called boroughs. Now, the case for the extension of the boundaries of Glasgow was, instead of being very strong, a very weak one. It was perfectly true that in the other House the Government proposed to include Govan and Partick within the Parliamentary limits, and upon that they were defeated; but they never ventured to propose such an extension as was contemplated by the Amendment that was now submitted to their Lordships. Such an Amendment had indeed been placed upon the Paper, but it had never been carried to a division. The noble Lord (Lord Redesdale) had talked of part of these suburbs being within the natural boundaries of Glasgow; but he (the Duke of Argyll) could assure the House from his own knowledge that these districts extended far beyond what could be at all considered as properly included within it. His noble Friend had appealed to the desire of the municipality of

Glasgow to take in the suburbs; but in February last a Petition had been presented from the magistrates of Glasgow, in which they prayed that four Members should be given to the city, and if it was decided not to give four Members then that the Parliamentary boundary should not be enlarged. It might be said that they had changed their minds when they found they could get only three Members; but the reason for that was because they wished to bring the whole of the inhabitants of the outlying districts within the area of Glasgow taxation. The inhabitants of those districts, on the other hand, resisted because they had a taxation of their own, and they feared that if brought within the municipality of Glasgow their taxation would be grievously increased. The population of Glasgow was somewhere about 450,000; and if this area, which had about 62,000 inhabitants, were added to it, the whole population of the city would be largely in excess of 500,000, and the number of voters would be between 60,000 and 70,000. A great many people therefore said that they would be entirely swamped by this immense mass of voters; and most of the intelligent inhabitants of the outlying districts did not desire to be taken within the city, because they would lose their county votes. On these and on other grounds, he thought it would be very inexpedient if that House was to interfere with the natural right of the House of Commons to define the boundaries of its own constituencies.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, he must defend the Government against the charge of having abandoned their fundamental policy of taking rating instead of rental as the basis of the franchise. The state of Scotland was so peculiar and so different from that of every other part of the United Kingdom, that it would have been impossible to adhere in that country to all the provisions of the English Reform Bill; for there were parishes in Scotland where there were no rates at all, and consequently had the rating principle been adhered to it would have introduced nothing but confusion. But with regard to the essential principle of the payment of rates, the Government had adhered to their principle in the other House, and had successfully vindicated that principle. But with regard to the proposal of his noble Friend (Lord Redesdale), he could only repeat what had been already stated as to the course the Government intended to pursue. What the opinion of the Government was had been sufficiently indicated by the Amendments proposed by the noble Duke at the head of the Post Office (the Duke of Montrose) in regard to the Boundary Bill. But the same considerations which had weighed with the Government in the case of the Boundary Bill had weighed with them also with respect to this Bill—they did not think it right to interpose any obstacle in the way of passing those measures which they considered absolutely necessary to be carried before the close of the Session. Under these circumstances, he would appeal to his noble Friend not to press his Amendment; and if his appeal should be unsuccessful he should be compelled to divide against him.

The Earl of AIRLIE said, he would not say more than a few words, as the Government had announced their intention not to support the Amendment. But he must say he felt some little surprise that the noble Lord (Lord Redesdale) should be the person to bring forward this Amendment—particularly after the part which he had taken in respect of the English Reform Bill of last year. On that occasion the noble Lord said that for this House to deal with the question of enfranchising or disfranchising boroughs was almost unconstitutional; it might be within the letter of the law, but certainly was a strain upon the Constitution. But was not an interference with the limits of boroughs in principle the same, seeing that you thereby affected one way or the other the franchise of a great number of persons? He thought that it was a mere question of degree between the enfranchisement or disfranchisement of boroughs and the alteration of borough limits.

Lord REDESDALE said, he did not see any inconsistency at all. What he stated last year was that it was a very delicate thing to disfranchise a borough which had perhaps enjoyed the franchise for centuries, and which the other House of Parliament, to which the question more especially belonged, did not think should be disfranchised. On the other hand, to say that in determining the question of Reform this House had not a right to give an opinion upon the boundaries of one of the boroughs affected by the Bill was really to limit the power of this House to an extent which he thought would not be contemplated by anybody in his senses. He should press his Motion to a division, because he felt bound to assert the independence of this House, which had been most unfairly treated with regard to this Bill. Every Member of the Government admitted that his Amendment was a proper one; it could not interfere in any way with the passing of the Bill, and being admittedly a proper Amendment he hoped that their Lordships would support it.

LORD LYVEDEN wished to say a word on the inconsistency of the Government, who proposed this year the very thing which they strenuously objected to last year. Last year there was to be no disfranchisement of boroughs; but this year seven boroughs were taken away from the English representation by one small clause in the Scotch Bill, and no reason whatever was assigned why it was done. He thought some notice ought to have been taken of this before the third reading, and nothing but the necessity of passing the Scotch Bill at the present time would induce him to acquiesce in it.

On Question? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 13; Not-Contents 53: Majority 40.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

CONTENTS.

Northumberland, D.
Rutland, D.

Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.

Coventry, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E. [*Teller.*]

Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Colchester, L.
Denman, L.
Redesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Grafton, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Abercorn, M.

Airlie, E.
Camperdown, E.
Clarendon, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Effingham, E.
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Minto, E.
Nelson, E.
Portarlington, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.

Halifax, V.
Hawarden, V.
Sydney, V.
Templetown, V.

Belper, L.
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Camoys, L.
Churchill, L. [*Teller.*]
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Clinton, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Cranworth, L.
Crofton, L.
De Tabley, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Leigh, L.
Lyveden, L.
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Raglan, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*) [*Teller.*]

Stanley of Alderley, L.
Suffield, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Talbot de Malahide, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.

Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

RAILWAY COMPANIES BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to further amend the Law relating to Railway Companies—Was *presented* by The Duke of RICHMOND; read 1^a. (No. 226.)

House adjourned at a quarter before
Eight o'clock, to Thursday next,
half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 7, 1868.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report*— Special and Common Juries [No. 401.]

SUPPLY — *considered in Committee* — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class IV.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — Trades Societies and Combinations of Workmen*; New Zealand Assembly's Powers; * Vaccination (Ireland)*; Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment. *

First Reading — New Zealand Assembly's Powers* [216]; Vaccination (Ireland)* [217]; Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment* [218]; Trades Societies and Combinations of Workmen* [219].

Report of Select Committee—Sale of Liquors on Sunday* [No. 402].

Committee — Public Schools (*re-comm.*) [135]; Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit* [184]; Court of Session (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [173]; Larceny and Embezzlement* [157].

Report — Public Schools (*re-comm.*) [135]; Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit* [184]; Court of Session (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [173-214]; Larceny and Embezzlement* [157; Sale of Liquors on Sunday* [12].

Considered as amended—Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland)* [150]; Court of Justiciary (Scotland)* [174].

Third Reading — Assignees of Marine Policies* [203]; Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment* [193]; Petit Juries (Ireland)* [209]; Metropolitan Police Funds* [132], and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

ARMY—THE CONTROL DEPARTMENT.

QUESTIONS.

COLONEL JERVIS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether Lieutenant General Sir Henry Storks, G.C.B., Controller in Chief, War Department, has not expressed his entire disapproval of the views laid down by the Treasury in their Letter of the 29th June last respecting the proposed arrangements of the Control Department, more especially as they do not carry out the Recommendations of Lord Strathnairn's Committee?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON in reply, said, he trusted that his hon. and gallant Friend would not think him wanting in courtesy to him if he declined to state in that House the substance of any conversations which might have passed between himself and the War Office officials with whom he had the pleasure of acting. There was, however, one statement which he wished to make, as it might possibly be inferred from the Question that his hon. and gallant Friend intended to imply that there had been some personal difference between Sir Henry Storks and himself. [Colonel Jervis: Not the slightest!] He did not mean to say that such was the intention of his hon. and gallant Friend, but he thought that might possibly be inferred from the terms of the Question, and he wished, therefore, to state most specifically that nothing could be more friendly and harmonious than his communications with Sir Henry Storks.

Colonel JERVIS said, he would now beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will lay upon the Table the Papers referred to in War Office Letter of the 6th April 1868, page 19 of Papers marked War Office, "Control Department," 373, as the "enclosed Draft Regulations;" together with any Memorandum thereupon by the Chief Controller?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON replied that his hon. and gallant Friend was quite mistaken in the inference which he seemed to have drawn, that the Regulations now upon the table of the House had been drawn by the Treasury. The first Draft of the Regulations was somewhat hastily compiled, and was rather more lengthy than was necessary. It was, therefore, improved and revised; but the revised Copy, which was now on the table, had been drawn up by the same hand which drew up the original Regulations, and he could not see what good object was to be attained by laying on the table the first Draft, which had been improved upon and considerably altered.

FRESCOES IN THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.—QUESTION.

Mr. COWPER said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he has received any Chemical Report on the trials that have been made for the induration of the Walls of the Houses of Parliament, and whether he will lay such Report upon the Table of the House; and, when the public will be admitted to see the Frescoes painted by the late Mr. Dyce in the Queen's Robing Room?

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, in reply, that as far as the Frescoes were concerned, they were now quite fit to be inspected by the public, and he believed he might also say, with great confidence, that they would prove themselves to be fully worthy of the fame of that distinguished and lamented artist. With regard to the room itself, there were some slight works being carried on under Mr. Barry's charge, which were not yet completed. Mr. Barry had been called away from London, and he was not able to say precisely how soon the room would be in a condition to be opened to the public, but he apprehended very shortly indeed.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Mr. Walpole, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*).

[Bill 135.]

COMMITTEE. [*Progress, 23rd June.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 20 (Powers of Special Commissioners).

Mr. NEWDEGATE observed that it was contrary to practice to repeal Acts of Parliament without specifying them, and he therefore proposed the following Amendment to be inserted after the word "Commissioners":—

> "But no statute or scheme proposing the repeal of any Act of Parliament, or the alteration of the provisions or application thereof, shall have effect until the same has been submitted to Parliament in a Bill, to be introduced by Her Majesty's Ministers within two months after the commencement of the then next Session of Parliament, and such Bill shall have been enacted."

The clause as it stood was a departure from the practice of the Universities and the Common Law of the State. There were two principal Acts of Parliament under which the property of these schools was appropriated, and his object in moving this Amendment was to prevent any existing Act relating to the public schools of this country being varied or repealed by Order in Council.

Mr. WALPOLE observed that the clause as drawn was almost entirely analogous to the Oxford and Cambridge Act. He did not think the hon. Gentleman was aware of what would be the legal effect of his Amendment. He (Mr. Walpole) thought the introduction of those words would cause great confusion, and instead of enabling the Commissioners or the Governing Body to settle what are to be the future arrangements, they would have to come back to Parliament, re-opening the whole of the questions now discussed.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, his object was to take care that a set of Commissioners or the new Governing Body should not have power to vary Acts of Parliament.

Colonel SYKES said, he hoped the clause gave no such power.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he could not admit that the clause would give any power to repeal Acts of Parliament. This Amendment would render it necessary to bring every scheme before Parliament to be discussed, and that would be obviously most inconvenient.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he thought the Amendment proposed would do away with all the advantage of passing the Bill. Where would be the benefit of the measure unless the new Governing Body had power to reform or make better regulations for the conduct of the schools ?

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that his object was that the property in question should be dealt with by Act of Parliament.

Mr. GOLDNEY supported the clause as it stood.

Mr. HENLEY said, that the object of his hon. Friend (Mr. Newdegate) was to prevent a course being followed which was unprecedented; and his hon. Friend contended that these schools should be enabled to come to Parliament in the same way as the schemes of the Charity Commissioners were submitted to Parliament.

Mr. NEATE said, there was a precedent, and in proof of it he would refer to the Acts relating to Oxford University.

Mr. NEWDEGATE denied that there was any precedent, and in the case referred to by the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Neate) the Act of Parliament was never mentioned.

Colonel SYKES said, the Commissioners would be enabled to deal with the rights of property in utter ignorance by this House.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he could not understand the tendency to hand despotic powers to Commissioners.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 21 (Clause A. Scheme for Appropriation of Estate to Westminster School).

Mr. WYNN moved in page 11, line 10, to leave out "exceeding," and insert "less than." He stated that the expenses of Westminster School had increased from £2,176 in 1861 to £2,681 in 1867; and that the Commissioners had stated in their Report that £3,300 would be barely sufficient to meet the expenditure of the future. He therefore proposed to alter the clause, so that the sum set apart for the Westminster School shall not be less than £3,500.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, if this were agreed to, he should move the insertion of other words preventing the Ecclesiastical Commissioners from appropriating more than £4,000 to Westminster School.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. AYRTON said, he hoped it would not be lost sight of by the friends of the Church and the supporters of religion that property originally set apart for the religious culture of the poorest was being appropriated for the education of the wealthiest. ["No, no!"] That he maintained was the fact. Reverting to the clause under consideration he advised the granting of an annuity to the School, rather than giving it property which could be much more cheaply managed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. He moved the insertion of the words "or for granting an annuity of the like amount."

Mr. MOWBRAY said, he hoped the Committee would not agree to the Motion, on the ground that it would maintain the connection between the Chapter, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and the School, whereas the object of the Bill was to sever the connection, and place the School upon an entirely independent footing.

Mr. BENTINCK said, he could not allow the statement of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets to go uncontradicted. The boys at Westminster School formerly were by no means exclusively the sons of the wealthy; they included a great many sons of struggling professional men, whose difficulties were greater very often than those of persons nominally in a poorer grade. The hon. and learned Member appeared to think that no boys whatever ought to be on the foundation but those whom one sees running about the streets in leather breeches and a little muffin cap.

Mr. NEATE said, he had certainly understood from many "Old Westminsters" that the School used to be specially the resort of the British aristocracy.

Mr. W. LOWTHER said, the aristocracy used to be strongly represented at Westminster, but they did not, as alleged, devour the endowments, which were freely enjoyed by sons of the poorer clergy and struggling professional men. The endowments of Westminster were not being created now for the first time, and in any fresh distribution of the funds he thought the School had a right to claim its fair proportion.

Mr. AYRTON said, the Government might very fairly have supported the recommendation of the Committee; but they had shown a ready lavishness to spoliate the people by adding a further sum of £500 a year to the endowment. His hon. Friends who had been educated at Westminster School seemed to believe that they had been there in company with all the poverty of the town; but that was not the impression of anybody else. What he complained of was, that those who had the charge of this Bill had refused to introduce a clause which would limit the application of these public funds to people who shall give evidence that they were required for the purposes of their education. He had a right to say therefore that this was a Bill for the benefit of a class who could afford to pay for their education. Supposing that Westminster School was used by those who could not pay for their own education, he would ask whether the same thing could be said of Eton, Harrow, and Rugby? Were those schools carried on upon the principle of being most adapted to the people who could not afford to pay for their education? On the contrary, their only peculiarity was that they were most expensive in point of charge, and least effective in point of education. ["No, no!"] It was notorious that the education of the majority of the scholars was neglected for the purpose of occasionally producing what were called "show boys."

Mr. WALPOLE said, the hon. and learned Gentleman, who was so severe upon the Government, had not been very careful as to the accuracy of his own stetement. So far from the Government seeking to spoliate the funds belonging to the Church, the proposal in Committee to fill up the blank with the sum of £3,500 was carried by a majority of 14 or 15 votes, the only dissentient being the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the Tower Hamlets. The Committee had determined that a sum should be paid to the School out of the property of the Dean and Chapter, amounting to nearly £3,593, and all that was now asked to be done, in addition, was, that the Commissioners should be left a discretion to increase that amount to a sum not exceeding £4,000. The Government, in sanctioning that proposal, were simply acting on the equitable construction to be put on the statutes, which laid it down that portions of the funds in question fairly belonged to Westminster School.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. MARSH moved the insertion, page 11, line 12, after the word "them," of the words—

> "The playground in Vincent Square with the buildings thereon; the dormitory with its appurtenances; the school and class-rooms; the houses and premises of the Head master and Under master; the three boarding-houses; the gymnasium excepting the crypts; and subject to existing interests the house in Great Dean's Yard, now occupied by the Rector Canon of Saint John the Evangelist, Westminster; the house abutting on the school premises, and now occupied by Mr. Turle; the house now occupiedby the Sub-Dean; and the house situate at the south-western corner of Great Dean's Yard, now numbered , and in the occupation of Mrs. Gullan and."

The space occupied by Westminster School, he said, was only 5,000 square feet, whereas King's College and the City of London School occcupied a space of 12,000 feet. He trusted the number of boys at Westminster School would largely increase, and if that were so they would stand in need of the additional accommodation which he proposed to provide.

Mr. W. LOWTHER expressed a hope that the Committee would accede to the very reasonable suggestion which had just been made. The requirements of the present day necessitated that additional accommodation should be provided for the School.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. POWELL moved to omit the words, "and such other portions of the said Chapter estates as are essential to the well-being of the School."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. MARSH said, that, according to the proviso at the end of the clause, in the event of Westminster School being removed beyond the City of Westminster, all its property and income derived from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or from the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, or their estates, would revert to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. He thought that Westminster School should be treated on the same principle as the Charterhouse School; and therefore, by way of Amendment, he moved in line 28, after "governing body," leave out to the end of the clause.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he was of opinion that there was force in the argument that Westminster School, not being an entirely independent school, but being connected with Westminster Abbey, should not be allowed to take the funds which arose from the revenues of Westminster Abbey and spend them in some place in the country. He therefore deemed it desirable that the decision of the Select Committee, which was in favour of the proviso, should be adhered to, though the matter was of no great practical importance, as it was not probable that Westminster School would be removed into the country.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE said, he thought that the buildings round Dean's Yard ought to be reserved, and ought to lapse to the Abbey, if the School should be removed.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 22 to 26 *agreed to.*

Clause 27 *postponed.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

MR. LOWE, in proposing a new clause, providing for an annual examination by Inspectors, said, that the proposal was not altogether a new one, because when the Public Schools Commission were inquiring into the matter they invited the public schools to submit to an examination of the kind he proposed; but for various reasons, all equally cogent, these schools declined the honour that was offered them. He made this proposal in no spirit of hostility to the public schools, but in friendship for the youth of this country. A very good case for the clause was, he thought, to be found in the Report of the Commissioners. A gentleman of great judgment and experience, for instance, stated that a few years ago the University of Oxford had to make its course commence with the mere rudiments of education, and on page 26 of their Report the Commissioners arrived at the conclusion, among others, that the classical knowledge possessed by young men leaving school was very low, but that the knowledge of arithmetic, mathematics, and general information was lower still. Now the deficiencies thus pointed out in no unfriendly spirit were such that he felt sure the Committee must deplore their existence. At Winchester, in his time, neither writing nor reading was taught, and a similar state of things prevailed, he believed, at most of our public schools. The question then arose how so great a want was to be supplied? His idea was that the sources of improvement were not to be sought in the endowments of a school, but in the parents of the children by whom it was attended. The object which the Committee should endeavour to secure was to bring the opinion of the parents to bear on the system of instruction which their children received; because our public schools being in the main adventure schools necessarily depended very much on those who were their customers. It was desirable, therefore, that the fathers and mothers of England should be made acquainted with the deficiencies in the education given, and the way to that was to submit the schools to examination and to make known the result. If the views of the Commissioners should then be found to be correct, a service would be done by having public attention called to the fact, while, if not, an erroneous notion would have been dispelled, and the schools would be the gainers. In either event such examinations as he proposed could not fail to be attended with advantage, and he could not see how, on the ground of expediency, there could be any objection to the clause. But then, perhaps, it might be opposed on the ground of right. It might be contended that Government Inspectors could not properly be empowered to enter the schools for the purpose of instituting an examination of the pupils. These schools, however, he would remind the Committee were really founded on endowments, and the Commissioners on Middle-class Education reported in favour of having every endowed school examined under Government inspection. He was therefore only asking the Committee to anticipate the recommendations of those Commissioners; and, indeed, it would, he thought, have been better if endowed schools had been dealt with as a whole, and the invidious distinction between public and private schools obviated. If the subjects to which his clause related were taught in our public schools, he could not understand why they should shrink from the proposed examination; if not, he could not see why the House of Commons should shrink from making the fact known to the world. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the following clause:—

> "That all boys educated at the seven Schools mentioned in this Act shall be examined once a year, by one of the Inspectors of the Committee of Council on Education, in reading, writing from dictation, arithmetic, including vulgar fractions, practice, and the rule of three, geography, English grammar and history, and the results of such examination and the Report of the examining Inspectors shall be laid before Parliament.—(*Mr. Lowe*).

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH contended that the effect of the adoption of the clause would be to degrade the great public schools of England down to the level of village schools. The right hon. Gentleman had in another place ascribed his success in life to his command of his mother tongue; but he would venture to say that there was no Member of that House who owed more to other sources. Had he trusted to his mother tongue alone, independently of the classical reputation which he had acquired, he would scarcely have reached so high a position as he had achieved. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to wish to interfere with private right, and the function of the Head master of the school. There was no such thing as *mens sana in corpore sano*, as when the mind was cultivated the body suffered, and when the body was highly cultivated the mind suffered. The richness of our language arose from the Anglo-Saxon foundation, enriched by copious gatherings from Greek and Latin. It was to these agglomerated sources that the English language owed its richness. The object of Eton and Westminster was to raise the minds of the pupils; but all those in the public schools would feel that examination in the branches mentioned in the Resolution would be a degradation.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he would be obliged to vote against the clause, because he did not think the Inspectors of the Committee in Council would be the proper examiners, nor did he think an examination should be limited to reading, writing, and arithmetic, or be confined to the schools affected by the Bill. He thought all endowed schools should be subjected to examination. Nothing seemed more clearly proved than this in the evidence before the Committee. If his right hon. Friend would frame a clause that would submit all these schools to an extensive examination, he (Mr. Forster) would vote for it; but he was afraid many of the schools would think this clause an insult.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he hoped the clause would be pressed to a division, because it was evident that most pupils at public schools did not know as much as an intelligent charity boy. Complaint had been made that the whole time of public school boys was taken up by the study of Latin and Greek; but, as a matter of fact, they learnt very little of these languages. An ordinarily educated German could converse with a foreigner in Latin if the two had no other language in common; but how many Englishmen carried from a public school sufficient Latin to do this? He confessed that, although he might be able to translate some half dozen words of Latin, he was wholly unable to translate a sentence from the Greek, although he had studied those languages for ten years at a public school. He complained that it was the fault of the system and his misfortune that this was so. The fact was, public schools had become mere hotbeds of social exclusiveness and aristocratic prejudice, where people sent their sons to pick up what they called gentlemanly connections. He hoped that a division would be resorted to, in which case the right hon. Gentleman would find more Members voting for him than he expected.

MR. WALPOLE agreed that it was desirable to remedy as far as possible the deficiency of their public schools with regard to the lower branches of education; but he did not think that the remedy which the right hon, Gentleman proposed to apply would at all hit the source of the disease. The sources of the deficiency were chiefly two—one was connected with the boys, as the hon. Member for Middlesex (Mr. Labouchere) had virtually admitted was his own case, the other was traceable to the parents. The real fault lay with the parents themselves, who left the responsibility altogether upon the school and the masters, and did not pay sufficient attention themselves to the progress which their boys made. But how was that difficulty to be got over? He believed the Bill would meet this evil much better than the appointment of Inspectors, and that it would be the primary duty of the newly-constituted governing bodies to make regulations for accomplishing the very purposes to which it was proposed that the Inspectors should apply themselves. It would be a great mistake, and that not merely in educational matters, to encourage the belief that everything which was complained of could be got rid of by a system of Government inspection. Evils like these were properly to be encountered and surmounted by the exertions of the people themselves. Even if Government Inspectors were appointed, in time the duties would be very imperfectly discharged, and the system would end very much in matters of form. Seeing, therefore, that the object which his right hon. Friend had chiefly in view could be accomplished by trusting and strengthening the new governing bodies, he hoped the Motion would not be pressed to a division.

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, there was no doubt the fault lay to some extent with the parents; but a parent who paid £200 a year for the education of his boy had, at the same time, a right to expect that he would be taught the elementary branches of learning. For his own part, he hoped the Motion would be pressed to a division. The Government had done a great deal during the last twenty years for the education of the poorer classes, and it was time now that something should be done for the children of the upper and middle classes. Government inspection, he believed, would do a great deal towards renewing public confidence in the education given in the public schools.

MR. HENLEY said, of all the curious propositions put forward during the present discussion, this was the most remarkable. For the last couple of years the Legislature had occupied itself in constituting anew the Governing Bodies of the great schools; it had not hesitated to deal freely with founders' wills, with Acts of Parliament, or, as some put it, had not scrupled to "rob the poor." But hardly was all this done, the work even was not yet completed, when the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) came forward and said—

> "These very authorities whom you have just established with so strong a hand are not fit for anything—not fit even to judge whether the schools are teaching anything or nothing."

Surely, if you have swept away much of what exists and set up something in its stead that you declare not to be competent to decide whether children can read or write, you must have done a great deal of wrong, and the better course would be to proceed no further with the Bill. What confidence could the Committee put in the machinery which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) now proposed? Why, he was the very man who was forced to come down to the House some years ago and state that all the beautiful system of inspection which had gone on for many years under the Privy Council was an utter failure, that the children could neither read nor write, and that an Act of Parliament was necessary to set right the very matters which, according to the Inspectors' Reports, varied only in their degrees of excellence. He honestly avowed that he had no faith in the proposed system of inspection. It was a serious charge, and behind it was the whole question of visitation. Were the Committee going to strike down the system of visitation, and to create in its stead a system of inspection? The hon. Member for Middlesex (Mr. Labouchere) told the House that there were a great many boys in these schools who learnt nothing. Some of these were not wanting in ability, but they set that ability to work to defy the masters, putting up with any little inconveniences for the sake of carrying their object. If the Committee chose to enact that the children in the different public schools should learn reading, writing, or arithmetic, that proposition in itself might be deserving of consideration. But a system of Government inspection, he believed, would be a failure, and, furthermore, would militate against the system of visitation.

MR. ACLAND said, the great evil of the public schools was the tacit recognition of idleness. One of the Assistant masters at Eton brought before him very plainly the difficulty of grappling with this evil, when he repeated a saying of the parent of one of these boys—"I don't care whether my boy learns anything as long as he makes a good connection." The gentleman who made this remark was a man likely to rise into a very high position in society, but he was nevertheless somewhat of an upstart. The ceremony of examination under the operation of the clause would in his opinion, be a great farce. Who were to be the examiners? Inspectors appointed by the Privy Council, who, he must say, with all respect for some of them, were not men in the slightest degree fitted to discharge the duty. Indeed, it would be nothing less than an insult to any respectable middle-class school, he thought, to send such persons to examine the scholars. Why were decimal fractions omitted from the list of subjects in which the examination was to take place? He hoped the Committee would not consent by a sidewind to erect the President of the Council into a Minister of Public Instruction. If the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne was so anxious for improvement in the direction to which his clause pointed, why did he not propose, he should like to know, that all boys should be examined before they were admitted to our great public schools? He himself was the advocate of enforcing elementary education in the schools of England from top to bottom; but the subject was one of great importance, requiring serious consideration, and ought not to be dealt with in a chance clause, such as that under discussion. The clause should run, not "all boys educated at the seven schools;" but all boys "admitted" to the seven schools.

Colonel SYKES maintained that the principle advocated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne was a sound one. The object of the clause was to see that the endowed schools did their duty in elementary knowledge. The fault was not in the pupils or the parents, but in the system. According to the rules at Harrow a pupil might go out with honours in Greek and Latin without knowing the multiplication table.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, the remedy which was now proposed was that the scholars should be examined, not in what the schools professed to teach, but in what every boy should know before he went. To examine them in what any boy should know at a National School might be an extremely good joke against the schools; but he hoped no one would vote for it seriously. The examination should be in those subjects the cultivation of which was the purpose of the schools. But he quite agreed that the examination provided by the clause might be applied as an entrance examination.

Mr. HEYGATE thought the objections which had been urged against the teaching at Eton applied more to a past state of things than to the present.

Mr. NEATE, having a great respect for endowments, protested against the way in which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) proposed to treat them, and expressed himself as not well satisfied with the feeble defence of them which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole).

Mr. LOWE, in reply to the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill), who argued that the Motion might be good as far as it went, but that it should go further, observed that it could go no further, as there was no machinery by which the boys could be examined to better effect than according to the plan he proposed. With regard to the Universities, there were enormous endowments held out to those who learnt there; but with regard to elementary studies nothing was to be got in the way of endowments, and no endowments were held out as rewards for good teaching. Therefore, it was important to bring before the public the amount of deficiency in teaching which might exist in any institution. The hon. Member for Devizes (Mr. D. Griffith) said that his (Mr. Lowe's) tongue was not enough. Now he (Mr. Lowe) quite agreed with him—mother wit was wanted as well as mother tongue. As to the statement that there was no such thing as *mens sana in corpore sano*, probably on that point the hon. Member spoke from his own experience. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole) attributed the evil to the wrong cause, and suggested the wrong remedy. He said that the evil was the fault of the parents. How was it their fault if they paid sufficiently for the education of their children? In that case was it not the fault of those who undertook to give the education and did not give it? Then, again, the right hon. Gentleman said that the remedy was to be sought in the governing bodies. Was that according to the analogy of human affairs? The evil of these endowments was that the persons enjoying them had a duty to perform but no interest in performing it, and it was desirable to create that interest in the Head masters by making known to the parents what was and was not taught. Then the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) said that it was monstrous that these great changes should have been made, and that governing bodies who were not competent to see the desired things done should have been created. Did the right hon. Gentleman suppose that the governing bodies of schools could be inspectors in that sense, and that they should look after the Head masters and stimulate them to teach what ought to be taught? Where were to be found the governing bodies who had ever exercised this great supervision? The right hon. Member for Oxfordshire expressed surprise that he (Mr. Lowe) should have made the present proposal, because he had pointed out that the inspection of schools was nugatory, and yet he now advised, it was said, the introduction of inspection. What he now proposed was not inspection, but examination; and when inspection was found deficient was not the evil remedied by examination? The statements which were made with regard to the defective results of inspection were at the time boldly denied, and by no one more strongly than by the right hon. Gentleman, and yet when they came to be investigated every word of them was verified. It stood *pro confesso* that the things mentioned in his clause were not taught at these schools; but he would not expose the remedy proposed in the clause to the disadvantage of a division in the existing temper of the House.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. AYRTON moved clauses, to be inserted in all statutes under this Act, providing for the admission of day scholars into every school to which the Bill applied. In a vague way the Bill recognized the admission of such scholars; but the provision did not go far enough, it being merely permissive, whereas the object of his clause was to make the admission of day scholars compulsory. The demands of the masters of these schools were enormous—£150 or £200 a year; but there were a great many people in this country who, from their position, might fairly desire to have their sons educated in those schools who could not afford to pay such a sum. There were, for instance, officers in the army and navy, members of the professions, many country gentlemen and clergymen, whose income would not enable them to pay such large demands. Then, there were a great many widows, whose husbands had occupied considerable positions, and who generally resorted to the places were those schools were situated, in order to obtain education for their sons at the low rate of charge. It was incumbent on the Committee to secure that the classes he had described should have the benefit of education for their sons on paying the actual sum required for instruction. The only objection to this was that the richer classes sent their sons there for social considerations, which they regarded as superior to educational considerations. Now, that was a feeling to which they ought not completely to succumb. The spirit of exclusiveness was cultivated by these schools, and the more the false pride and pretension of money was checked the better, by the association of the children of the wealthy with those who, though not so rich, were probably their superiors in mental accomplishments and moral elevation of character. He proposed to limit the application of the clause to children residing with persons who stood to them in the fourth degree of relationship. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would consent to the clause being inserted in the Bill.

Clause (In the statutes to be made under this Act, for every school to which this Act applies, provision shall be made for the education of any boy, as a day scholar, who may be residing within three miles of the school with a parent or relative within the fourth degree of relationship, consanguinity, or affinity, or with his guardian, and who may be proved by a preliminary examination to be in other respects fit to be educated at such school: Provided, That every such boy may be required to pay a reasonable sum for his education not exceeding that paid by borders,)—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

MR. P. WYKEHAM-MARTIN, in supporting the clause, observed that when he was at Eton there were there a certain number of day scholars, the sons of tradesmen, who were received upon an equality with the rest of the scholars.

MR. BARNETT also supported the clause and remarked that he recollected when the head boy of Eton was the son of an Eton tradesman.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, that the boys were all treated alike at the public schools.

MR. WALPOLE objected to the clause, on the ground that it would interfere with the management of the school by permitting the influx of a number of boys far larger than the teaching power of the school was calculated to educate in a proper manner. He added that under a clause of the Bill the object of the hon. and learned Gentleman might be accomplished.

MR. NEATE urged the necessity for some such provision, as the interest of the school would rather be in the direction of boarders, who would be more profitable, than of day scholars.

MR. AYRTON urged that there was no ground for the objection made by the right hon. Gentleman to the clause. He was willing to consent to the introduction of words to guard against any undue increase in the number of the scholars.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE remarked that in the 12th clause power was given to the Governing Bodies to afford facilities for boys other than boarders to attend the schools.

MR. AYRTON said that power was not given to the Commissioners to do what he required, and therefore the clause was necessary.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he thought his hon. and learned Friend would do well to leave the education of the day boys to the Commission.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 40; Noes 96: Majority 56.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Thursday.*

IRELAND — COMPULSORY PRESENTMENTS.—QUESTION.

COLONEL FRENCH, on rising to put a Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer respecting the amount levied off the Irish counties by compulsory presentment under the head of Audit, referred to the circumstances under which Mr. Anthony Blake was appointed to the office of Chief Remembrancer under the Act of Parliament passed in 1833. In his opinion compulsory presentments had been levied off the Irish counties in a very unconstitutional manner. For works on the Shannon, which had not effected the objects for which they had been undertaken, as much as £300,000 had been so levied. He hoped his right hon. Friend would state how much had been levied for audit expenses. He would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, For how many years the sum of £500 a year, part of the amount levied off the Irish counties by compulsory presentment under the head of Audit, has been placed to the credit of the Consolidated Fund; and, whether it is intended to appropriate the accumulated sum towards developing the resources of Ireland?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that in answer to the first Question of the right hon. Gentleman he had to say that the money referred to had been paid into the Consolidated Fund since the Act passed authorizing such payment, which was in 1843. There was an Act passed in the first year of the present reign to provide for the audit of accounts in Ireland, and a fee of not exceeding 5*s.* per hundred was to be paid to constitute a fee fund. The Lord Lieutenant could charge on that fund any expenses necessary for carrying out the Act; and it was provided that the expense of auditing the Treasurer's accounts should be borne by the counties. In 1843 an Act was passed having relation to the offices of Chief and Second Remembrancers in Ireland; and since the passing of that Act the duties formerly discharged by one of the Remembrancers in regard to auditing the accounts, for the audit of which the fees were levied, had been performed by one of the Masters in Chancery, who was paid out of the Consolidated Fund. It seemed not unreasonable, therefore, that the respective counties should in respect of the audit, contribute to the Consolidated Fund a sum equal to that which they formerly paid to the Remembrancer. He was not aware that there was any accumulation from those fees. If his right hon. Friend could show that there was, he would have the matter inquired into. He could, however, assure his right hon. Friend that the Consolidated Fund was a considerable loser by the offices of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, as the fees received from them did not amount to the sum which had to be provided for those offices.

MR. SYNAN said, he did not think the explanation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer satisfactory. The Master in Chancery who audited the accounts referred to only received the same salary as the other Masters of the same Court.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee).

(1.) £67,380, to complete the sum for the British Museum.

MR. LOWE: The grant to the British Museum last year was £95,446, and the sum for which I am to ask this year is £99,380, showing an increase of £3,934. That increase is accounted for mainly by grants for different special purposes. For instance, £1,000 extra have been granted for the purchase of Mr. Hay's very curious and interesting collection of Egyptian antiquities; £1,300 for the purchase of a bronze head of Hypnos, with an owl's wing on one side of the head, and other bronzes of great value; £1,000 for researches in Asia Minor, conducted by Mr. Dennis, mainly into the tombs of the Lydian kings at Sardis; and £1,000 to the gentleman who was sent with the Abyssinian Expedition. These sums together nearly cover the increase upon the former Estimate; and, as the year has been very uneventful, it is not necessary for me to detain the Committee with further observations. I ought, however, to mention the munificent bequest which has been made to the Museum by Mr. Slade of a very curious collection of glass worth £8,000, and prints worth £1,600. The gentleman whom we despatched to Abyssinia upon a scientific mission with the expeditionary force seems have acquitted himself of the task with great energy and considerable success. He obtained a large quantity of Ethiopic manuscripts, which we have not yet had an opportunity of inspecting, but which may, perhaps, contain something of interest and value, remembering that in 1820 the remarkable Book of Jasher was recovered from Abyssinia. Mr. Holmes, it seems, contrived to get into Magdala within ten minutes after the troops entered; he found the dead body of Theodore, and made a sketch of him as he lay, which competent judges have pronounced to a most faithful and admirable likeness. He also secured from a private soldier, for the very moderate sum of £4, the crown of the Abuna, and also a chalice and some other articles. I am sorry to add that, though these were obtained for the modest amount which I have stated, we are now offered by the Government the option of purchasing our own collection for the sum of £2,000. These were the only items which it was necessary for him to mention in connection with the Vote. There is only one subject more; but it is one which ought always to be mentioned on these occasions, and that is the question of room. There is no complaint against the Government on this account. They have taken all the necessary information, and I trust that before long we shall have a comprehensive scheme, which is so much needed for the proper display of the objects in the Museum. The fact is we are proceeding in a most absurd manner. We are spending large sums in obtaining a valuable collection, a great part of which is useless and packed away, because this House has not made due provision for the treasures it has so liberally acquired. This is a state of things which is an opprobrium to the national liberality and taste. We have a collection that would make the fortune of twenty ordinary museums, yet they are lost to view as if they did not exist, and they are undergoing a process of injury and dilapidation. He hoped that something would soon be done to remove this opprobrium on the public taste and sense. The right hon. Gentlemen concluded by moving the Vote.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK congratulated the Trustees on the success of their efforts in obtaining works of art; but could not congratulate the Museum upon its success in a popular point of view. Notwithstanding the sums that had been spent on it, the people did not go to it as they were expected to do, and the number of visitors fell off every year. Even the readers frequenting the Reading Room showed a diminution of more than 30,000 in the last six years. There was far too much of some things, and too little of other things. People got tired of seeing so many cats, dogs, monkeys and birds—in fact it wanted weeding. Many of the gems and articles of value the right hon. Gentleman admitted were put away in cellars. Even celebrated antiquities did not please everyone. A person he knew said of one room that it was "full of big stones, and men without heads, and he did not see much merit in them." He told his friend he was not perhaps a judge of Fine Art; but being himself in the room devoted to antiquities the other day not a single person was to be seen. The public wanted greater variety, and the tastes of all should be considered and not that of only one part of the community. At present he could not regard the British Museum as a success, or as a proof of good management.

COLONEL NORTH said, that as it appeared that some of the greatest curiosities that would give the Museum greater novelty were "going to the bad" for want of more space, he wondered why the worthy Alderman did not propose a large sum for a proper building.

VISCOUNT AMBERLEY agreed in thinking that the present managemement of the Museum was not satisfactory; but the fault was not with the Trustees. One great drawback to the library was the want of a printed catalogue. If a catalogue were published every three or four years the sale would be to a considerable extent remunerative, and it would greatly add to the usefulness of the Museum.

MR. M. CHAMBERS said, that a few years ago property might have been purchased adjacent to the Museum on very reasonable terms. He believed that it would be an economical thing even now if an estimate were made for the purchase of the property in Montague Street, and if negociations were forthwith entered into to buy the property. Such a step would, of course, invoke the question of the separation of articles of vertu from the collection of natural history. Ought it not to be the duty of some one to ascertain what articles were now stowed away and perhaps going to ruin for want of proper accomodation in the Museum? He believed the time had arrived when there ought to be a proper depositary for the invaluable treasures of every description collected in the British Museum.

Vote *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

(2.) £1,024,653, Customs Department.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK commended the economical administration of this Department, and said it was an example which he thought might be advantageously imitated in the Admiralty and other Departments; but he ought to have remembered the Customs existed for the collection of money and the other offices seemingly only for the purpose of spending it.

Vote *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

(3.) £1,574,210, Inland Revenue Department.

Vote *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—POST OFFICE, &C.

(4.) £2,369,235, Post Office, &c.

VISCOUNT MILTON called attention to the absence of any direct communication between this country and British Columbia.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the matter could be more conveniently entered into if the noble Lord would give Notice of a Question upon it.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK remarked upon the insufficient redress given with respect to lost letters, and gave an instance which recently came under his own notice. He was not quite sure that the Post Office was so well-managed as it was stated to be, and complained that the authorities were rather harshly prosecuting a company for delivering circulars at a fourth of the cost which they charged.

MR. M. CHAMBERS expressed an opinion that much improvement might be made in the postal service by the adoption of a system of country sorting offices, to which letters might be sent direct, instead of, as in many cases, being first sent to London, whereby much time was lost. Some years ago he drew the attention of the Post Office to this subject. He found that if a letter intended to be sent to Chatham were put in the Post Office at Woolwich at seven o'clock, it was sent up to London, and passed by Woolwich again at twelve o'clock the next day, and was not delivered at Chatham till about two o'clock in the day. He admitted that the great commercial communities were well served; but he thought greater advantages might be conferred on the rural districts.

MR. M'LAREN called attention to the expediency of carrying printed matters cheaply by the Post Office. The Post Office, having a monopoly, was able to drive private carriers out of the market. But when the private carriers were allowed to deliver circulars, they could carry with profit to themselves for a farthing what the Post Office charged a penny for carrying. Agencies were established in Liverpool, London, Edinburgh, and other towns for the delivery of circulars; but the Post Office took legal means of establishing its monopoly, and put down the private trade. The Post Office now proposed that they should be allowed to do all the telegraph business of the country, on the ground that they could do the work much more cheaply than the telegraphic companies. If that was true, why could not the Post Office carry circulars for double the charge that would be asked by private carriers? He thought the Post Office ought to carry any printed matter not exceeding one ounce for a halfpenny. If that price were charged a very large number of circulars would be sent through the Post Office. There was a special reason why circulars should be carried by the Post Office cheaply at this time. Millions of circulars were sent out at election time, and it had been calculated that if a candidate for a large town, such as Liverpool, Glasgow, or Manchester, were to send four circulars to each elector by the penny post it would cost him

£1,000. He (Mr. M'Laren) did not know whether the rules of the House would allow him to move, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Post Office should carry printed matter, not exceeding one ounce in weight, for a halfpenny." No Act of Parliament was necessary to effect the alteration. An Order from the Treasury to-morrow would be as effectual as any Act of Parliament. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary to the Treasury would take this matter into their serious consideration, and give an assurance that the reform he suggested should be carried into effect without delay.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, that with reference to the matter so ably advocated by his hon. Friend, he could not help suggesting to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it would be very proper to carry *bonâ fide* election circulars through the Post Office free. If that were done it might come to pass that candidates would address their constituents much more by circulars than by speeches. Election expenses were increased much more than hon. Gentlemen were aware by the charges for the delivery of election circulars.

COLONEL FRENCH said, that hon. Gentlemen seemed to forget that the Post Office contributed to the revenue of the country. In his opinion no person had reason to complain of 1*d.* being charged for any quantity of printed matter not exceeding four ounces. The efficiency and economy of the Post Office had been recognized in every country. As to the complaint of want of accommodation in the rural districts, he could say that as far as his experience went it was not well founded.

MR. WYLD called the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a prosecution which was being carried on against the Circular Delivery Company. That Company charged only one farthing for a circular for which the Post Office charged 1*d.* Now, a most important question was involved in this prosecution; because if the Government could prosecute the Company they could also prosecute any private person who delivered his own circulars. If it were true that the country derived a revenue from the Post Office, it should not be forgotten that the Post Office was established for the benefit of the country.

MR. RAMSAY said, that the object of the Post Office was to bring the different parts of the country within reach of each other. He could assure the hon. and gallant Member below him (Colonel French) that his experience as to the accommodation given to the rural districts was very different. He knew parts of Scotland where the post from London could not be reckoned to reach in less than a month, and where a letter from New York would arrive as soon as one from London. He had himself conveyed Her Majesty's Mails for the last fifty years for nothing in some of the remote districts of Scotland.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he was not able to answer the question of the hon. Member (Mr. Wyld) about the prosecution, as he had not received Notice that it would be put; but if the hon. Member would repeat it he would be happy to let him know how the matter stood at another time. With respect to the Circular Delivery Agency, he understood that some of those agencies professed to deliver circulars; but it was found that a great many of the circulars which it was alleged were delivered were thrown into rivers and ponds and out-of-the-way place, and that some of them were put into pillar-boxes without being paid for, in order that they might be delivered by the Post Office. He was not sure, therefore, that those agencies really carried out what they professed to do. He had been several times in communication with the Post Office to see whether printed matter weighing less than four ounces could not be carried cheaper than 1*d.* The question was still under consideration, and he hoped that they should arrive at a satisfactory solution of it.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE complained that the postal communication with the Continent of Europe was very defective, and that no progress had been made in the delivery of letters. They were told in the *Post Office Directory* that there were two mails a day made up for France, Belgium, Holland, Hamburgh, Bremen, Prussia, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Denmark; and therefore one might imagine that, as two mails left England for those places, there were two deliveries; but that was not the case. It was true that two mails were daily sent to Italy, but there was only one delivery; because when the letters posted in London in the evening reached Paris in the morning they they remained there all day until evening, when the French mail left Paris for Italy.

A letter posted in London at seven o'clock in the evening reached Italy exactly at the same time as a letter posted at Liverpool. He thought the time was come for all the nations of Europe arriving at an understanding not only upon the question of postal intercommunication between the various countries, but also upon the matter of establishing some uniform system and rate of postage. The subject was one well worthy of investigation and consideration by the Post Office authorities in England. It was of the utmost importance that the great bulk of the correspondence of this country should not be delayed at Paris, as was the custom at present. Nobody could guarantee when a letter posted at London would reach Berlin, Madrid, or other distant places, as no information on this point was given in the *Postal Guide.* This clearly demanded a remedy. He considered that if the subject were properly discussed an uniform rate of postage might be procured.

Vote *agreed to.*

POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE.

(5.) £789,349, to complete the sum for Post Office Packet Service.

MR. CRAWFORD called attention to the recent increase of postage on letters addressed to the East Indies and Ceylon, and the exemptions allowed in certain privileged cases. The subject was considered two years ago by a Select Committee of the House, and recommendations were made which resulted in increased facilities being afforded and in many additional services being established. A recent arrangement with the Peninsular and Oriental Company had given the public the advantage of communicating once a week with Bombay, instead of forty-eight times a year as formerly; but this increase from forty-eight to fifty-two posts in the year, or about 8½ per cent, had been followed by an increase in the rate of postage from 10*d.* to 1*s.* 1*d.* for letters going by way of Marseilles, and from 6*d.* to 9*d.* for letters going by Southampton. In other words, the Government were making those who used the Post Office pay the extra expense of increased service instead of trying what was to be made out of the cultivation of new and improved communication with India. Great objections had been taken to the course pursued by the Treasury, not only here but in India; and various Chambers of Commerce and other bodies interested had petitioned on the subject, although, so far as he was aware, no answer had been returned to these representations. The present postage system was full of anomalies—for instance, a letter not exceeding half-an-ounce, *viâ* Marseilles, was charged 1*s.* 1*d.*, and to China 1*s.* 4*d.*, whereas the same letter could be sent the much greater distance of Australia for 10*d.* He could not understand why this should be so. Again, a large mercantile letter, containing enclosures, say, of two ounces, could be sent to Australia for 3*s.* 4*d.*, the same rate as was charged for India, whereas 4*s.* 4*d.* was charged for Ceylon and 5*s.* 4*d.* for China. And the only ground that he could see for this overcharge was that the Government had given the people of India the privilege of writing and posting their letters fifty-two times in the year, instead of forty-eight times. He objected to these increased burdens being placed upon the shoulders of correspondents. In the case of American and other letters, the postage was being reduced; and he could not understand why a different system should prevail with regard to Indian letters, unless it was because the Indian purse was a convenient one to tax. The subject was one of great importance, and he had received representations from many people in India respecting it. He had hoped that some Member of the Government would have directed their attention to it. If his remarks were to receive no attention, he had perhaps as well sit down at once, though he had hoped that some Member of the Treasury would have paid attention to what he was saying.

MR. DISRAELI: I rise to Order, Sir; I am listening to every word the hon. Member is saying. I have reason to believe that other Gentlemen on this Bench are listening also; and I am therefore quite at a loss to put any interpretation that is intelligible upon the observations of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. CRAWFORD said, that he had observed that the First Lord of the Treasury had been paying attention; but he did not think he would interest himself in these mere departmental details. He would now proceed with his remarks. The Post Office authorities had given notice that, concurrently with the establishment of the weekly mail service to India, the rates would be raised to 1*s.* 1*d.* per ½oz. to the general public, while letters for officers of the army and navy would still be carried at 6*d.* *viâ* Southampton, and 10*d.* *viâ* Marseilles. He could not understand on what principle this privilege was granted, and he knew that to many commercial and professional men postage was as much a burden as it was to officers of the army and navy. The recent increased charges had the effect of inducing people who carried on an extensive correspondence with India to look far more closely than they had previously done to that item of their expenditure; and he could state that a firm in the City had thus been induced to use lighter paper and to adopt other expedients by which their expenses were diminished £5 a week on their inward and the same sum on their outward letters, so that the Post Office would receive from them £500 a year less than there had been received before the change that had recently been effected. He felt convinced that a similar course would be followed by other firms, and that the Treasury in the long run, instead of benefiting, would suffer by the increased rate of postage, which could be justified neither by expediency nor fairness. Referring to a recently issued Return, in which the net produce of the mails between the United Kingdom and India, &c., was estimated by deductions of the amounts paid to the French Government and to the colonies, and of £25,000, or 1*d.* out of the 13*d.*, for inland conveyance, he said that if the latter deduction were made, it would be equally fair to charge the Military Estimates with the sum saved to British soldiers and sailors. Commenting upon some discrepancies in Returns, he traced them to the natural tendency on the part of those who framed the Estimates to make the burden on the taxpayers in this country for Indian postage appear as large as possible. He had no intention of moving an Amendment, and he apologized to the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Sclater-Booth) for having noticed his departure from the House when his absence was only temporary.

MR. HORSFALL said, the principle had been frequently laid down in that House that mail packet contracts ought to be thrown open to public competition. But he had heard it stated that that rule had not been followed in the case of the contract for the West India mail service, and he should be glad to receive some explanation upon that subject.

MR. T. BARING said, he wished to bring under the notice of the House and of the Government a complaint made by the inhabitants of Penang. For a period of twenty-two years the people of that colony had enjoyed direct postal communication with England; but they had been deprived of that advantage by the contract recently entered into with the Peninsular and Oriental Company. He had put a question on the subject, and had received a reply which left the impression that the Post Office would re-open negotiations with the Company, in order to remedy the grievance; and a communication was sent to the Secretary of the Company, setting forth the complaints that had been made since their steamers ceased calling at Penang. The Company offered to resume the old system provided their subsidy was increased by £5,000 a year. That offer was followed last month by a letter from the Post Office, stating that the Lords of the Treasury would not assent to such an arrangement. He believed that hitherto no case had occurred when after postal communication had been accorded to a colony it had been stopped without any compensation or equivalent being given to the colony. In regard to this particular colony it could be shown that at the time when the privilege was granted it was poor and unprotected, and yet in the course of twenty-two years it had increased enormously, and was still making rapid advances. This was obvious from the fact that one year's tonnage at Penang now was equal to the tonnage in the ten years preceding the establishment of postal communication. It was, however, now arranged that the mails should be taken from Singapore to Penang and back again to Singapore. But as the outward bound steamer touched at Singapore only three days before the homeward steamer from China touched there it would follow that the merchants at Penang would not be able to answer their letters for a fortnight. It could hardly be denied that this was a substantial grievance. And what was the reason for making the new arrangements? He was told that the only offer for carrying the mails to the East had proceeded from the Peninsular and Oriental Company; but, on the other hand, it should be borne in mind that Her Majesty's Government was the only body which could thus employ the Company, and that consequently the Government was perfectly able to insist that the Company's vessels should touch at Penang as before. Indeed, the contract contained a clause under which the Government could force on the Company the resumption of its former duties as regards Penang, subject to such compensation as might be awarded by an arbitrator. The Company, however, had offered to perform the service for £5,000 extra, and therefore the cost to the country would be but slight when it was considered that the postage between Penang and this country produced between £2,000 and £3,000. He confessed himself unable to say very confidently whether the new system would expedite the transmission of correspondence between China and this country; but at all events the calling at Penang would only occupy fifteen hours longer. The Government was bound to consider whether it could not restore direct postal communication with Penang or make some arrangements which would give satisfaction to the colony. The conduct of the Post Office had been truly ridiculous. He was not an advocate for an extravagant expenditure; but a stingy saving, which was not economy, had been effected, and it might result in starving one of our distant possessions without nourishing the Empire. Indeed, it would tend to deprive us of those collateral sources of wealth which established the prosperity of the country, and which were obtained by a liberal treatment of our dependencies. The question in reality was, whether the Post Office Department should lose between £2,000 and £3,000 per annum, or whether, on the other hand, the settlement of Penang should be wholly deprived of the facility and advantage of a prompt communication with this country.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER pointed out that under the old arrangement the steamers of the Peninsular and Oriental Company touched at Malta; but under the new arrangements they had ceased to do so. At present our communications with that important dependency were made under most unsatisfactory circumstances—Italian steamers being employed to convey the mails to Sicily and thence to Malta. The communication between Sicily and Malta was only once a week, and the consequence was that there was unnecessary delay in the transmission of letters between Malta and this country. This was a great injustice to a dependency which had vastly increased in importance since the cession of the Ionian Islands. Malta was a great port and also a strong fortress, besides which it had the capabilities for becoming a dock for the whole of the Mediterranean. And yet, while knowing full well how important a place it was, the Government had totally neglected the means of communication between this country and Malta, but had allowed the mail service to be performed by foreign steamers. The present service was dilatory, uncertain, and altogether unsatisfactory. If the Government did not take this matter up, he hoped the House would do so, in justice not only to Malta, but to this country also.

MR. CANDLISH said, he had been informed that the Government had not only not invited tenders for an intermediate monthly mail to the Cape of Good Hope, but had disregarded an uninvited tender, though it was lower than the contract made with the Peninsular and Oriental Company. In substance, that contract had been entered into last year; but it was not yet laid on the table of the House. If he had not been correctly informed, the fault was with the Department in not having furnished before now a correspondence which had been ordered for the use of Members. If contracts were laid on the table only a few days before the termination of the Session, the rule of producing them, that they might be approved or objected to within a month, was not kept in spirit.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK observed that in the matter of postal contracts the public should be considered as well as merchants and owners of steam-packets. The Government were bound to view such questions in an economical light—not forgetting the taxpayers—and to see that the total sum received for postage, if it did not equal, should at least bear a considerable proportion to the amount paid for the contract. In many cases the subsidies were too large, and he thought better bargains might be made.

MR. WYLD suggested that the experiment of having the packets call at Falmouth should be tried, as that of having them call at Plymouth had not been considered successful.

MR. HORSMAN said, he had received several communications from merchants and others on the subject brought under the notice of the Committee by the hon. Member for Huntingdon (Mr. T. Baring), and he had accompanied that hon. Gentleman as one of a deputation on the subject to the Postmaster General. By a Resolution passed in 1860, all contracts extending over a period of years for the conveyance of mails by sea were required to be laid on the table of the House for a month, and the sanction of the House was necessary to give them validity. When this question was first started by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) the present Chancellor of the Exchequer said that, in consequence of the view which seemed to be taken by the House, he thought it would be undesirable to conclude the contract till the House should have had a further opportunity of expressing an opinion on the subject. Now, he took it that the rule respecting the laying of those contracts on the table had reference to a regular Session; but when Parliament held what he might call the Abyssinian Session last November, the Chancellor of the Exchequer laid this particular contract before the House on the 27th of that month, and proposed a Resolution giving it the approval of the House on the 29th. In a House of sixty-eight that Resolution was carried by 55 to 13. He thought that, under all the circumstances, that might be considered as snapping a division in favour of the contract. This case was one without precedent. Twenty-five years ago a postal communication was given to Penang. Since that time Penang had gone on improving. It had an increasing revenue, and that being so, there was no precedent for taking away from it postal advantages which it had been enjoying for a quarter of a century. The intention of Parliament had plainly been set aside, inasmuch as no opportunity had been afforded them of seeing the contract that was laid upon the table, while at the same time their representatives in this country were precluded from expressing their opinions as to its merits. It had always been the practice—a practice invariably adopted by Sir Rowland Hill—not to withdraw postal communications which had been once established, on the ground that the districts so convenienced failed to make a profitable return to the revenue, because it was found that, though a loss might be incurred for a few years, the very nature of such communication was to produce and create a development of correspondence, and so ultimately to make an ample return. As there was no precedent for withdrawing this communication from Penang, it only required, he felt sure, that the facts should be stated in order to obtain the alteration which was so much desired.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he would endeavour, as far as he could, to answer the observations made by hon. Members, though the Committee would, he trusted, extend some indulgence to him, as much of what had been referred to related to his predecessors in Office. In answer to the observations of the hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Crawford) with reference to the increased charge levied upon letters sent to India, he would remind the Committee that the new contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Company had entailed an additional expense of £300,000 a year upon the country. When he was asked if the new contract was a paying one, he could only say that, while the old contract was conducted at a loss of £82,000 a year, the new contract, even if the new rates returned what was anticipated, would involve a loss of £195,000 a year. He was far from denying that these matters ought to be regulated by considerations apart from a mere question of profit or loss to the revenue. The subject, however, had received a very fair share of attention in the short Session held before Christmas. The increased charge, as far as their present experience had gone, had fully answered their anticipations. At the time that increase was made it was contemplated that the result would be an increase of £37,000 a year to the revenue; but their experience hitherto had shown that something like an increase of £40,000 would be realized by a charge which, if heavier than that formerly imposed, was to a great extent justified by the increase of postal facilities. He admitted that it was an experiment, and that circumstances might occur which would render a change necessary; but, considering the enormous increase which they had to pay for the contract, he thought that it was but right that they should endeavour partly, at all events, to re-coup themselves by the imposition of an extra charge on those availing themselves of postal communication between England and India. The hon. Gentleman also complained of the reduction which was made in favour of the officers of the army and of the soldiers in India. He (Mr. Sclater-Booth) was not sure that the reduction in favour of the officers was altogether justifiable; but it should be remembered that those officers were stationed in India from no inclination of their own, but simply for the purpose of performing certain duties to their country, and the indulgence to them in this respect was something analogous to that which was made in their favour when travelling. The rates charged in the case of soldiers had always been lower than those exacted from the public, and he scarcely thought that any alteration in that respect would be desired. The reduction had only been granted to officers of the army within a recent period, and might, perhaps, have arisen, to some extent, from the fact that a reduced rate had long been used in the case of officers of the navy and sailors. If that were so, it only showed how dangerous it was to establish a precedent, and how difficult it was to adhere to the strict path of rectitude after having once departed from it. The hon. Gentleman next complained as to the difference of charge between letters and parcels sent to India and those sent to Australia. He (Mr. Sclater-Booth) was not sufficiently informed on the point to account for the discrepancy alluded to by the hon. Gentleman; but he would cause inquiries to be made into the matter, although it might arise from the greater frequency of the communications in the one case than in the other. He could not, however, help thinking that the hon. Gentleman employed rather a suicidal argument when he said that in consequence of the increased charges those who sent to India so compressed their parcels and reduced the weight of the paper they used that they were enabled to send what they required at a less cost than formerly. He congratulated the hon. Gentleman on the facility with which he and his friends had overcome the difficulties placed in their way; but the hon. Gentleman and his friends could scarcely expect that the old rates would be recurred to unless he could guarantee that the paper formerly used should be again employed and the present compression be discontinued. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Liverpool (Mr. Horsfall) had complained that the West India mail contract had not been thrown open to public competition. He had on several occasions, in answer to questions which had been put to him, stated that the old contract was renewed in consequence of the injury caused to the West India mail steamers by the hurricanes of last autumn. That Company had represented to the Government that an extension of the term, of which two years then remained unexpired, would enable them to raise fresh capital, re-construct their fleet, and carry on their affairs as before; and under the circumstances the Chancellor of the Exchequer, after a great deal of correspondence had passed on the subject, and after taking the advice of the Postmaster General and his very able staff, did not regard the proposal as unreasonable or improper. He was sorry that on a recent occasion he had been unable to give his hon. Friend (Mr. T. Baring) a more satisfactory answer with regard to the postal communication with Penang. It was true that Penang was shut out by the terms of the new contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Company from the advantage of the postal communication which it had hitherto enjoyed. But the objection taken to stopping at Penang was a very serious one—that it interfered to a certain extent with the direct communication with China and Japan, and that, if continued, would result in a delay of twenty-four hours. The postages received on account of Penang would not amount to one-half of the cost, but no doubt some arrangement might be come to between the authorities at Penang and Singapore, whereby some of the extra cost might be borne by them. The wants of these colonies had not been lost sight of by the Government, and it was hoped that some means might be adopted whereby the wants of those colonies might be complied with. With regard to the Malta mail, he said that one might suppose, from the observations of the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir George Bowyer), that Malta, as well as Japan, was cut off from all communication with England. That, however, was not the case, for the Malta mail from Southampton, though not so speedy as could be wished, called at Malta every week, and there was a communication by overland mail *viâ* Marseilles. There were two mails in addition every week, one through Italy and the other from Marseilles by French steamers. Greater regularity might shortly be expected in the arrival and despatch of those mails. He was sorry that the contract and correspondence with reference to the Cape mails laid on the table had not been earlier in the hands of hon. Members, in which case the objection of the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Candlish) would have been satisfactorily met. It would be found advantageous both to the Government and the colony.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER was perfectly aware that there was communication with Malta, but he complained that the communication was excedingly dilatory and uncertain; and a considerable improvement would be effected on the present system if the Government would run a steamer between Malta and Sicily.

Mr. HORSMAN admitted that the hon. Gentleman had given an explanation with respect to Penang with great fairness, but there was no precedent either at home or abroad of postal communication being withdrawn from any community to which it had once been granted; and the Resolution of the House providing that the postal contract should be laid on the table for a certain period had practically not been carried into effect by the course which was adopted.

Mr. T. BARING urged the claims of Penang to improved postal communication.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN called attention to the inconvenience which arose in respect to answering letters arriving from Australia by the present arrangement for the arrival and departure of the mail steamers, the letters from Australia reaching this country after the mails had left. He had moved for a copy of the memorials from bankers and others presented to the Postmaster General on this subject on the 31st of March last; but the answer given was that the matter was still under consideration. What was wanted was a fortnightly mail to Australia.

MR. O'BEIRNE asked if the Cape mail contract is to be entered into before hon. Members had an opportunity of seeing what that contract is?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that the contract had been laid on the table, and would, he hoped, be in the hands of Members to-morrow. The question of a fortnightly mail to Australia was still under the consideration of the Postmaster General. No doubt there was inconvenience, in consequence of only four days being allowed to answer letters to Australia, but it was very difficult to arrange the mails so as to suit all places; but, in the course of another year, perhaps some more convenient arrangement might be devised. The expense of a fortnightly mail to Australia would be very great, and it was by no means clear that all the Australian colonies were of one mind on the subject.

MR. CRAWFORD complained that while the postage of newspapers to Australia was only 1*d*, it was 2*d*. to India.

MR. CHILDERS observed that the difficulty was to meet the requirements at both ends, consistently with the arrangements for India and China. If another week were allowed for answering letters in this country, the result would be that the letters would arrive at Sydney two days after the homeward mail had left. On the existing basis, he believed that the present time-table was the best that could be devised. He hoped hon. Members would suspend their opinion till the correspondence was in their hands.

In reply to Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE,

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH stated that there were two Italian mails from this country to Paris, but only one from Paris to Italy. The Post Office, however, had no power to remedy that inconvenience.

Vote *agreed to.*

House resumed.

Resolutions to be reported upon *Thursday;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

TRADES SOCIETIES AND COMBINATIONS OF WORKMEN BILL.

On Motion of Sir THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON, Bill to repeal and amend the Laws relating to Trade Societies and the Combinations of Workmen, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON and Mr. RICHARD YOUNG.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 219.]

NEW ZEALAND ASSEMBLY'S POWERS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ADDERLEY, Bill to declare the powers of the General Assembly of New Zealand to abolish any Province in that Colony, or to withdraw from any such Province any part of the Territory thereof, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ADDERLEY and Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 216.]

VACCINATION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of The Earl of MAYO, Bill to amend the Act of the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh years of Victoria, chapter fifty-two, intituled "An Act to Further Extend and make Compulsory the practice of Vaccination in Ireland," *ordered* to be brought in by The Earl of MAYO and Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 217.]

TITHE COMMUTATION, &C. ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, Bill to alter certain provisions in the Acts for the Commutation of Tithes, the Copyhold Acts, and the Acts for the Inclosure, Exchange, and Improvement of Land, and to make provision towards defraying the expense of the Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Office, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH and Mr. Secretary GATHORNE HARDY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 218.]

House adjourned at half after
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 8, 1868.

MINUTES.] — NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* Clitheroe, *v.* Richard Fort, esquire, deceased.

SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report*—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons) [No. 409].

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered*—Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation*; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment*; Tain Provisional Order Confirmation*

First Reading — Liquidation* [220]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* [222]; Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* [223]; Tain Provisional Order Confirmation* [224]; Army Chaplains* [225].

Committee—Mines Assessment (*re-comm.*) [127]; Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies* [201]; Promissory Oaths [113]; Government of India Act Amendment [91]—R.P.

Report—Mines Assessment (*re-comm.*) [127-221]; Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies* [201]; Promissory Oaths [113].

Considered as amended — Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit* [184].

Third Reading — Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland)* [150]; Court of Justiciary (Scotland)* [174], and *passed*.

Withdrawn—Water Supply* [131]; Adulteration of Food or Drink Act Amendment* [161]; Ejectments Suspension (Ireland)* [100].

IRELAND—RAILWAYS.—QUESTION.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, What, up to the present time, has been the cost of the Irish Railway Commission; when the Return, ordered on the 24th of June last, of the details of the expenditure of that Commission will be laid upon the Table of the House; and, whether the labours of that Commission are now closed, or whether there is any foundation for the statement that has been made in the Public Press, that the Commissioners have been asked by the Government for a Supplemental Report with reference to the purchase of Irish Railways?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that, up to the present time, the cost of the Irish Railway Commission had been a little over £22,000. It could hardly be said that the labours of the Commissioners had been finally closed, because the Commissioners in their Report stated that if there was any other question on which they could afford assistance to the Government they would be happy to do so. With regard to the latter part of the hon. Baronet's Question, it was substantially true that the Commissioners were making a Supplemental Report, because questions had been put to them on certain matters which would call for such a Report. The Commissioners had not been asked to present a Report as to the desirability of the purchase of Irish Railways by the Government, but they had been asked to make certain estimates with reference to such a purchase which might, no doubt, materially influence the mind of the Government on that subject. The Return alluded to by the hon. Baronet was in the hands of the printer, and he hoped it would be placed on the table this week.

MINES ASSESSMENT (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Mr. Percy Wyndham, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Henderson.*)

[BILL 127.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (All Mines to be rated).

MR. WENTWORTH BEAUMONT, who had given Notice of his intention to move a series of new clauses, proposed the omission of all the words after "sixty-eight" down to the end of that clause, in order to insert the words "the occupier of every mine in England and Wales producing coal, clay, stone, salt, or ore, shall be rated in respect thereof for the relief of the poor."

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM suggested, that as the proposals of the hon. Member were more in the nature of an alternative Bill than of Amendments, it would be most convenient to take the discussion upon them at once as a whole; and then, if the hon. Gentleman succeeded in carrying the first of them on a division, that decision might be accepted as a decision upon them all.

MR. BRUCE said, he wished seriously to call the attention of the Government to the great importance of that measure. Its object, which was generally approved, was the rating of certain property which had hitherto been exempt from rating. But now it also proposed to make serious alterations in the manner of rating coal mines, which were already subject to rates; and he thought a question of that great importance ought not to be embodied in the Bill without due notice to the whole country. It affected not simply the coal owners, who might as a body be in favour of the change, as it would give them a considerable relief; but it likewise affected the interest of all other classes of ratepayers. Therefore, although he certainly did not wish to oppose the further progress of a Bill to which the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Percy Wyndham) had devoted so much time and pains, he thought it would be more acceptable, both to the hon. Member himself and also to the House generally, that they should receive from Her Majesty's Government an assurance that they would take up the whole question as regarded coal mines and other mines in a future Session.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he for one had come to the conclusion that the only way of dealing fairly with the question of rating was to do away with all exemptions. His hon. Friend would, he might add, in his opinion, do well not to press his Bill this Session. The subject was one on which he could not take it upon himself to legislate now; indeed, it belonged to another Department of the Government; but he confessed he should like to see the whole question of exemptions dealt with in one Bill.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he believed that the House was pretty well agreed that mines should be rated; and the only remaining question was, on what principle the rating should be assessed. His own opinion was that all mines should be rated upon the same principle as coal mines; and he thought a simple enactment might be passed declaring that the words "coal mines" in the statute of Elizabeth should be held to include all mines. As to the course which the Government were prepared to take in the matter he could give no definite promise. All he could say was that his Department would give it due consideration during the Recess; and he should be very glad if he were enabled to introduce a measure dealing with it next Session.

MR. HENDERSON said, that there were no two parishes in England in which mines were rated on the same principle.

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, he could not help thinking that the House had all the information on the subject that was necessary to enable it to legislate upon it with advantage. The Bill did not interfere in the least with the principle on which coal mines were rated. It simply proposed to obviate the complaints that mines were rated in the most contradictory manner. The real question before the Committee, he believed, was whether the word "occupier" should be inserted in the clause; and he was opposed to that being done, because it was necessary to retain the provision that the owner might by agreement pay the rate. In Derbyshire alone there were between fifty and sixty mines, the royalty on which did not exceed *5s.*; and if it were made compulsory that the occupier should be rated great inconvenience in that county would be the result.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said he thought the proceedings of the Committee would be facilitated if it were decided that the Bill should have nothing to do with coal mines.

MR. CORRANCE contended that the proposition for a deduction of 33 per cent was one which ought to be thoroughly considered by the House before it was adopted. He did not think it had been so considered, and his hon. Friend would in his opinion act wisely in withdrawing, at all events, that part of the clause.

MR. HIBBERT said, he would suggest that, as there seemed to be so much difficulty with respect to the assessing of coal mines, it would be well that the portion of the Bill relating to it should be withdrawn, to be re-introduced next Session in a better form by the Government. In Lancashire three or four different plans of assessment prevailed, and it would be desirable that one uniform system should be established.

MR. KENDALL said, he wished to point out that mining in Cornwall was at present in a depressed condition, and that if this principle of rating were applied there it would greatly aggravate the distress. The copper mines among others should be very tenderly dealt with.

MR. AYRTON said, he objected to the application of a particular mode of rating to particular descriptions of property. He thought that all property liable to pay poor rates should be rated according to the general system, and that it would be inexpedient to lay down a special principle with regard to the assessment of mines. All that was necessary was a short clause to abolish the exemption from rating which had hitherto existed in favour of certain underground property, by declaring that every description of mines, not liable to be rated to local rates, should in future be liable to such rates. The general law would then take effect. Another question for consideration was whether, if the law under which persons held leases of property at a fixed rent was suddenly changed, it would be right that they should bear the whole burden of a new rate. He suggested that, in rating for the first time property which was never before rated, it would be only a just provision to divide the payment of the new rate between the landlord and lessee. He conceived that the enactment of two such provisions as he had just mentioned was all that was necessary.

Mr. LIDDELL said, he was glad that many difficulties had been cleared away—difficulties which arose chiefly from the variety of absurd conditions under which mining operations were carried on. But that House would make a great mistake if they laid down fixed modes of assessing mines. As a representative of a large coal district, he had always felt that there was very great injustice in the exemption of other forms of mining from the payment of rates, and he was prepared to accept the principle that all mines should be liable to be rated. He believed that the effect of rating mines would in many cases be to shut them ; but the question was whether it would not be charitable to do so, because at present they were being worked at a loss. The coal trade of the North had agreed that if the deduction of 33⅓ per cent in their favour suggested by the Valuation Committee of last year were allowed they would consent to be placed in the same category as all other mines.

Mr. READ said, he regretted that the question of rating woods and plantations had not been dealt with in the Bill.

Mr. BRUCE protested against this wholesale system of rating mines, the country having received no sufficient notice that such a measure was to be brought forward. The subject was much too important to be handled by a private Member. In his opinion the Government ought to take the matter into their own hands. He would recommend that the assessment of coal mines should be dealt with by a special Bill, to be introduced by the Government next Session.

Colonel GRAY moved that the Chairman report Progress, as the discussion appeared unlikely to lead to any result.

Lord HENRY CAVENDISH said, he would vote for no measure that would transfer the rate from the owner to the occupier.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM said, that everyone who had spoken appeared to be in favour of the principle of the Bill, but as he did not wish that at that period of the Session some measure on the subject should be delayed in passing through the House, he suggested that hon. Members having Amendments to propose should not press them, but allow the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) to move his Amendment, in favour of which he should give his vote, or he might run the chance of losing the Bill altogether.

Mr. WENTWORTH BEAUMONT declined to withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. AYRTON said, that if the Committee agreed to that Amendment he would immediately after propose the one he had already described to the House.

Motion to report Progress *withdrawn.*
Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. AYRTON moved the addition of words to make all mines not now rated liable to be rated. They would be rated by the application of the ordinary law of rating.

Page 1, line 11, Amendment proposed,

After the word "sixty-eight," to add the words "any description of Mines in England and Wales not now liable to be rated to the rates for the relief of the poor and other local rates shall be liable to be rated to such rates."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

Mr. ST. AUBYN opposed the Amendment. He was very much afraid that profits would be rated.

Mr. KENDALL also opposed the Amendment. Although he was quite willing that mines should be rated, those in Cornwall were in an exceptional condition.

Mr. LIDDELL said, he could not understand the peculiar exceptional character of the Cornish mines. If they were exhausted or nearly so, the Assessment Committee would prove the fact, or it would be their duty to ascertain it.

Mr. AYRTON said, all the mines that would be rated under this clause would be rated upon the principle at present adopted, all the circumstances being considered. The measure of the rate would be the value of the mine—that was to say, what could be got as a reasonable rent for a certain number of years. It would have no reference to profits.

Mr. KENDALL said, he thought the Amendment was fraught with danger.

Mr. WENTWORTH BEAUMONT said, he thought that the occupier should be rated.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the question as to the mode of rating arose more properly upon the succeeding clauses of the Bill.

MR. BRUCE said, that nothing could be more absurd than the notion about mines being rated on profits. In his part of the country the only consideration with the Assessment Committee was the rent that a tenant would give from year to year.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 119, Noes 6: Majority 113.

Clause, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

MR. AYRTON said, that in consequence of the acceptance of his Amendment the other clauses of the Bill were rendered unnecessary or inapplicable. The only question that remained was as to the proportion of the rate to be paid by the landlord. This was a matter of considerable importance, and it would be better to report Progress and bring up a well-considered clause on the Report.

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM stated that the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), in conjunction with himself, would propose a clause on the bringing up of the Report to settle the proportion of the rates to be paid by the landlord and the tenant.

Remaining Clauses *struck out.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Friday,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 221.]

PROMISSORY OATHS BILL—(BILL 113.) [*Lords*]—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, before the House went into Committee upon this Bill he wished to draw attention to the difference between the form of Oath proposed in the present Bill to be taken by high officers of State and the Oath of Allegiance which Parliament, after twelve years' discussion, decided should be taken by Members of that House. By this Bill a very important departure was made from the terms of the Act of 1866. By that Act the Oath was as follows:—

> "I, A. B., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true Allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria; and I do faithfully promise to maintain and support the Succession to the Crown as the same stands limited and settled by virtue of the Act passed in the reign of King William III., intituled 'An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and of the subsequent Acts of Union with Scotland and Ireland.'"

By the 2nd clause of this Bill the Oath of Allegiance runs as follows:—

> "I do swear that I will be faithful and bear true Allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, Her Heirs and Successors, according to Law; So help me GOD."

In 1866 the present Prime Minister proposed that the Oath should run in these terms—

> "I, A. B., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true Allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and will defend Her to the utmost of my Power against all Conspiracies and Attempts that shall be made against Her Power, Crown, or Dignity."

The House would perceive that that Oath was a great deal fuller than the Oath which which was contained in the Bill before the House. But so little satisfactory did that seem that the following words were inserted:—

> "And I do faithfully promise to maintain and support the Succession to the Throne as the same stands limited and settled by an Act passed in the reign of King William III., intituled 'An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and the better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject.'"

The words with regard to the Union with Scotland and Ireland were added in the House of Lords. There was nothing in the circumstances of this Session which ought to induce the House to be less cautious in the matter of the Oaths of Allegiance than it was two years ago. It might be said that the Oaths proposed in this Bill did not contain a recognition of the fact that the Crown of these realms was held by law, and that, therefore, the tenure and power of the Crown formed part of the Constitution, together with the provisions of Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights, which were embodied in the Act of Settlement. He would point, however, to the fact that the words "by law," as they stood in this Bill, might refer to any law at present existing or hereafter to be framed, whereas Parliament distinctly, two years ago, refused to be satisfied with anything less than a direct recital of the Oath of Allegiance, pointing to the Act of Settlement as forming the basis of the Sovereignty of the country. He therefore desired to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he saw any objection to substituting for the Oath proposed in the Bill the Oath of Allegiance which they, as Members of Parliament, were bound to take, whatever might be their position or creed?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the form of Oath proposed by the Bill had been settled by the Commission which had sat for a considerable period to inquire into this subject and by a Committee of the House of Lords which went fully into the question. For himself, he had no objection to take the Oath of Allegiance at the table, but he did not think there was any material alteration from it in the present Bill. Both the Commissioners and the Committee of the House of Lords came to the conclusion that it was necessary to make the form of Oath as concise and clear as possible, pledging those taking it to bear true allegiance to Her Majesty and her successors, but avoiding entering into any historical matters. One objection to the present Oath taken by Members of that House, was that it declared the succession of the Crown to be based upon the Act of William III., which claimed for the Sovereign of this country a right to the Crown of France. The Oath proposed in the Bill was in fact a resignation of that claim. He could not assent to the suggestion of the hon. Member, as he thought that the form of Oath proposed in the Bill was calculated to fulfil the purpose they had in view.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Form of Oath of Allegiance).

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, the recommendations of the Commissioners for which the right hon. Gentleman had expressed such a preference were against the adoption of the words "the succession according to law." In reference to what had also fallen from the right hon. Gentleman he had always believed that any pretension to the Crown of France had long been abandoned. If there was any doubt about the point the Government ought to bring in a Bill formally abandoning any such idea, though if that were done the lingering attachment which still existed in the minds of certain Sovereigns on the Continent, and especially at the Court of Rome, to the House of Stuart should, in an international sense, be equally repudiated. He thought that the Act of Settlement ought to be recited in the Oath taken by Members of that House, and he therefore moved an Amendment to the clause, the effect of which would be to include the recital of the words of that Act.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he would remind the hon. Member that the subject had been fully considered, not only by a Commission but by a Committee of the House of Lords. The present clause was quite as binding for the purposes contemplated by the hon. Member as it would be if the Amendment which he now proposed were made.

Mr. SYNAN contended that in promising to maintain the succession as by law established hon. Members bind themselves to the Act of Settlement, which really was the law upon this subject.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, he wished to direct attention to the fact that the Act of Settlement stood on exactly the same footing as any other Act of Parliament, and was binding upon all her Majesty's subjects until it was repealed. Its validity required no more the recognition of an Oath than did the Statute of Frauds or the Statute of Uses. The old Oath of Allegiance was praised by Lord Hale for not being entangled with intricate clauses, and yet comprehending the whole duty of subject to Sovereign. The proposed Oath was in some measure a return to that Oath.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he objected altogether to Oaths, which he regarded purely as relics of a bygone barbarism. The less a man swears the better. What was the use of this Oath? There was no doubt that Parliament could alter the succession, and was this Oath intended to burden them if they wished to do so? Besides, if a man did not do his duty, no Oath would bind him. He did not see why there should be so many different Oaths. They were so numerous that one could hardly get them by heart. He thought they should amalgamate some of the Oaths in this Bill, though for his own part, thinking Oaths entirely unnecessary, he should be glad to see the Bill got rid of altogether.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he thought that the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Serjeant Gaselee) ought to strongly support this Bill if he had such an aversion to Oaths, because it proposed to repeal a large number of those at present imposed.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he would not have raised this question if he had not been supported by the unanimous opinion of Parliament two years ago. He believed there was an ambiguity in the phrase "according to law," while there was none about the Act of Settlement. Some years ago Mr. Dillon, a Roman Catholic Member of the House, said of that Oath, what they were called upon to do was not merely to submit and to be loyal to the Protestant monarchy of this country, but to swear to maintain an Act of Parliament which was conceived in a spirit most injurious and offensive to the Roman Catholic religion, by the terms of which a Roman Catholic was bound, if at any time the Sovereign of the country were to become Roman Catholic, to take up arms and dethrone him. Now, there was a wide difference between binding them to loyalty to the Sovereign, whatever his creed might be, and binding them by positive Oath to take up arms and dethrone their Sovereign in case he adopted the Roman Catholic creed. Now, the expression "to take up arms" was merely imported into the discussion *per invidiam*, for the Act said nothing about taking up arms, but undoubtedly it did release from their allegiance all the subjects of this realm if the Sovereign should become a Roman Catholic. Either there was a difference between the two Oaths or there was not. If there was a difference, then he preferred the present. If there was no difference, why should they change a clear declaration for an ambiguous one.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 3 to 7, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Form of Oath of Allegiance in this Act substituted for Form in certain other Acts).

Mr. BOUVERIE said, there was a growing disposition in certain clerical quarters to dispute the supremacy of lay authority, and therefore he looked with some jealousy on the proposal in this clause to free the clergy from making the declaration as to the Royal Supremacy which was imposed upon them by the Clerical Subscription Act three years ago. He was a member of the Commission on whose Report this Bill was framed, but he did not remember that this point had come under their consideration. He was also a member of the Commission on Clerical Subscriptions, and the point was brought before them and discussed, but the great majority of the Commissioners were against it. Under these circumstances he should move that the words exempting the clergy from the present declaration be omitted from the clause.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "substituted," in line 34, to the second word "and," in line 36.—(*Mr. Bouverie.*)

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he regretted that no Notice had been given of so important an Amendment. He believed that in the Clerical Subscription Act no new Oath was imposed—there was simply a reference to the old Oath, and it was that old Oath which this Bill proposed to abolish. The clergy, would, he believed, be subject to a sufficient number of declarations with regard to the Supremacy if the clause were carried in its present form.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 79; Noes 51: Majority 28.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with an Amendment, as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

GOVERNMNET OF INDIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 91.]

(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir James Fergusson.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Salaries of future Members of Council).

Lord WILLIAM HAY moved to insert at the beginning the words "From the passing of this Act," to leave out "such," and insert "each." The effect of the Amendment would be that the old Councillors, as well as those newly appointed, should not serve for a longer period than ten years.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE objected, on the ground that the old Councillors were appointed under the Act of 1858, for ten years, at a salary of £1,200 a year, with the prospect of holding their offices for life or receiving a pension on retiring at the end of the ten years. To propose now that they should cease to serve at the end of their ten years and receive no pension was unjust, especially as the new Councillors would be appointed at

£1,500, and would accept the increase of salary in place of the prospect of a pension. He admitted the Act of 1858 would permit them to deprive the old Councillors of their pensions, but he contended that to do so would be straining it.

LORD WILLIAM HAY said, he thought it so necessary that some limit should be put to the term for which the old Councillors should serve that he was quite willing to allow them the pension.

MR. HANKEY said, the time had expired for dealing with this matter.

MR. AYRTON said, the time had not expired. The Act under which the present Councillors were appointed expressly stipulated that Parliament should have the power of re-considering the terms on which they accepted office. This being so, he thought it monstrous that anyone should say, "The ten years is nearly up; these men have served with the prospect of a pension during these ten years; and therefore it would be unjust to step in and say, Parliament, on re-consideration, could not grant the pensions." He hoped the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for India would consider the question in a reasonable and intelligent manner. It would be better even to let them serve ten years more at £1,500 than that no limit should be agreed on. He might observe that they were for the most part in the receipt of pensions paid out of the revenues of India, and incidentally he must protest against the double system of pensions now growing up; pensions were obtained for special services in India from the Indian Government in India, and then they were obtained again, on the general ground of length of service, from the Indian Revenue, through the Office in England.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) had forgotten one matter—namely, that the pensions from India were bought, being derived from stoppages from pay. He (Mr. Stuart Mill) quite agreed that an ample salary rendered a retiring pension unnecessary. But there would be a hardship if, when the expectation of pensions had been held out to the existing Councillors, they were deprived of pensions in the end. If an increase of salary were to be given instead, that increase should range over a fresh series of ten years. But the reason which induced the House to limit the service of future Councillors should prevent it from continuing the old for another ten years. He, therefore, recommended the Committee to agree to give the old members an opportunity of serving for another five years at the increased salary, or else to grant them a pension at the end of the ten years.

COLONEL SYKES said, he thought faith ought to be kept with the old Councillors, and that common honesty required it should be optional with them whether they accepted any new terms in place of those under which they took office. He did not see why the salary should be raised to £1,500, because many of the Councillors would soon have a right to a Civil Service pension on account of thirty years' service.

SIR HENRY RAWLINSON said, he thought it morally out of the power of Parliament to withhold the pension, because virtually the full term had expired, and it was in consequence of that expiration the Bill was brought in. If the old Councillors had served only five years, the propriety of granting the pensions might be questioned; but it only wanted some forty days of the ten years.

MR. OTWAY said, the Act would never have passed if it had been supposed that the appointments would have the permanent character now claimed for them. He would, however, support the suggestion of the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill), which seemed to be a fair compromise between the proposition of the noble Lord and that of the Government.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he thought the suggestion of the hon. Member for Westminster could best be dealt with in a new clause. At present he was neither prepared to accept nor to reject the proposition, but desiring fully to consider it, he recommended the withdrawal of the Amendment and the introduction of a new clause, to which he promised to give careful consideration.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he would be happy to bring up a new clause.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. OTWAY said, he rose to move that the salary of the new Councillors should be £1,200, and not £1,500. Some officers of State received no more, and members of the Board of Admiralty received only £1,000. Feeling that there might be an injustice in turning members of the Council adrift without recognition of their services, he thought that a graduated scale of pensions might not be indefensible. But there was a great danger of rushing into extremes in such a matter. He thought it very undesirable that, under pretence of introducing "fresh blood," officials should be elected to the Council immediately upon their return from India, as any misgovernment which might have attended their administration would thereby be condoned. We were bound to consider the revenues of India even more than our own, because the people of India were not represented in that House. He thought it little creditable to the Government that, in a Bill brought forward with such a flourish of trumpets, the principal clause should be to improve the position of the members of the Council, an institution which he regarded as of very questionable utility, as he considered that they had only proved themselves obstructives. No reason had been shown for fixing these salaries at £1,500 each, and he therefore moved that they be reduced to £1,200.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 18, to leave out the word "five," and insert the word "two."—(*Mr. Otway.*)

COLONEL HOGG said, that if it were not proposed to give retiring pensions to men of the class whose services it was sought to enlist, they ought at least to pay them proper salaries. The hon. Gentleman, he thought, would have shown better taste and more discretion had he consulted those having official knowledge of the subject about the labours which members of the Council were actually called on to undertake before submitting his present Amendment. The Councillors were a very hard-working body of men, and were quite entitled to £1,500 a year each.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, that if it was not for the Council the Government of India would be left wholly to the Secretary of State—who before his appointment was generally ignorant of Indian affairs—and to such irresponsible persons as he might choose to consult, who if he had a pre-conceived opinion would be likely to share it. The Secretary of State would be left with no regular assistance but that of the subordinates in his office. Of the latter, having himself been included in the number, he entertained, generally speaking, a very high opinion; but he did not think Parliament and the country would approve of handing over the government of India entirely to them. It was absolutely necessary that there should be associated with them some men of standing, of professional knowledge, and practical acquaintance with India, whose names and character were known to the public. It was also necessary that such salaries should be given them as would induce them to continue in their offices. Although yielding to no one in his desire for economy, he did not think that retrenchment was judicious when it took the form of stinting the remuneration for the best and most difficult work. It was possible they might get very much the same class of men for £1,200 as for £1,500; but, in the absence of a pension, he did not think the latter amount excessive.

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, that the salary of £1,200 hitherto had been accompanied with some expectation of a pension. In proposing, therefore, to fix it at £1,200, without any pension, the hon. Member for Chatham (Mr. Otway) was practically lowering their position. He entirely agreed with the view taken by the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill) and thought the sum proposed by the Bill by no means too great.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, that the proposal in the Bill was not to improve the position of existing members of the Council. The increase of salary applied only to future appointments. The House had decided that in justice Members of the Council should be appointed for a term of years only; and then came the question what was to happen on the expiration of that term. Clearly, it would not be right to lay on the revenues of India an indefinite number of pensions; but if not, they must be prepared to pay the fair market value of those services which they desired to obtain. The persons required were those whose names would carry weight, not only here, but in India; for if we rested merely upon clerks brought up and trained in this country, however valuable their assistance might be, it would fail entirely to command that sort of respect which attached to the recommendation of persons whose names were familiarly known. On the other hand, by introducing into the Council men of different careers, who had served in different parts of India, and who looked upon questions in a totally different light from that in which purely official minds regarded them, very obvious advantages were gained. A discussion arose upon a recent occasion in the Council with regard to the mode in which a certain canal was to be made, and the territories through which it was to pass. As far as the correspondence went, or the information otherwise in possession of the Department, no special question appeared to arise. But when the matter was mentioned at the Council there were circumstances known to one or two of the members which raised a very important political question, that otherwise never would have attracted attention, and threw a flood of light upon the whole matter. It must be remembered, also, that the Secretary of State for India was in a different position from that of any other Secretary of State coming fresh to the business of his Department. The Secretary of State for the Home Department, or the First Lord of the Admiralty, for instance, lived in an official atmosphere in which they must be certain to gain valuable information; they were constantly meeting people also who set them right if they were going wrong. But the Indian Minister had no such chances thrown in his way. The Indian newspapers formed but a very imperfect source of information, while the chance visits to England of distinguished personages could hardly be relied upon as means of obtaining accurate information, seeing that these were not in any way bound to give information, or responsible for such intelligence as they might think proper to give. Hence, there was a real and pressing necessity for the existence of a Council, composed of the best men that could be procured. And, bearing in mind that there was a great demand in mercantile life for the special kind of knowledge which they possessed, the salaries offered by the Government ought not to be of a niggardly character. The proposal embodied in the clause as it stood was a fair one, and he hoped it would be adopted by the Committee.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN thought it would be false economy to reduce the pension of members of Council, as proposed by the hon. Member for Chatham (Mr. Otway).

Question put, "That the word 'five' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 73; Noes 26: Majority 47.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

LAND DRAINAGE PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

On Motion of Sir James Fergusson, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Land Drainage Act, 1861," *ordered* to be brought in by Sir James Fergusson and Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 223.]

SANITARY ACT (1866) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Bill to amend "The Sanitary Act, 1866," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy and Sir James Fergusson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 222.]

TAIN PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

On Motion of The Lord Advocate, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1867," relating to the Burgh of Tain, *ordered* to be brought in by The Lord Advocate and Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 224.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, July 9, 1868.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report*— New Forest Deer Removal, &c. Act, 1851.

Public Bills—*First Reading* — Petit Juries (Ireland)* (231); Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment* (229); Metropolitan Police Funds* (230); Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland)* (233); Court of Justiciary (Scotland)* (232); District Church Tithes Act Amendment* (236).

Second Reading — Bankruptcy Act Amendment (208); Uniformity of Public Worship (173), *negatived;* Entail Amendment (Scotland)* (183); Consular Marriages* (198); Railway Companies* (226); Curragh of Kildare* (195); Land Writs Registration (Scotland)* (213).

Committee—Petroleum Act Amendment* (178); Lee River Conservancy* (140); Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings* (93); Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts (Lanarkshire) Amendment* (202); New Zealand (Legislative Council)* (197); Admiralty Suits* (182); Registration* (218).

Report—Compulsory Church Rates Abolition (211); Petroleum Act Amendment* (178); Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts (Lanarkshire) Amendment* (202); New Zealand (Legislative Council)* (197); Admiralty Suits* (182); Registration* (218).

Third Reading—Fairs* (223); Representation of the People (Ireland)* (176); County Courts Admiralty Jurisdiction* (108); Medway Regulation Act Continuance* (199); Bank of Bombay* (196); County General Assessment (Scotland)* (190); Courts of Law Fees, &c. (Scotland)* (189), and *passed.*

HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

The Earl of MALMESBURY: My Lords, before we proceed to the Business on the Paper, I beg to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, congratulating Her Majesty on the Princess of Wales having given birth to a Princess, and assuring Her Majesty of the deep interest which is felt by the House of Lords in all that concerns the domestic happiness of Her Majesty and her family. I am sure this Address will be cordially adopted by your Lordships, interested as we all are in the domestic happiness of Her Majesty, and grateful as we are to Providence for having preserved the Princess of Wales through this period of trial. I believe, indeed, there is not a person in the country who does not share the same sentiments, for it is impossible that anyone in her high position could have more endeared herself to the nation than Her Royal Highness has done.

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to congratulate Her Majesty on The Princess of Wales having happily given birth to a Princess, and to assure Her Majesty of the deep Interest felt by the House of Lords in all that concerns the domestic Happiness of Her Majesty and Her Family. — (*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

Earl RUSSELL: I have great pleasure in seconding the Motion; and I am sure all Her Majesty's subjects participate in the congratulation and loyalty expressed in the Address which the noble Earl has asked your Lordships to adopt.

Agreed to, *Nemine Dissentiente:* And the said Address Ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

SIR ROBERT NAPIER.

MESSAGE FROM THE QUEEN.

Delivered by The Lord Privy Seal; and read by The Lord Chancellor, as follows:

Victoria R.

Her Majesty, taking into consideration the important Services rendered by Sir Robert Napier, a Lieutenant-General in Her Majesty's Army, and Commander-in-Chief of the Army of Bombay, in the Conduct of the recent Expedition into Abyssinia, and being desirous to confer some signal Mark of Her Favour for these and other distinguished Merits upon the said Sir Robert Napier, recommends it to the House of Lords to concur in enabling Her Majesty to make Provision for securing to the said Sir Robert Napier and the next surviving Heir Male of his Body a Pension of Two thousand Pounds per Annnm.

Ordered, That the said Message be taken into consideration *To-morrow.*

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Lord Cranworth.*)

(NO. 208.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord CRANWORTH, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, explained that it had been introduced into the other House in consequence of the impossibility of passing a comprehensive measure during the present Session, and that its object was to check the abuses attendant upon the power given to three-fourths of a bankrupt's creditors to withdraw the case from the Court of Bankruptcy and distribute his assets. In order to prevent such arrangements being improperly made by pretended or partial creditors, the Bill required a debtor, within a week of the execution of any composition deed, to file a schedule, verified by oath, giving every particular of his assets and liabilities, and it also required creditors to prove their affidavits in the same way as if the matter was before the Court of Bankruptcy.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Cranworth.*)

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that when the Government felt constrained, by the pressure of business, to withdraw the Bankruptcy Bill which they had introduced, and which had made considerable progress in their Lordships' House, one of the causes of his regret was that the public would be deprived of the benefit of the alterations with respect to composition deeds which the Bill provided. He felt much rejoiced, therefore, that the other House of Parliament had taken this branch of the subject into consideration, and that the present measure had been introduced by one of its Members (Mr. Moffatt) in order to obviate the inconveniences arising from the present state of the law. The Bill which was now proposed for second reading in reality embodied the clauses upon the subject which were contained in the Government measure. He thought the passing of this Bill would effect a great improvement in the law; and, although it was a pity that a larger and more comprehensive reform could not be carried out, he thought it would be well to at least go the length here proposed. He could not at first sight understand the petition which had been presented against the Bill by certain traders. No doubt it was natural that those persons should feel some anxiety regarding a Bill which had only been before Parliament two or three weeks; but no apprehension need really be felt, for the clauses embodied in the measure had for a long time been before Parliament and the country. He hoped therefore that their Lordships would read the Bill a second time.

Lord OVERSTONE said, he should be glad to see this measure passed; but he thought some consideration ought to be given to the petition referred to.

Lord WESTBURY said, that he would not oppose the Bill, because he thought that if it were thrown out much disappointment would ensue. At the same time he thought, if it were necessary he could demonstrate that everything proposed to be done by the present Bill might have been done under the Bill of 1861. If the law had been properly understood and properly carried out by the machinery originally provided for the purpose, this Bill would have been wholly unnecessary, and no failure would have occurred. He had no objection to offer to the provisions of a Bill for the purpose of applying in a more effectual manner that remedy which might have been provided, and ought to have been provided by the Bill of 1861.

Lord ROMILLY said, this Bill proposed a very important change in the law, which no one of their Lordships he believed, had had the opportunity of considering for more than half-an-hour. The Bill, in fact, was not delivered at his house until after he had left home that morning. He was informed that it contained exactly the same set of clauses as those contained in the Bill which had been introduced by his noble and learned Friend on the Woolsack, but which had been withdrawn. However this might be, it was a matter of great importance that time should be given for consideration, and he hoped his noble and learned Friend would postpone the Committee for at least a fortnight in order to give their Lordships an opportunity of mastering the details.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a accordingly and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

UNIFORMITY OF PUBLIC WORSHIP BILL—(No. 173.)

(*The Earl of Shaftesbury.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY said: My Lords, it will not be necessary for me to detain your Lordships for more than a very short time on this occasion. The discussion of last year and the Reports of the Commission have very much simplified the question, and, moreover, it is not my intention to ask your Lordships to go further than to give a second reading to the Bill, that its principle may be affirmed; that the Bill may be circulated through the country, and that it may come on for discussion in the next Session of Parliament. A few days ago certain noble Lords, Members of the Commission, and the right rev. Prelate who presides over the See of London, declared this question ripe for legislation. There can be no necessity to wait for the Commisisioners' third Report, which is on totally distinct matters from that before us. It cannot directly or indirectly affect this question. Now, my Lords, a year has elapsed since this Commission was appointed, and very nearly a year since it made its first Report, and certainly now another year will elapse before an end can be put to those practices of which the country so strongly complains. Now, I think it would be far more satisfactory, and at the same time much more respectful to the Commissioners, if we did not treat, or apparently treat, their Report as a dead letter, but rather treated it as a document having life and importance, and one which may form the foundation of our Church ceremonial for many years to come. It has also been said that legislation of this nature should be undertaken by Her Majesty's Government. I entirely agree in that proposition; but your Lordships will bear in mind that I submitted this question to Her Majesty's Government, and asked whether they were disposed to legislate on the subject. They declined so to do, and your Lordships will hardly think that because they gave that answer I, as an individual Member of this House, should be bound not to take any course that I might deem necessary in the exigencies of the case, and that their answer should be considered as a final bar to any Peer who wished to take up the matter. Moreover, I must observe that the Commissioners were pretty nearly or entirely unanimous in their first Report on this question. They all declared that some restraint must be employed for the prevention of the practices complained of, and it is in that spirit that I now bring forward this measure. The Bill of last year dealt only with vestments; the Bill of the present year goes further, and includes lights and incense. This Bill has undergone considerable modifications, which I believe will recommend themselves to your Lordships. I have endeavoured, as far as possible, to keep close to the recommendations of the Commissioners; and if, in any instance, I have diverged from those recommendations, I think I shall be able to give good reasons for it. I find in the first Report of the Commissioners this statement—

> "We find that while these vestments are regarded by some witnesses as symbolical of doctrine, and by others as a distinctive vesture, whereby they desire to do honour to the Holy Communion as the highest act of Christian worship, they are by none regarded as essential and they give offence to many."

They continue—

> "We are of opinion that it is expedient to restrain, in the public service of the United Church of England and Ireland, all variations in respect of vesture from that which has long been the established usage of the said United Church, and we think that this may be best secured by providing aggrieved parishioners with an easy and effectual process for complaint and redress."

This is the first Report, which was signed by the whole body of the Commissioners. In the second Report, which was signed by only twenty-three out of the whole body, they state—

> "The use of lighted candles at the celebration of the Holy Communion has been introduced into certain churches within a period of about the last twenty-five years. It is true that there have been candlesticks with candles on the Lord's Table during a long period in many Cathedral and Collegiate churches and chapels, and also in the chapels of some Colleges, and of some Royal and Episcopal residences, but the instances that have been adduced to prove that candles have been lighted, as accessories to the Holy Communion, are few and much contested. With regard to parish churches, whatever evidence there may be as to candlesticks with candles being on the Lord's Table, no sufficient evidence has been adduced before us to prove that at any time during the last three centuries lighted candles have been used in any of those churches as accessories to the celebration of the Holy Communion until within about the last twenty-five years. The use of incense in the public services of the Church during the present century is very recent, and the instances of its introduction are very rare; and, so far as we have any evidence before us, it is at variance with the Church's usage for 300 years."

They conclude by saying—

> "Under these circumstances, and in conformity with the principles which guided us in our first Report, we are of opinion that it is expedient to restrain in the public services of the Church all variations from established usage in respect of lighted candles and of incense."

My Lords, the Bill which I have introduced is an attempt as far as possible to embody these opinions, and perhaps I may be allowed to call your attention to the main clauses. The Preamble recites as closely as possible the opinions of the Commissioners, merely adding that the remedy should be a public and local one. The main provisions in the Bill are contained in the 4th and 5th sections. First, it provides for sundry exceptions in respect of the apparel or vesture of any minister in any Cathedral or Collegiate church, and in other cases, and then it goes on (Clause 5)—

> "No minister shall in any church, at any time, during the saying the public prayers, use, or allow any other person to use, lighted candles when they are not needed for the purpose of giving light, or use or allow any other person to use incense."

By these provisions all such practices will henceforward be interdicted as illegal. It is a question of no importance at the present moment whether they are legal or illegal now; the object of the Bill is to declare them positively illegal, and I believe that will be a proposition accepted by your Lordships generally and by the country at large. Recollect how these practices are spoken of by the Commissioners, who say that they have no material value, that they are by none regarded as essential, yet they give much offence. Down to this point, then, I do not expect much opposition; but, when we come to discuss the machinery, no doubt there will be differences of opinion. In their second Report the Commissioners make a suggestion as to the mode in which aggrieved parishioners shall have a remedy, and they state, and very properly state, that they think a speedy and inexpensive remedy should be provided for that purpose. But the remedy they suggest is directly the reverse of either speedy or inexpensive. Their proposal is that parishioners when aggrieved "may make a formal application to the Bishop *in camerâ*—

> "And the Bishop on such application shall be bound to inquire into the matter of the complaint, and if it shall thereby appear that there has been a variation from established usage, by the introduction of vestments, lights, or incense in the public services of the Church, he shall take order forthwith for the discontinuance of such variation, and be enabled to enforce the same summarily."

The Commissioners think that the decision of the Bishop should be subject to appeal to the Archbishop *in camerâ*, "whose decision thereon shall be final;" but in case the decision of the Bishop or Archbishop is questioned on legal grounds, a case may be stated for decision by the Court of the Archbishop, with a right of appeal to the Queen in Council. The Commissioners add that precautions should be taken against frivolous objections, and these precautions I have adopted in the Bill. The Commissioners recommend for that purpose—

> "That the application should be made either by one or more of the church or chapel wardens, or by at least five resident parishioners, who shall be householders, and declare themselves to be members of the United Church, in places where the population exceeds 1,000, and by at least three such persons where the population is less than that number."

This is an excellent provision; but in what possible aspect can the remedy which the Commissioners provide be regarded as speedy or inexpensive? Remember what the process is to be. The aggrieved parishioners must appeal to the Bishop, who may live at a considerable distance from them, who may be incapacitated by age, ill health, or infirmity, who may be absent on the duties of his diocese, or may be discharging his duties in London. Here may be a great source of delay. Supposing that the Bishop gave his attention on the instant to the complaint of the aggrieved parishioners, a long time might elapse before they obtained a remedy. Take the case of Exeter. The aggrieved parishioners might live at the Land's End, and in that case must go to Bishopstowe and take all their witnesses. In the case of an appeal they must go up to London with their witnesses, the result being an intolerable expense and great delay. I say upon very high ecclesiastical authority that even when there was no intention to delay great loss of time must ensue; and if there was any desire to protract the proceedings three or four years might elapse before they came to an end. The aggrieved parishioners might be small farmers or shopkeepers, or persons of small means, and how would it be possible for men in that position to obtain redress in the mode suggested by the Commissioners? The thing is manifestly impossible, unless the five parishioners were men of wealth and leisure. This Bill, on the other hand, proposed a far more efficient and speedy and a far cheaper remedy. We propose, in the first place, that a petition should be addressed to the Bishop, who, if he pleases, may hear the case in person, or may issue a commission to the chancellor of his diocese, or to any two beneficed clergymen in his diocese, to hear the case. The Bill provides that the inquiry should be local; and this will not only insure better evidence, but at the same time will save great expense and trouble to the aggrieved parishioners. I think your Lordships will see the great advantage of enabling the Bishop to act by deputy and on the spot, thus securing both cheapness and promptitude. Above all, the Bill insists upon publicity, which is, I believe, the best guarantee we can have that these proceedings shall be properly conducted. I am sure that without publicity there will be little hope of bringing about peace and tranquillity in a parish, and I believe it would be far better for the Bishop himself, because it would exonerate him from any charge of incompetency and partizanship in the matter. With a view to give weight and sanction to the evidence the Bill proposes that it shall be given *vivâ voce*, and on oath, and the Bishop and Commissioners are authorized to administer the same. Clauses 27 and 28 are of considerable importance, for they provide that questions may be raised by consent of the parties, and the judgment of the Bishop may be required thereon without further proceeding; and, again, by consent of the parties, on appeal from the Bishop, the Archbishop may, without hearing the appeal, send it to the Queen in Council. But I must call especial attention to the 29th clause; it is as follows:—

> "If any minister shall, in any church, during the saying the public prayers, offend against this Act, or aid, or assist in, or allow the commission of such offence, the Bishop of the diocese wherein such offence has been committed shall, upon the conviction of such minister, for every such offence inhibit him from saying the public prayers for the space of three months."

In the former Bill an offence might be visited by a process in the Civil Courts; in this case the Civil Courts were excluded. In case of any offence you have an ecclesiastical person to judge, you have an ecclesiastical sentence, and you have an ecclesiastical penalty—in fact, everything is entirely ecclesiastical; and therefore on that ground no objection can be raised. This is a great concession as compared with the first Bill, and shows our desire to come to an amicable conclusion. These are pretty nearly the provisions of the Bill which it has been designed to make as simple as possible consistently with giving effect to the recommendations of the Commissioners. I will call your Lordships' attention to two or three other points. All the protests appended to the Report are worthy of consideration from the character of the persons by whom they are written; but there are only two upon which I will comment. The first is signed by the Bishop of Oxford and the Very Rev. H. Goodwin, Dean of Ely, who say—

> "We are of opinion that continued usage in ordinary circumstances ought in matters ceremonial to be so far the rule as to protect unwilling parishioners from arbitrary change, even though the change may seem to be within the letter of the law; but we cannot approve any attempt to stereotype by legislation for perpetual observance any use not actually enjoined. Such legislation, even thirty years ago, would have prohibited much which is now generally adopted and all but universally approved."

I should be as much indisposed as the right rev. Prelate to pass any law which should be irrevocable, and which should stereotype by legislation for perpetual observance any use not actually enjoined; but I think it must be manifest that, if at any time, a majority in our Church is determined upon a change in that or any other respect, there is nothing in this Bill which will prevent them making it. Should the mass of Churchmen change their views, and desire to introduce what they think a higher ceremonial, it would be in the power of the majority so to do. It is not possible you can stereotype by legislation, nor is it desirable you should do it to such an extent as the protest implies. The next protest is signed by Sir John Duke Coleridge and the Very Rev. A. P. Stanley, Dean of Westminster, and they say—

> "The Church of England has always contained within it two parties, one caring much for outward observance and ceremonial, the other careless about, or even hostile to, them; and these two historical parties represent two classes of minds which always have, and probably always will, exist, and proclaim their existence in a free country. If, therefore, the Church of England is to remain the National Establishment of a free country, room for both must be found in it, as far as is consistent with general uniformity in such matters as may be deemed essential."

I perfectly admit the statement made in the first sentence; and if any large proportion of the members of the Church wish to have a more lofty ceremonial, I can understand an arrangement by which parties strongly animated by the feeling should subscribe among themselves to erect a chapel or chapels in which they might be allowed to enjoy their ceremonial. I do not see any objection to that, provided the persons kept within certain limits, and that they did not give to their places of worship anything of a parochial or district character; but in expressing that opinion I am speaking for myself only, and as I have communicated with no one on the subject, no one can be implicated by what I say. No one can be more ready than I am to admit that many of the Ritualistic party are sincere and conscientious in their convictions that the system which they adopt is the only one that can cope with the exigencies of the time. I must say I think a more grievous error never entered into the minds of men. As far as my experience goes, I find the case to be quite the reverse. If you go to that famous church, St. Albans, you see there the highest ceremonial and the most ornate worship you can well conceive. You will see there a most decent and orderly congregation, consisting manifestly of persons of a superior class in life, many from all parts of London, who attend to gratify their curiosity and see what is going on. You will not see there a great number of poor working people. Go at what hour you like you will never see there more than two or three of that class; and I know this from personal inquiry. If you go 150 yards from that church, to the upper room of the Field Lane School, you will see there on a Sunday morning from 800 to 1,000, and sometimes more, of persons in the most destitute, abject, and miserable condition, who positively enjoy a very humble and simple ministration. Your Lordships may have heard of what are called the Special Theatre Services. Several theatres are thrown open on the Sunday evening, and persons are invited to listen to various preachers. These special services are attended by from 20,000 to 25,000 persons of the poorest condition in life. While 2,000 or 3,000 attend the simple services in a theatre, the poor are not attracted to the Ritualistic churches by incense, lights, coloured vestments, and everything which can delight the eye and ear. They will not go to them, and indeed the mass of the poorer working people seem to have an objection to these Ritualistic ceremonies. I do not deny that to many persons of elevated taste there is something very attractive in them; but I say they do not draw the classes to whom all the energies of the Church must be directed, not only to save the Church, but to save the people. I say it is of no use attempting to attract the people by such modes as these; a few may go to a church where they are attracted from motives of curiosity; but the bulk of them must and will remain outside, preferring to go to no church at all than to be found within the precincts of a church where these things are carried on. No doubt we have a common enemy whose strength lies in our disunion, and who in the midst of our divisions, will destroy us both. Can your Lordships be astonished at the alarm which prevails on this subject? I will read your Lordships extracts from documents which have been widely circulated, and which have produced serious effects upon the minds of men. Here is a letter by Dr. Littledale, evidently an able and learned man, which appeared in the *Guardian* of May 20. He had delivered a lecture, in which he drew a parallel between the Reformation and the French Revolution; he published it, and he was rebuked by Dr. Gatty for the comparison he instituted. In replying to Dr. Gatty, Dr. Littledale says—

> "His words convince me that he is not familiar with either 1550 or 1793. It is quite possible for men to take very widely-differing views as to the Reformation itself in its character and results. Some may look on it as a Pentecost. I look on it as a Flood—an act of Divine vengeance, not of Divine grace; a merited chastisement, not a fresh revelation."

This is pretty well, but further on Dr. Littledale says—

> "Dr. Gatty cannot know the facts, or he would say as I have done. But I admit my parallel with the Jacobin leaders was somewhat harsh and unjust—to them. Robespierre (who, by-the-by, is counted as a martyr, and celebrated on the 9th Thermidor as a true apostle of Liberty here in London still, as I know), Danton, Marat, &c., betrayed no trust, were not sharers in the particular iniquity they overthrew, crouched to no tyrant, perjured themselves to no man. So far they stand on a higher moral level than the base traitors who were, and deservedly, executed—blunder and folly as that execution was — by Mary I. I should have compared them with Egalité Orleans and St. Huruge, the basest of that bad eighteenth century. These are no hasty sentiments. They have been slowly built up by years of careful reading."

Here comes another passage even more pungent—

> "I gravely assert it to be absolutely impossible for any just, educated, and religious men, who have read the history of the time in genuine sources, to hold two opinions about the Reformers. They were such utterly unredeemed villains for the most part, that the only parallel I know for the way in which half-educated people speak of them among us is the appearance of Pontius Pilate among the saints of the Abyssinian calendar."

I ask your attention, my Lords, to an extract from a paper of authority among the Ritualists—the *Church Times*—

> "The Reformers were dunces and liars. The active agents of the Reformation were bad men, and the worst among them was Thomas Cranmer."

But listen to this which follows; mark the expression used in reference to that innocent and blessed Prince, Edward VI., that gentle and beloved youth for whom, after the interval of 300 years, the people of England feel almost a personal affection—

> "The evil reign of that wretched tiger-cub," [remark the word, that tiger-cub], "Edward VI., was ruinous to the Universities; and learning was as actively discouraged by the blessed Reformers as honesty, morality, and almsgiving."

Can we wonder that when writings of this kind are diffused and circulated throughout the country disastrous consequences should ensue? Is it a matter of astonishment that such writings have produced a deep and permanent effect on the masses of the people? The enemies of the Church are active enough in diffusing such proofs of our Rome-ward tendency; and will it be wise on the eve of a General Election to reject a measure like the present, which is introduced to repress these practices, and discourage such doctrines? Disaffection is spreading among classes of persons who formerly were really attached to the Church, and who, though not belonging to the Church, had no desire whatever to disturb it. The existence of the present state of things is alienating the general body of Nonconformists. I am speaking now not of the members of the Liberation Society. Many of these are able and earnest men, but they have very decided opinions; and I do not think anything would cause them to deviate from the great object they have in view—the severance of Church and State. But disaffection is spreading among the great body of Wesleyans, who have hitherto been true and earnest friends of the Church of England, which they desire to uphold with the view of securing both civil and religious liberty. They differ in discipline, but not in feeling, from the Church of England. Now, you are gradually driving away all these men. Many of them, indeed, have lately said that they do not know how they can support a Church which allows in its bosom such practices and such sayings as these, which have a tendency to bring back the people of this country to all the abominations of Popery. Their feelings are such that although they do not take any actual part against the Church—and it will, I believe, be a long time before they do so—yet they exhibit comparative indifference, and will not lend a helping hand to the Church in the hour of her necessity. Then it is impossible not to perceive that you are alienating from the Church many of its members who occupy a good position in life. In all parts of London I hear one and the same thing from members of the Church of England. Vast numbers are being alienated to this extent — that they will not go over to Popery nor to Dissent, but remain within the Church in a state of utter indifference. They have come to the conclusion that the Church of England and the Church of Rome are so nearly identical that it is of little importance to them which gets the upper hand. Now, I cannot conceive anything more threatening than the present state of affairs. It may, perhaps, be said that I have been exaggerating, and I sincerely trust it may prove that I have done so, but I firmly believe that I have been guilty of no exaggeration whatever. When I addressed your Lordships last year on a subject analogous to this my feelings were very strong, but I am bound to say that those feelings have been confirmed and not weakened by what I have learnt and experienced since that time. In pressing this Bill to a second reading I think I may fairly count upon the votes of all those who last year voted for the adjournment of the debate in order that they might have the advantage of seeing the Report of the Royal Commissioners. That Report has now been made, and I cannot understand on what ground they could now oppose themselves to the recommendations which it contains. At all events I may claim the support of all those who voted with me last Session, because they then voted in favour of a much more stringent Bill than the one before us. But, my Lords, whatever may be the result of the vote, and whoever the men who give it, I say that it is the earnest prayer of many a faithful and loving member of our communion that God, who is the author of peace and lover of concord, will restore union and harmony to this trembling and distracted Church.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Shaftesbury.*)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I wish to state the difficulty in which I am placed with reference to the Bill of the noble Earl. And, in the first place, I am very desirous of assuring the House that I am equally anxious with the noble Earl himself to restrain the practices which have given rise to so much complaint. I think my conduct as a Member of the Commission is a sufficient proof of my earnestness in desiring to restrain these practices; but at the same time I feel that, as a Member of the Commission, I am placed in great difficulty on this occasion. The Preamble of the Bill sets forth what the Commissioners have recommended, and then the 4th and 5th sections proceed to lay down a rule which was never sanctioned by the Commissioners. We never went so far as to say that we advised immediate legislation in order to restrain these practices. What we did say in the 10th clause of our Report was this—

> "Our intention in making this recommendation is simply to provide for parishioners aggrieved by the introduction of variations from established usage in respect of vestments, lights, and incense, a special faculty for restraining such variations, without interfering in other respects with the general law of the Church as to ornaments, or the ordinary remedies then in force."

Now, my Lords, if the Government of the day were to introduce a Bill, in the framing of which the voice of the Church were heard as well as the voice of the Parliament, I should be ready to concur in such a measure. But my great objection to this Bill is that, if passed, it would be simply an act of the Legislature without any reference to the feelings, views, or opinions of the Church—an act which might, perhaps, completely over-ride the action of the clergy. For my own part, I have always been desirous to put effectual restraints on these Ritualistic practices; but I have always laid it down as a principle that we ought to do so in such a way as to avoid producing a convulsion in the Church. Now I firmly believe that if a private individual were to bring in a Bill, and if that Bill were carried without any reference to the wishes and opinions of the clergy, it would effectually lead to disruption. In taking that view of the matter, I am anxious to show your Lordships that I am acting in conformity with an authority which most of you will greatly respect. Dr. Birch, in his *Life of Tillotson*, relates that—

> "While the Bill of Union (comprehension) was depending in Parliament, Dean Tillotson, as we are informed by Dr. Nicholls (*Apparatus ad Defensionem Eccles. Angl.*, p. 93) persuaded the King to pursue another method for accomplishing the design of it. He reminded His Majesty of the reproach often cast upon the Reformation by the Papists, that it was founded chiefly upon Parliamentary authority; and that no handle ought for the future to be given for such an objection that the affairs of the Church chiefly belonged to synodical authority; and, if they were passed by the members of the Convocation, they would not only be more acceptable to the body of the clergy, but would be more religiously observed by the laity. He added that lest affairs of this nature, consisting of such a multitude of particulars, might proceed too slowly in so numerous a body, it would be best, as had formerly been done, for His Majesty to authorize by his letters patent several of the most eminent of the clergy to consider of some methods of healing the wounds of the Church, and establishing a durable peace; that so what they should agree upon being laid before a Convocation might first have their sanction and then that of Parliamentary authority. In pursuance of this advice the King summoned a Convocation, and issued out likewise . . . a Commission to prepare matters to be considered by the Convocation."

I think that if the Government of the day, whoever they might be, should hereafter, after very careful consideration, bring in a Bill on the subject, peace might through God's blessings arise from it; but I have no expectation that such a result would follow from precipitate legislation, like that which is now proposed; and, therefore, I could not feel justified in supporting the Bill.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, as the noble Earl who has moved the second reading of this Bill has referred to the answer I gave some weeks ago on behalf of the Government, your Lordships will perhaps allow me, at this early period of the discussion, to make a few observations on the Bill. My Lords, I desire, in the first place, to remind the House what have been the course taken and the suggestions made by the Royal Commission. That Commission, which was appointed in the month of June last year, was composed of twenty-nine members, fourteen of whom were ecclesiastics and fifteen laymen. The names of the Commissioners are sufficiently well-known to your Lordships to make you aware that the Commission was composed of members of the greatest learning, eminence, experience, and ability, who could possibly have been selected to deal with a question of this kind. In their first Report the Commissioners were, as the noble Earl said, unanimous. The whole of the Commissioners signed the Report, though three of them appended a certain amount of qualification to the absolute recommendations of the Report. That Report was made last year, and in regard of vestments it states—

> "We, your Majesty's Commissioners, have, in accordance with the terms of your Majesty's Commission, directed our first attention to the question of the vestments worn by the Ministers of the said United Church at the time of their ministration, and especially to those the use of which has been lately introduced into certain churches. We find that while these vestments are regarded by some witnesses as symbolical of doctrine, and by others as a distinctive vesture whereby they desire to do honour to the Holy Communion as the highest act of Christian worship, they are by none regarded as essential, and they give grave offence to many. We are of opinion that it is expedient to restrain in the public services of the United Church of England and Ireland all variations in respect of vesture from that which has long been the established usage of the said United Church; and we think that this may be best secured by providing aggrieved parishioners with an easy and effectual process for complaint and redress. We are not yet prepared to recommend to your Majesty the best mode of giving effect to these conclusions, with a view at once to secure the objects proposed and to promote the peace of the Church; but we have thought it our duty, in a matter to which great interest is attached, not to delay the communication to your Majesty of the results at which we have already arrived."

A second Report was made in April last, and published in May. It deals with the question of what are called "lights and incense." In this Report the Commissioners were by no means unanimous. Twenty-three out of twenty-nine Commissioners signed it; two Commissioners declined to sign any part of it; and of the twenty-three who did sign the Report, eight made certain qualifications or statements dissenting from its recommendations. In the Report to which I am now referring there are these statements—

> "The use of Lighted Candles at the celebration of the Holy Communion has been introduced into certain Churches within a period of about the last twenty-five years. It is true that there have been Candlesticks with Candles on the Lord's Table during a long period in many Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Chapels, and also in the Chapels of some Colleges, and of some Royal and Episcopal Residences; but the instances that have been adduced to prove that Candles have been lighted as accessories to the Holy Communion are few and much contested. With regard to Parish

Churches, whatever evidence there may be as to Candlesticks with Candles being on the Lord's Table, no sufficient evidence has been adduced before us to prove that at any time during the last three centuries Lighted Candles have been used in any of these Churches as accessories to the celebration of the Holy Communion until within about the last twenty-five years. The use of Incense in the public services of the Church during the present century is very recent, and the instances of its introduction are very rare, and so far as we have any evidence before us it is at variance with the Church's usage for 300 years. Under these circumstances, and in conformity with the principles which guided us in our first Report, we are of opinion that it is expedient to restrain in the public services of the Church all variations from established usage in respect of Lighted Candles and of Incense."

After those Reports were made I took the liberty on a former occasion to say—and I think that at the time your Lordships were inclined to agree with me—that it would be not only inexpedient, but highly censurable of the Government to propose legislation on this subject until the question how far legislation should go and what shape it should assume had been anxiously and earnestly considered by the Government, and until the Government were able to come to Parliament with some proposal which they might reasonably expect to see either rejected altogether or made the law of the land. Now, that being the pure principle on which the Government have acted, the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury)—as was competent to him to do as an independent Member of your Lordships' House—has introduced the Bill which now comes before your Lordships for a second reading. My Lords, I speak with great submission and deference to the noble Earl; but I do venture to express a doubt whether the course taken by him is an expedient course. The noble Earl, as I understand him, said he had no expectation this Session of carrying the Bill beyond a second reading; but that his object was that it should be printed and should go before the country between this and the next Session of Parliament. Now, my Lords, surely that object would have been fully obtained by the step which the noble Earl naturally and properly pursued in laying the Bill on the table of your Lordships' House. But as the noble Earl proposes that the Bill should now be read a second time, it becomes necessary for your Lordships to consider the course you will take with respect to the Motion for the second reading. I do not propose to go into the details of the Bill; but if I understand the Report of the Royal Commission—though the Preamble of the Bill recites the Reports of that Commission—the noble Earl has failed to apprehend the spirit of the recommendations made by the Commissioners; and I think that if we had now to consider the provisions of the Bill in detail there would be very serious objections to it. But, of course, if the Bill went into Committee your Lordships would have the power of introducing modifications with the view of removing those objections. My Lords, I do not know whether the noble Earl will go to a division on the second reading; but, inasmuch as the Bill recites in its Preamble the Report of the Commission, I feel that, however grave the reasons against some of the provisions, and however inexpedient it might be to pass such a Bill now, yet if I were to vote against the second reading my doing so might be construed into a proposition which I am not prepared to assume—namely, that at no time and under no circumstances ought legislation to follow the Reports of the Royal Commission. Having said that, I claim for myself, and I think I am entitled to claim for many of your Lordships who may not be disposed to vote against the second reading, that we hold ourselves free and unfettered as to our action on this question in the next or any subsequent Session of Parliament. My Lords, deploring, as I do, the practices to which the noble Earl has referred—feeling, as I do, entirely adverse to those practices—I have always thought that it devolves upon those who do entertain such strong feelings on the subject to be particularly cautious and forbearing in respect of any propositions for restrictive legislation. The noble Earl read to your Lordships two or three extracts which I was much pained to hear, and I think those extracts must have been painful to many of your Lordships; but, with every respect for the noble Earl, I am at a loss to know what the object was for which he read them. Is the Church answerable for those extracts, or any section of the Church? I have no right to speak for the Church; but as one of her Members I do protest against the supposition that the opinions to which expression is given in the extracts read by the noble Earl are opinions entertained by any section of the Church of England. If the noble Earl wanted us to legislate against the publication of such opinions, I could understand his reading them to your Lordships; and legislation on the subject of lights and incense is, after all, only legislation against an outward expression of opinions which we are utterly unable to control. It appears to me, my Lords, that much benefit would follow from our postponing legislation till next year. The noble Earl proposes, contrary to the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners, to enact that practices to which the Bill refers shall be declared illegal. The Royal Commissioners carefully abstained from any recommendations of the kind, merely proposing that restraints should be applied to any departures from the established practice or usage. Three questions are involved in this Bill, of which two have already become the subject of legal proceedings—namely, the questions of lights and incense. I have been informed, and I believe accurately, that within the last few days the litigation upon these points has been transferred into the Court of highest Appeal in the kingdom; and, according to the natural order of business, in that tribunal the appeal would be tried in November or December this year. Your Lordships, therefore, before next Session, will have the benefit of a decision by the final Court of Appeal of this Kingdom with regard to the legality of two of these practices. I own I very much regret that it has not been thought desirable, when a judicial decision was being invoked upon two of these practices, to endeavour to obtain a legal decision also with regard to the question of vestments. I say this, not because I think that the opinion of Parliament ought to be fettered in any way by the decisions of the legal tribunals: it may well be that after a decision declaring one or more of these practices to be perfectly legal, Parliament might, in its wisdom, consider that, for the future, the law ought to be altered, and observances declared to be illegal for the future which had been legal hitherto. But Parliament would in any case have this advantage—that it would know from what point to start. What the law is at this moment upon these different subjects rests, of course, in a state of uncertainty; but there is every reason to believe that before next year an authoritative decision will have been given upon two, at least, of the matters in dispute. I therefore trust the noble Earl will not press this Bill to a division; and I say so with the more freedom because I have already declared that it is a Bill against the second reading of which I should not be disposed to vote. A legal decision will, I hope, be obtained before next year, and your Lordships, in case it should then be necessary, will be in a position to legislate with much better effect.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: It is not often—indeed, it is the only time—that I have heard my noble and learned Friend and have been unable to follow the course of reasoning which has gone on in his mind during the course of his speech. He told us that he strongly disapproved this Bill being pressed to a second reading; he pointed out the defects which lay, not only in the machinery of the Bill, but in its utter disregard of the recommendations of the Royal Commission and of the reasons upon which their Report was founded, and he spoke of the advantages of delay; and then, having told us all this, he said he meant to vote for the second reading of the Bill, merely because its Preamble recites that the Bill proposes to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission. I will ask my noble Friend whether that is a principle which he proposes to extend and apply to the legislation generally of your Lordships' House—that if in the Preamble of a Bill a proposition is laid down of which you happen to approve, no matter how entirely the clauses may fail to carry out that proposition, you are yet to vote for the second reading of the Bill? If so, we certainly should have passed the second reading of a great many Bills which we are in the habit of throwing out. I believe it is true of almost all Preambles that they are innocent and plausible in their language, and few persons upon that ground merely would desire to oppose them; but I say that to commit your Lordships to support the second reading of measures merely because of the moderation or plausibility of the Preamble would be to introduce an entirely novel principle into our legislation. Nobody will deny that in dealing with questions of the kind upon which the House now is asked to legislate every effort should be made to avoid exciting unnecessary irritation. The subjects are those upon which men's passions are bitterly excited, leading them to mis-state the real meaning of words used; and, therefore, the first duty of a prudent Legislature is to avoid all that can increase that irritation. But what are you now going to do? For the first time for 200 years you are going to break the truce which has existed between the two parties in the Church. During those 200 years many very different views have been entertained; various schools have flourished and decayed, all kinds of extravagant opinions have been advanced —but Parliament has never during that time interfered between the conflicting schools in the Church to strike one combatant to the ground. I do not deny that such legislation may be necessary; I do not wish to prejudge the question, which we must consider very carefully next year. But it is very important that your Lordships should pronounce no judgment beforehand which is certain to add to the irritation your legislation is certain to excite. What will be the effect of this proposal? There is not, I believe, any very considerable party in the country attached to the unfortunate practices that have created so much ill-feeling; but you are going to add to that party all the members that will be driven to it by the invigorating process of penal legislation. All those who naturally sympathize with anyone against whom Parliament legislates—all those who naturally take the weaker side, and all who hate the particular school from which this legislation proceeds will be inclined to abandon the former moderation of their opinions, and to lean towards the very extravagant views and practices which it is your object to discourage. You will be adding force, moreover, to the violence of the irritation by passing the second reading of this Bill without any of the precautions habitually taken in matters of such great importance; you will be passing it merely as a matter of form at the fag-end of the Session, without even soliciting the opinion of the Government upon the measure. My feeling with regard to the Bill is that if you wish to make more men like Dr. Littledale you could adopt no more certain method. Dr. Littledale is a gentleman of very extravagant opinions, and probably expresses his own opinions merely; but this Bill, even if it passed, is not the way to discourage those opinions. It certainly would not prevent him from holding or urging them with as much force as before; all that it would do would be to create sympathizers with him who did not exist before. It seems to me that it is of the greatest importance to treat gently the feelings and prejudices of the considerable number of persons who have been very much excited upon this subject, and, with that end in view, that legislation upon these matters should only be undertaken upon the responsibility of the Government, and with a reasonable certainty that a decision one way or other would be obtained within a very short period. First of all, legislation should not be undertaken in such a manner as to give to those whose dearest feelings and prejudices you are touching the impression that your Lordships regard these as matters of very trivial importance, which may be sacrificed to the feeling or to the convenience of a noble Earl—who is deserving of the highest respect. I am very anxious to guard myself against being supposed to view with anything like sympathy the action which has brought this controversy into its present stage. I think that blame attaches to those who selected for their operations the precise points upon which they knew the feelings of their countrymen to be most irritable, in order, apparently, to make disturbance in the Church. But I ask your Lordships not to allow yourselves to be infected with the imprudence which you are yourselves the first to condemn. Do not allow your own feelings to lead you to depart from that gravity and moderation which you ordinarily exercise upon matters of such importance. I ask you to deal with this matter as one of the first moment, and not to be drawn into a decision opposed in any way to the recommendations of the Commissioners. It is for these reasons that I beg you not to give a second reading to the Bill proposed by the noble Earl.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE said, that the two noble Lords who had last spoken were neither of them Members of their Lordships' House when the noble Earl originally introduced a measure similar to that which was now upon their Lordships' table. The overwhelming amount of evidence and argument then brought forward by the noble Earl showed the imperative necessity for legislation upon this question. And how was his Bill defeated upon that occasion? By a promise given by the Government of the day, speaking through their mouthpiece the noble Earl below the Gangway (the Earl of Derby), that a Royal Commission should issue for the purpose of investigating the subject. There was, therefore, an honourable obligation resting upon the Government to do something, because the noble Earl who was then at the head of the Government refused to allow the Bill to be read a second time, upon the ground that a Royal Commission was about to be appointed. The noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) promised on that occasion that that Commission should attend to the subject of vestments, and cognate matters, first, and report thereon with a view to legislation. The Commission did at length make their first Report, and recommend that something should be done to restrain the use of vestments. In a second Report they had pronounced against lights and incense also, and advised that the use of them should be "restrained." It then became the imperative duty of Her Majesty's Government to take up the subject, for there was a vital necessity that something should be done if the Church of England was to be saved. The noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) having in vain waited for the Government to do something, having in fact been informed by the Lord Privy Seal that the Government were not prepared to move until a third Report was sent in—a Report which had nothing to do with the special subjects under discussion —must be exonerated from all blame in now bringing the subject again before their Lordships. He would not enter into the question whether the Bill might not be improved in Committee. In respect to the legal remedy proposed in the Bill, he thought it better than the recommendation of the Commissioners. But, be this as it might, it would be in his opinion a disastrous thing if this Bill should be pressed to a division, and if a majority of their Lordships should decide against legislation on this subject. He lamented the course taken by the Government, because it would lead to the impression out-of-doors that they were not alive to the greatness of the emergency in which the Church of England was placed. The extracts read by the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) were useful as straws which showed the way of the wind. They certainly showed that, with the party now attracting so much attention, the Protestant Reformation found but little favour. And yet the only standing ground of the Church of England before God and man was as a Protestant Reformed Church. But all this the compact, organized, energetic body of Ritualists wished to undo. The questions of vestments, lights, and incense were of very little importance, except as connected with doctrine. Now, if there were two things more emphatically repudiated by the Church of England at the Reformation than any others, it was the sacrifice of the Mass and the practice of Auricular Confession. The speaking of the Lord's Table as the altar, the lights, the incense. and other Ritualistic practices, were all connected with the revival of the sacrifice of the mass. Concurrently with this was the revival of the claim of the priesthood to exercise judicial functions in the tribunal of the confessional. That he was correct in these assertions, noble Lords might satisfy themselves by perusing the evidence taken before the Ritual Commission, and appended to their first Report. Mr. Bennett of Frome, for example, before the Ritual Commission, acknowledged that he sacrificed and adored the elements, and Mr. Wagner admitted that he practised auricular confession. And these gentlemen were but representatives, in these respects, of the opinions, and too often of the practices, of the clergy known as Ritualistic. Various arguments, however, were urged against any amendment of the law which should put a check upon this process of un-Protestantizing the national Church. It was said, in the first place, that the Church of England was a comprehensive Church. It was comprehensive, no doubt; but it was, to borrow technical words from the science of logic, a comprehension of "contraries" and not of "contradictories." "Contraries" might stand together, but "contradictories" could not. The Church of England contained what was called High-Church and what was called Low-Church. Some members of that Church might call themselves Arminians and others Calvinists. But while all these four parties might be "Contraries" between themselves, Rome was "contradictory" to all. The toleration of Romanism within the Church of England would be fatal to its existence. The noble Marquess said they were going by this Bill to destroy a truce within the Church that had existed for 200 years. He (the Bishop of Carlisle) must assure the noble Marquess that he was mistaken. The truce, as he was pleased to call it, between High-Church and Low-Church was not threatened by this Bill. Were he a High-Churchman he should indignantly repudiate all identification with the innovating party. The object of the Bill was to repel the invasion of a third, a Romanizing party, who, masked as High-Churchmen, were introducing doctrines and practices, of essentially Popish character, and utterly inconsistent with the continuance and healthy existence of that Church. A second argument which had been used on various occasions, though it had not been broached to-day was, that the persons against whom the noble Earl wished to legislate, were the greatest obstacles to perversion to the Church of Rome. So said their predecessors the Tractarians thirty years ago. They claimed to be the greatest opponents of Rome. But their Lordships had not forgotten the hundreds of the laity and the scores of the clergy who had gone over to Rome since that movement began—Archbishop Manning, in a volume of *Essays on Religion and Literature* (Second Series), edited by him, conclusively disposed of this allegation. In an "inaugural address," prefaced to that volume, the Archbishop said—

> "I do not include in this, as I have already said, those few in number, I believe, who use these things as a stumbling-block to keep back souls from the truth, and imitate the Catholic Church with a formal servility, that they may pass themselves off as Catholics, even to our Catholic poor. For such men we can have no sympathy, and little hope. Every parish priest happily knows how empty and foolish is the boast they make of keeping souls from conversion. The public facts of every day refute it. They may keep back the handful who surround them, and hide the truth from their own hearts; but the steady current of return to the Catholic and Roman Church throughout the whole of England is no more to be affected by them than the rising of the tide by the palms of their hands. Against their will, certainly, and, perhaps, without their knowledge, they are sending on numberless souls into the truth which they probably will never enter. But the number of those whose good faith is doubtful is not great. The multitude of those who are drawn by a natural and simple reverence to clothe what they sincerely believe with a becoming ritual, and who worship piously and humbly in churches which might almost be mistaken for ours —if it were not for the one great blank, the absence of life, which is like a beautiful countenance without sight—is very great, and is perhaps continually increasing. They are coming up to the very threshold of the Church. They have learned to lean upon it as the centre of Christendom, from which they sprang, and upon which their own Church is supposed to rest. They use our devotions, our books, our pictures of piety; they are taught to believe the whole Catholic doctrine, and to receive the whole Council of Trent, not indeed in its true meaning, but in a meaning invented by their teachers. This cannot last long. Such teachers are, as Fuller quaintly and truly says, like unskilful horsemen; they so open gates as to shut themselves out, but let others through."

So much for the argument that Ritualism was deterrent from Rome. But, in the third place, the noble Marquess and the most rev. Primate argued that if Parliament legislated hastily — "hastily," indeed, when four years had now elapsed since first the subject was broached at Lambeth by the Bishop of Lincoln—there might be a fearful disruption in the Church of England, such as led the Free Church of Scotland to go forth from the Establishment, and such as led the Wesleyans, 100 years ago, to leave the Church of England. But the comparison would not bear examination. These Churches were identical in doctrine with the Churches they left, both of them holding Protestant truth, and agreeing in their abhorrence—he used a word most properly employed by a noble Duke, not now in his place, (the Duke of Argyll) in the late debate — of Popery. But the Ritualists rejected the Thirty-nine Articles, or as they are said to call them—the "forty stripes save one"—and yearned for Rome. The comparison of the Ritualists to the Free Church and the Wesleyans was untenable, moreover, in other respects, for the latter had the people with them, whereas the sympathy of the middle and lower classes was not at all with the innovators in the present case. The noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) was quite right when he said that how much soever such churches as St. Albans might be crowded, the middle and lower classes viewed all that was carried on within their walls with suspicion and dislike. The truth was, that these practices were a check upon Church extension; subscriptions having been withheld on account of the present state of uncertainty as to whether the Church of England would be Protestant and Reformed some years hence. He admitted that, had greater discretion been shown with regard to the Free Church and the Wesleyans, each of the Churches which they quitted would probably have been a gainer, for they would have added life and vigour to its ranks, for the reasons he had given. But for the very absence, the negation, of the same reasons, if Ritualism were allowed to go on, it would result in the breaking up of the Church of England. The true parallel was between the Ritualists and the Roman Catholic clergy who refused to conform in the reign of Elizabeth, and likewise the Non-jurors who refused to take the Oath of Allegiance in the reign of William and Mary — though here again Archbishop Sancroft, loyal Protestant as he was, would hardly, if alive, endure the comparison. The secession in the former case consisted of 189 clergymen of all ranks, and in the latter of one Archbishop, four Bishops, and 400 clergy. Any secession which might now take place of Ritualistic clergy could not exceed—he did not believe it would come up to half these numbers. The Ritualistic party was forward and loud, and compensated for their numerical paucity and personal insignificance by their organization and the noise they made in every direction. The House should not, therefore, be deterred from legislating — he would not say this — but early next Session, by any fear of committing grievous injury to the Church. They should rather be deterred from further delay by the grievous injury that would accrue if these practices were not checked. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) spoke on a former occasion of a Puritan faction hammering at the doors of Parliament; but prompt legislation was called for, in order that such a contingency might not arise. Delay was giving force and power to a Puritan faction outside the Church, which was making use of the present condition of affairs to assail the ramparts and overthrow the citadel of the Church. And herein he detected a power at work behind the scenes which desired to compass the overthrow of the Church of England as the one stronghold of Protestantism and the Reformation in the world. He did not say that the bulk of the Ritualistic clergy were conscious of the fact. But as a small cog-wheel kept up the connection between the steam power of a vast manufactory and all the shuttles at work in every direction, so a single point of contact between the Church of Rome and the Ritualists was quite enough to account for all that was going on. If then the House believed that to the blessed Reformation we owed the temporal as well as the spiritual liberties of England — if they believed that the Church of England, in her articles, homilies, and other formularies represented that Reformation—they would permit no temporizing policy, no fears, no threats, to deter them from doing their duty at this solemn crisis. By giving the Bill a second reading, if the noble Earl pressed it, they would emphatically declare their determination at the first convenient opportunity to take effectual measures for staying the plague that was at work among us.

Earl STANHOPE said, that the noble Earl who introduced the Bill (the Earl of Shaftesbury) said, that it was intended to carry out the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners. Now he (Earl Stanhope) was one of those Commissioners, and had concurred with the large majority in signing the two Reports reprobating vestments, lights, and incense. He earnestly concurred in the recommendations of the Commissioners on those subjects, for he looked upon those practices as innovations, and as calculated to bring evil upon the Church of England; and he was desirous by moderate and temperate means to restrain them. But he could not admit that the noble Earl in this Bill carried out the intentions of the Royal Commissioners. In one material respect the Bill went much beyond those recommendations. They had been told by the most rev. Primate who spoke early in the debate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) that this Bill declared practices to be illegal which the Commissioners, though disapproving of them, had carefully abstained from declaring to be illegal. Therefore, whatever might be the merits of the proposition of the noble Earl, one thing was perfectly clear—that his proposition was not the proposition of the Commissioners—his Bill was not theirs. What object was to be gained by a second reading? Suppose it was assented to, no further step could be taken this Session, nor even in this Parliament. He must, however, express his regret that his noble Friend had introduced this Bill at all without giving the Government time to produce a measure of their own. It was desirable to legislate in a manner that would cause the least offence and irritation. Now, the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) was a distinguished member of one of the two parties into which the Church was divided, and it was impossible to expect such ready acquiescence by the other party in a Bill introduced by him as in one proceeding from a more neutral and less partizan quarter. He entertained a decided opinion that it was most desirable, whatever Government might be in power, it should next Session introduce a Bill on the subject; but, if the Government, whatever it might be, should be unwilling, or unable, after proper deliberation, to bring in a Bill, then would be the time for the noble Earl to do so. Much as he respected the high authority of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, he could not but think that all the arguments of his speech were decidedly antagonistic to the Bill, while his conclusion was in favour of it. For his own part, while yielding to no man in his desire to restore to the Church the peace which had been disturbed by the practices so justly complained of, he wished to avoid unnecessary irritation, and, since the present Bill would not advance the question an inch, but would certainly produce irritation, he felt bound to vote against it.

EARL RUSSELL: I must confess I have been rather perplexed by the speeches of the most rev. Primate, the most eminent representative of the Church in this House, and of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, our greatest legal authority, for there was something so uncertain about them that I could not make out whether they intended to vote for the second reading of the Bill or against it.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I distinctly said I did not intend to vote for the second reading.

EARL RUSSELL: I am much obliged to the most rev. Primate for his explanation. I think it is desirable that legislation should be postponed to the latest possible period. We have seen very critical and agitating questions debated on the Church; we have seen those questions resolved by the highest tribunal—the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and those decisions, though adverse to the opinion of a considerable party in the Church, have been received with respect, and have decided the legal view of those questions. Now, the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack tells us that about November next two important points which are still in agitation will come by appeal before the Judicial Committee. That, it appears to me, is sufficient reason why this House should pause with respect to legislation, and should wait till we at least know upon the highest authority what the present state of the law is upon these important points. It also appears to me desirable that whenever we do legislate the Government of the day should propose the measure, and that they should introduce it with the assent of the Prelates who represent the Church in this House; for it is only in that way that I can suppose an Act will pass which will receive the general assent of the country. I see no reason to doubt that, whether by judicial decision or legislative action, if there be a general assent of parties, those at least who think certain practices desirable, though not essential, will bow respectfully to whatever decision shall be come to. On the other hand, if there be a division—I will not say of political parties, but of Church parties—on the subject, I should be very much afraid that there would be further agitation, which would be very mischievous. I do not object to this Bill or to anything contained in it, if we are obliged to come to legislation as a last resort. It is not, therefore, on account of the Bill itself, but on account of the time at which it has been brought forward, that I object to the Motion, and that I shall certainly not go into the Lobby with my noble Friend should he proceed to a division.

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, I have no intention of entering into the very difficult questions involved in the consideration of this Bill, and I am very glad that I gave way to the noble Earl who has just sat down, because I am happy to think that—as is not always the case—I entirely concur in the view he has taken as to the course that should be pursued with respect to this question. What I feel is this—and it is a point which has been stated by my noble and learned Friend on the Woolsack—that if you come to any decision upon this subject now you will do that which will be liable to be misunderstood. If you vote in favour of this Bill you will hold yourselves tied down to act on the course recommended by the noble Earl, irrespective of the future recommendations which may proceed from the Royal Commission, and irrespective of the information, as to the existing state of the law, which may be derived from the legal proceedings which are likely to occur in November. If, on the other hand, we vote against the Bill, as my noble and learned Friend pointed out, we shall be held up as assenting to those practices of the Ritualists to which I, for one, am entirely opposed, and shall be giving them countenance, which I should be sorry to give by voting apparently in their favour. If, as was supposed by the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Carlisle), it be a great object to avoid delay there might be something to say for coming to a decision one way or the other on the question; but the right rev. Prelate knows well, and the noble Earl the Mover of the second reading has himself stated, that he has no intention to press the Bill to legislation this Session. The question of delay, therefore, does not enter into the consideration of the subject at all. I share very much the opinion expressed by the noble Marquess behind me (the Marquess of Salisbury) and the noble Earl near me (Earl Stanhope) of the great inconvenience of coming to a hasty decision with regard to the Bill before us. I think if we decide one way or the other it will give one party a great and unreasonable amount of encouragement, and will create in the other party a proportionate degree or irritation, which will be constantly working up to the time when legislation will be possible. I also think that a question of this kind ought to be brought forward with all the authority of Government, and of Government informed by all the views of the Royal Commission. I am very unwilling to oppose my noble Friend, for I have the highest respect for his sincerity, and for his zeal in the advocacy of the opinions which he entertains. I do not say that I go along with his opinions ; but if I were disposed to go to one extreme or the other I should be inclined to support the views of my noble Friend rather than those of the Ritualists, who are responsible for the agitation which has been excited. But the noble Earl has had the opportunity which he sought of stating his views and calling the attention of the country to this important question. I would suggest, therefore, that it would be the better course to avoid the inconvenience of a division, and to enable that to be done I am disposed to move "the previous Question." ["Hear, hear!"] I beg to move "the previous Question."

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY : I hope your Lordships will allow me one or two words in reply to what has fallen from noble Lords in the course of the debate. The object which I have had in view in moving the second reading of this Bill was to obtain the affirmation of its principle, not of its details, so that it might go to the country as a Bill that had been considered and had obtained the assent of your Lordships' House. I understand the most rev. Primate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) to object to the Bill as not having been brought forward with the assent of Convocation. I should like to obtain the approval of Convocation ; but I do not think that I am bound, or that any Member of Parliament is bound to wait for the consent of Convocation in any course we may think it our duty to take. Then the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack said he did not see how I connected the extracts which I read with the legislation I propose; but I read the extracts because I saw that the statements had been made with great skill, and circulated through the great mass of the people and had caused great irritation, and I should be sorry if the great mass of the people, knowing and feeling these things, saw that the House of Lords did not reject those practices, which were so repugnant to them. I confess I am greatly astonished at what has fallen from the noble Earl (Earl Russell), for I can assure the House, and my noble Friend himself will recollect, that there was no one who last year urged me more than he did to go on with the Vestment Bill, which was more deficient in ecclesiastical authority and other authority than the Bill now before your Lordships. All I can say is that the noble Earl may be quite right to judge as he pleases, but never as long as I live will I repose any confidence in him again. Nothing puts me to so much pain as to appear to be wanting in respect to the noble Earl opposite, but I fear there is no other course open to me than to put your Lordships to the trouble of a division.

LORD DENMAN said, that if the Question went to a division (as the noble Earl opposite had decided on attempting to carry the Bill no farther than a second reading) it could amount to nothing more than an abstract Resolution, and he thought it very objectionable to send abroad a decision that would carry no authority with it.

Then a Question being stated, the Question was put, Whether the said Question shall be now put ?

Resolved in the *Negative.*

COMPULSORY CHURCH RATES ABOLITION BILL.—(No 211.)

(*The Earl Russell.*)

REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD : I propose at the end of Clause 7 to re-insert a clause which was in the Bill when it came up from the other House of Parliament. The Bill as it now stands will, as I think, be productive of this inconvenience, that the churchwardens may incur expense upon the faith of persons undertaking to pay their church rates, who may afterwards make default, and there is no power provided in the Bill by which those persons may be compelled to perform the agreement they have made. Now the office of churchwarden is not a voluntary office—it is an office in which a man is liable to serve even against his will, and from which he cannot withdraw—and you may put a conscientious man, who is endeavouring to carry out the duties he has unwillingly undertaken, in a very unpleasant position if he has incurred expense on the faith that he will be repaid by persons who have promised to pay but have afterwards refused. I beg to move, therefore, at the end of Clause 7, to insert as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act shall prevent any Agreement to make any such Payment, on the Faith of which any Expenditure shall have been made, or any Liability incurred, from being enforced in the same Manner as other Contracts of a like nature might be enforced in any Court of Law or Equity: Provided that in any Suit or Proceeding to enforce such Agreement as last aforesaid, it shall not be necessary to join as Parties any other Person or Persons than the Party to be made Defendant, and the Churchwardens, Chapelwardens, or Treasurer hereinafter mentioned."—(*The Lord Bishop of Oxford.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: In the Select Committee I stated the objections which I felt to this clause, and I will now shortly repeat those objections. It is not a question upon which either side will wish to gain any triumph, for I apprehend we are all anxious to arrive at the conclusion which will be the soundest and safest. In the first place, I think that practically this clause will be of very little use, and for this reason — The various sums contributed or promised by individuals will be so small that I cannot believe that any churchwarden would bring an action at law, or file a bill in Equity for the purpose of recovering them. Moreover, the difficulty of showing any agreement to pay would be so great, and the presumption of such agreement arising from presence at a meeting would be so small, and so difficult to bring home, that I think the action or suit would be certain to fail. My next objection is, that I do not think the clause is necessary. It is said that the churchwarden may undertake expenditure on the faith of promises to pay the rate; that when the work is done he will not have the money to pay for it; and that then he will be personally liable. The simple answer is that, under the new state of things which this Bill will produce, the churchwarden must get in his money before he undertakes expenditure, and then he will be exposed to no risk. My third objection is that, while the clause would be of little use and is unnecessary, it might on the other hand have a seriously deterring effect upon those who might otherwise be willing to contribute. If you ask a man for a subscription which he knows is to be purely voluntary, you may hope to receive it; but if you keep a rod in pickle for him behind your back—if you have something in reserve in the shape of an action at law or suit in Equity—he will think twice before he makes any promise. I know that many persons for whose opinion I have great respect attach a value to this clause, but I cannot subscribe to their opinion.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I cannot hope to add anything to the arguments of the noble and learned Lord; but, as a Member of the Select Committee upon this Bill, I feel bound to support his view. Looking simply and solely at the interests of the Church, I can scarcely conceive that any person should desire that this clause should pass. No doubt the right rev. Prelate sincerely believes that it would result in larger support to the Church; but I think, with the noble and learned Lord, that it would be likely to have just a contrary effect. If it were passed, a large number of persons—even attached members of the Church—would never consent to make themselves liable to this voluntary rate. They might give subscriptions, but they would not promise to pay the rate; and I hope, therefore, that on the grounds stated by the noble and learned Lord, your Lordships will reject this clause.

LORD DENMAN said, that if a man wrote down his name as promising to pay a church rate, he might easily be sued in a County Court, and the money recovered at a very trifling expense.

Clause *negatived.*

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I have another Amendment, to leave out Clause 8 as inserted by the Select Committee, and re-insert the clause which was in the Bill when it came up to us from the Commons. It is quite contrary to all the principles of English law to commit the administration of funds and the general power of deciding on expenditure to parties who by the legislation of Parliament have had given to them the power of withdrawing altogether from contributing to that expenditure, and who have exercised that power. When parties in the parish say, "We will give nothing towards the maintenance of the Church," I do not see why you should allow those persons to attend the particular vestry which is to manage the funds contributed for that purpose. The Bill, as it stands, will introduce a troublesome element into many parishes. It is said that we ought to be generous and to trust these people. My Lords, this principle seems to have not the slightest relation to generosity. It is simply a matter of business. Those who contribute should surely have the management of their contributions. Nor is there, as far as I can see, any exclusion; for those who, after declining to pay, renew their contributions return to the list of managers of the church funds by the act of contributing. Then it is said that we ought to keep the old machinery going, and that there will be a break if this clause is re-inserted. But in the country parishes there will be no break. The farmers and ratepayers who are willing that the church rate should be continued as a voluntary impost will vote for it and pay. The new vestry will there be the old vestry, because the old vestry will be repeated through the voluntary ratepayers. In the towns, where the rate has ceased to be enforced, subscriptions must always fail, because there are always those who wish to be on the list of contributors upon the cheapest possible terms and who give an insignificant amount, others will not give more, and thus the subscriptions will be brought down to nothing. I think that the management of the voluntary rate should be committed to those who give towards the voluntary rate; and while freely admitting that men may honestly take different views on the subject, I must ask your Lordships to decide the question by a vote.

Moved, to strike out Clause 8 and insert—

(No one to vote who has not paid.)

"No Person shall have any Right to vote upon any Question as to making any such voluntary Rate, or to vote or act, as Churchwarden or Chapelwarden or otherwise, in or as to the Disposal of Funds raised by any such voluntary Rate or by such voluntary Contributions as aforesaid (the Rector, Vicar, Perpetual Curate, or other Incumbent of a Parish or Ecclesiastical District excepted), who shall not have paid up his voluntary Rate for the last preceding Occasion on which such a voluntary Rate as aforesaid shall have been made, or paid a voluntary Contribution in aid of the same Fund which in Amount is not less than that of his voluntary Rate."—(*The Lord Bishop of Oxford.*)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: As the Bill came up to us from the other House, the vestry was to make the voluntary rate. In the Select Committee it was shown that such a clause was unworkable, and the Committee therefore reverted to the old vestries. That is a point which mainly influenced my own opinion; and, as I am authorized to say, the opinion of my most rev. Brother (the Archbishop of Canterbury) and my right rev. Brother (the Bishop of London). To insert therefore the clause now proposed would be to destroy the old vestry, which in a former clause we have established. There are a number of people in almost every parish who are rather indifferent to their connection with the Church. You would say to them in the second year, when they had ceased to contribute to the voluntary rate, "You must not come into the vestry.' Is it the policy of the national Church, which says, "We are the ministers of all for godly things, and if you separate yourselves from us that is your fault, not ours; we would have you if we could,"—I say is it the policy of the Church, when a man is doubtful and wavering in his allegiance, and from some motive or other, perhaps from sheer inability, has contributed nothing towards the maintenance of the Church, to say to him, "You are a defaulter, and you shall not come in?" I have no doubt that the clause sent up to us by the House of Commons was prepared in a spirit friendly to the Church; but we must not let our judgment be biassed by that fact. I think we ought not rashly to change the existing machinery of the Church, and as no one has demanded a new vestry it will be best to give up the compulsory church rate, and adhere to the old vestry.

EARL RUSSELL: I quite concur in the statement of the most rev. Prelate. I believe that, instead of disagreeable consequences following from the plan proposed by the noble and learned Lord, very disagreeable consequences would follow to the Church from the clause adopted by the House of Commons. There are many Dissenters who will be quite willing to subscribe if you do not make any invidious distinctions, such as, I think, are made by the plan proposed by the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Oxford.)

On Question, That the Words proposed to be left out stand Part of the Bill? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 46; Not-contents 13: Majority 33.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, Archp.
Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
York, Archp.

Cleveland, D.
Devonshire, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Somerset, D.

Camperdown, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
De Grey, E.
Effingham, E
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.

Halifax, V.
Hawarden, V.
Melville, V.

Carlisle, Bp.
London, Bp.

Bagot, L.

Belper, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Camoys, L.
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
Cranworth, L.
Crofton, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Leigh, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Monson, L.
Portman, L. [*Teller.*]
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Templemore, L.
Truro, L.
Vernon, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Bath, M. [*Teller.*]
Salisbury, M.

Derby, E.
Nelson, E. [*Teller.*]
Stradbroke, E.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Oxford, Bp.
Salisbury, Bp.

Chelmsford, L.
Delamere, L.
Denman, L.
Fitzwalter, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)

The Bishop of OXFORD proposed to amend Clause 8, at line 20, by inserting these words:—

> "If any churchwarden makes default in paying a church rate for which he is rated, a treasurer who shall not have made such default may be elected in his stead, and shall possess all the powers appertaining to such churchwarden in respect of the church rate."

He said, as the clause stood, a man who conscientiously dissented from the payment of the church rate, might be called upon to collect and administer it, because the office of churchwarden was not a voluntary one, but one that was imposed compulsorily. The Amendment did not substitute a treasurer for him unless it was found expedient to do so. On all principles of liberty we ought to allow the possibility of a treasurer being appointed by the parish when a man who conscientiously objected to acting in this matter had been appointed to the office of churchwarden.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, the Amendment did not discriminate between a churchwarden who conscientiously objected to pay the rate and one who did not pay it for any other reason. In either case the parish was to appoint a treasurer, but there was no machinery provided by which the parish could meet in vestry and do this; and, supposing that difficulty got over, there was a chance that the treasurer so elected might be a Dissenter; and so Dissenter after Dissenter might be appointed until the vestry got a treasurer who was qualified and would act.

Amendment *negatived.*

The Bishop of OXFORD said the office of churchwarden was one of observation and report, but not of original power; but for the first time it was proposed to give the churchwardens absolute power to settle matters as if they had direct authority; which was an entire evasion of the ecclesiastical law of England. The churchwardens might be Dissenters, and yet it was proposed to give them a wholly new power in regard to the appropriation of a fund to which they might refuse to contribute. He therefore proposed an Amendment, the effect of which was to make the clause provide that money might be applied to such purposes as might be agreed upon by the churchwardens and the trustees.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, it had been suggested that the church trustees, having funds in their hands, might require the churchwardens to spend them upon ecclesiastical purposes whether they wished it or not, and that it was therefore necessary to insert a provision requiring the churchwardens to be consenting parties to any expenditure which might be made upon the church. He believed the words in the clause already attained that object. The effect of the Amendment would be that the trustees, having funds in their hands, and desiring them to be applied to ecclesiastical purposes, would propose that the churchwardens should hand a certain portion of their funds to be applied in that way; and it was not at all likely that the churchwardens would refuse the application. Supposing, however, that they did so, he was not aware of any machinery which could be devised to force them to make such expenditure; and it would, in his opinion, be wrong to allow the church trustees to interfere with the fabric. On the whole, he was at a loss to suggest any other machinery than that provided by the Bill.

After some remarks from several noble Lords and right rev. Prelates which were not heard,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, it was not desirable to make any alteration in the clause with undue haste, and he would therefore re-consider the whole matter before the Bill came on for the third reading.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

The Bishop of OXFORD then moved an Amendment that the Bill should not come into operation till a fortnight after Easter, 1869.

The LORD CHANCELLOR pointed out that the proposed change would be productive of practical inconvenience.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Bill to be read 3ª on *Monday* next.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL.—OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of MALMESBURY: My Lords, to prevent such misunderstandings as I am sorry to say occurred last week, I think it right to interrupt the Business of the evening for the purpose of stating to your Lordships that it has come to my knowledge that a very important Amendment in the Scotch Reform Bill has been carried in the House of Commons against the Government. I will in a few words explain the effect of the Amendment. Your Lordships are aware that in Scotland occupiers of houses rated at a yearly value of less than £4 do not pay poor rates. As the Bill stood when it left your Lordships' House such persons would not have a vote; but, as I understand it, the effect of the Amendment carried this evening in the House of Commons will be that all persons who are otherwise qualified will be allowed to claim the right of voting as if they had been assessed for rates and had paid their rates. The effect of this would be to add a very large number of voters to the lists. My Lords, it appears to me that, after our discussions here last week, both sides came to the decision that the Bill should be regarded as settled, and, accordingly, we refrained from making any Amendments in it, and we had no reason to expect that further Amendments would be made in it when it went back to the Commons. Under that impression, Her Majesty's Government will resist in this House the Amendment of the Commons, and I cannot help appealing to noble Lords opposite to support us in doing so. I shall move the Scotch Reform Bill as the first Order to-morrow, because I believe it is very important that the Bill should be back in the Commons by nine o'clock, and if we take it up at five o'clock I think there will be no difficulty in that.

Earl RUSSELL: Of course I entirely concur with the noble Earl that it is not the fault of Her Majesty's Government that the Bill should come back to this House with an Amendment, as they have supported the Bill in the shape it left this House. I think the noble Earl is quite right in fixing the Bill for the first Order to-morrow. I do not know what the particular Amendment is, but I shall endeavour to support Her Majesty's Government.

Afterwards—

Bill returned from the Commons, with several of the Amendments made by the Lords *agreed to;* certain Amendments *agreed to,* with Amendments; and One Amendment *disagreed to,* for which they assign a Reason: The said Reason, and Bill, with the Amendments, to be *printed;* and to be taken into Consideration *To-morrow.* (No. 235.)

DISTRICT CHURCH TITHES ACT AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the District Church Tithes Act, 1865, and to secure Uniformity of Designation amongst Incumbents in certain Cases—Was *presented* by The Lord Bishop of Oxford; read 1ª. (No. 236.)

House adjourned at a quarter before Nine o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 9, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee*—Army Estimates.

Resolutions [July 7] *reported*—Civil Service Estimates—Class IV.

Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Inland Revenue * [207]; Registration (Ireland) *[213]; New Zealand Assembly's Powers * [216]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment * [222]; Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation * [223]; Tain Provisional Order Confirmation * [224].

Committee — Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. [149]—R.P.; Colonial Governors Pensions Act Amendment * [202].

Report—Colonial Governors' Pensions Act Amendment * [202].

Considered as amended — Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies * [201]; Promissory Oaths * [113].

Third Reading — Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies * [201]; Indorsing of Warrants * [208]; Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit * [184] and *passed.*

CASE OF STAMPER AND THE OVERSEERS OF SUNDERLAND.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CANDLISH said, that he had given private Notice to the First Lord of the Treasury of his resolve to call the attention of the House to the important decision which had been delivered in the Court of Common Pleas on Saturday last, relative to the rating clause of the Representation of the People Act. He should —although he was exceedingly unwilling to do so—conclude by moving the adjournment of the House, in order that he might be enabled to enter into a short explanation of the circumstances to which his Question related.

MR. DISRAELI: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would not object to take the more legitimate course of bringing on the subject on the Motion for going into Committee of Supply. By this means the necessity for moving the adjournment of the House would be avoided.

MR. CANDLISH said, he regretted he could not comply with the right hon. Gentleman's suggestion, as several Questions stood for discussion on the Motion for going into Supply: and as there were several hon. Members then present who took an interest in the subject to which he was about to invite the attention of the House, who might not find it convenient to be in their places at a later hour. The circumstances of the case were these—Stamper was rated for the relief of the poor for the borough of Sunderland—he being an occupier of a house with five other persons—to the amount of £3 10*s.* He appealed against being so rated, and the Court of Common Pleas on Saturday last sustained that appeal. That decision was based on the construction of the words of the 7th section of the Act of last Session, by which the Court held that with respect to tenements let out in apartments the words "not separately rated" meant not rated at the time of the passing of the Act. The result of that decision went to show that persons similarly situated to Stamper were by the 7th section of the Reform Act debarred from rateability, and as a consequence from enfranchisement. The extent to which such disfranchisement would be carried was exceedingly serious. It would, he believed, affect upwards of 100,000 persons throughout the country. Such, at all events, was the estimate made by gentlemen well qualified to judge in the matter. He could state confidently that in five boroughs within a radius of twelve miles in the North of England no fewer than 12,000 or 15,000 persons would be disfranchised by the decision of the Court of Common Pleas. The extent of the disfranchisement would, for instance, in Newcastle be about 6,000; in the borough which he represented (Sunderland) about 4,000; in South and North Shields about 1,000; while it would be of more or less extent throughout the whole country. He begged, under those circumstances, to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, in consequence of the decision in the Court of Common Pleas on Saturday last, in the case of "Stamper *v.* the Churchwardens and Overseers of the Parish of Sunderland," having the effect of excluding many thousands in that and other boroughs from the franchise whom Parliament, by the Representation of the People Act of last year, intended to enfranchise, he will bring in a Bill this Session to amend the 7th section of that Act, so as to give the franchise to those occupiers of parts of houses whom that decision excludes from its possession?

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Candlish*).

MR. DISRAELI: By the Act of last Session, so far as the franchise of boroughs was concerned, the House gave it, and intended to give it, to every householder rated to the poor who paid his rate, and to every lodger who lived in a lodging of the clear annual value of £10 per annum. I do not understand that the decision of the Court of Common Pleas has impugned either of these qualifications, which are the qualifications of the new suffrage. The hon. Gentleman says that a great number of persons have been disfranchised in consequence of a section of the Act which provides that the owner of all tenements let out in several dwellings should be rated. If there is a section, and no doubt there is, to that effect in the Act of last year, it is not the 7th, which was not at all passed in reference to the suffrage, but merely in regard to rating; nor was it introduced by Her Majesty's Government. I cannot myself say what number of persons may have been deprived of the vote they expected to enjoy in consequence of the decision of the Court of Common Pleas. I should myself imagine that the original estimate of the hon. Gentleman must have been greatly exaggerated; but there is no reason whatever why those persons should not claim to be rated under the provisions of the Act of last year, and if their claim is a valid claim it will be allowed. Therefore I do not clearly understand what it is that the hon. Gentleman maintains, and certainly I am not prepared to introduce any measure which would impugn the principle of the provisions of the Act of last year.

SIR ROBERT COLLIER said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman was not correct when he said that those persons could claim to be rated, for, so far as he understood the decision of the Court of Common Pleas, it was to the effect that they could not be rated. He did not, of course, now propose to impugn the decision of the Court of Common Pleas—it would be extremely inconvenient if the decisions of the Courts of Common Law were to be impugned or canvassed in that House; nor did he think the Government could fairly be called upon to bring in a Bill for the purpose of settling any doubts which might have been the consequence of that decision, considering the time of the Session at which they were arrived, and that such a Bill would necessarily re-open some questions which might lead to considerable discussions. But he would merely state that the decision of the Court of Common Pleas, although, no doubt, it was a correct decision on the wording of the statute, did not appear to express what was the intention of the House when it passed the clause. He could not help thinking that the intention of the House was that the owner of every separate and distinct tenement in a house, where he was not a lodger with a resident landlord, should be entitled to the franchise, and that his hon. Friend was right in saying that a large number of persons who expected to be enfranchised under the Act, and whom the majority of the House expected to be enfranchised, would not be enfranchised. However, it was too late in the Session to expect Government to bring in a measure, and therefore he trusted his hon. Friend would be satisfied with the answer on that part of the case.

MR. GOLDNEY said, the point raised by the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Candlish), when the Reform Bill was under discussion in Committee last year, applied not to the definition of rating, but to the construction of the word dwelling-house. The hon. Member said that in the borough he represented there were a large number of persons occupying parts of the same house who were separately rated. The question decided by the Court of Common Pleas was, that where the owner was actually rated, and not the occupier, at the time of the passing of the Act, he should so continue under the 7th section. As regarded the number of persons likely to be disfranchised, he had received letters from Manchester, Birmingham, and various places in the North of England, stating that they had accepted the interpretation of the Reform Act thus laid down, and had in all those places rated the owners, and not the occupiers. A letter had appeared in the *Sunderland Times* — a paper which upheld the same opinions as the hon. Member—stating that the decision of the Court of Common Pleas would not affect the register very materially one way or the other, as the class whom it was said the decision would affect in that borough consisted of persons who occupied rooms or tenements for which they did not pay more than 3*s.* a week, who were constantly moving from place to place, so as never to get the qualification of residence, and who were only a shade removed above vagrants.

MR. DENMAN said, he had received an authentic report of Mr. Justice Smith's judgment from Mr. Scott, the official reporter of the Court of Common Pleas, from which it appeared that the house to which it related was built with six rooms for one family, and afterwards let in separate rooms to six persons, there being only one street door and one set of domestic offices for the whole. The owner did not live there, or exercise any supervision. The effect of the decision, as stated by the Judge himself was, that by the operation of the 7th section of the Act occupiers of small houses and separate parts of houses would for the future be liable to be rated, whatever might be the value of their holdings, notwithstanding the Small Tenements Act, and the owners would no longer be rated. Such occupiers would be qualified to vote on the occupation franchise; but as regarded the occupiers of lodgings, where the house was separately let out when the Act was passed, the owner and not the occupier would be rated, and the occupants might claim under the lodger franchise. It was well that the real scope of the decision should be known, in order that overseers might not attempt to strain it, and thus exclude from the franchise persons whom the Court did not intend to disfranchise.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

CATTLE FROM AFRICA.—QUESTION.

MR. BARNETT said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Council, Whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that, on Monday last, three or four hundred head of Cattle, imported from Algeria, were exposed for sale at the Metropolitan Cattle Market; whether it is true that the greater part of these animals appeared half-starved, in filthy condition, and more or less diseased; and whether there is reason to expect any further importation of a similar character?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, in reply, that the importation was not from Algiers, but from Tangier. Last May the Government were asked for permission to land cattle from that locality, and they having ascertained that neither the cattle plague nor any other contagious disease existed in that part of Africa, gave the required leave. The cattle were inspected on arrival by Professor Simmons and the Custom House authorities. Only a very few suffered from any disease, and that not a contagious disease; but it was true that they were all starved and had suffered much from the voyage. He did not think that there would be any other such importation, for the importer could obtain no sale for the cattle, and he has suffered great loss from the transaction.

ARMY—MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

QUESTION.

Captain VIVIAN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House Copies of Captain Galton's Memorandum on the Draft Regulations of the Control scheme, with the Reply by the Controller in Chief; and of the Draft Regulations for an independent and efficient audit of Military Expenditures, as prepared by the Controller in Chief?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, in answer to the Question of his hon. and gallant Friend, he had to state that it was true Captain Galton, the Assistant Under Secretary in the War Office, had written a Memorandum on the Draft Regulations of the Control scheme, and that Sir Henry Storks, the Controller in Chief, had written an answer to that Memorandum. Both the Memorandum and the answer referred to the first Copy of the Draft Regulations, which had been superseded by the Regulations on the table; and it would conduce to no good end to lay on the table either the Memorandum or the answer; therefore, as at present advised, he must decline to produce those Papers. With reference to the latter part of the Question which referred to Regulations for an independent and efficient audit of Military Expenditures he had laid those Regulations on the table some time since; and they were referred to the Committee on Public Accounts. Whether they had been ordered to be printed he could not say.

Mr. CHILDERS said, they had been ordered to be printed. The Paper purporting to be an answer to the Memorandum, however, did not appear to be included in the Papers.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he was not aware that any of the Papers were wanting. He would, however, make inquiry.

ARMY.—ARTILLERY PRACTICE.

QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been called to the following paragraph in the "*Hants Telegraph*:"—

> "The steamer *Princess of Wales*, belonging to the Port of Portsmouth and Ryde Steampacket Company, left Southsea Pier on Thursday morning at half-past nine o'clock, on her passage to Ryde. When opposite Fort Monckton a shot passed between the foremast and jib stay, causing considerable consternation among the passengers, many of whom were so frightened that they laid down upon the deck. This occurrence will serve to show the immense amount of danger resulting from the shot practice at this fort, for if the shots had struck the vessel beneath the water-line, the probability is that she would have sunk, and that many lives would have been sacrificed."

Similar incautious proceedings had occurred at Dover. He wished to know, whether measures have been taken to prevent the recurrence of a practice so dangerous to the lives of Her Majesty's subjects?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had received several letters relating to this matter. He was afraid there could be no doubt that both at Dover and at Portsmouth there had been considerable want of proper and due care in the practice of the artillery; but as the conduct of Officers was involved the House would see it would be right he should be in possession of the fullest information before he was called upon to say more on the subject. He must decline to give any final answer to the Question till he was in possession of the whole facts of the case. He had not yet received any information from Dover.

COLLECTION AND PAYMENT OF RATES.

QUESTION.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps this Session to give effect to the recommendation contained in the Report of the Select Committee on the subject of Rates, particularly with reference to the payment of Rates by four quarterly collections?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that he did not think it desirable at this period of the Session to introduce a Bill to give effect to the recommendation of the Committee on the subject of Rates; but the overseers had the power of doing voluntarily that which the Committee recommended should be compulsory—that was to say, they might collect by instalments, or they might make quarterly rates.

ARMY—VOLUNTEERS AT WINDSOR.

QUESTION.

Lord ELCHO said, that about ten days ago he asked the Secretary of State for War whether the Government intend to institute any inquiry as to the rumours of insubordination of Volunteers after the Windsor Review, and with the view of taking steps after that inquiry, he wished now to ask, Whether that inquiry has taken place, and whether the Government intend to take any action with regard to the result of it?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, in answer to his noble Friend, he had to state that since he answered the Question on a former occasion he had had communication with General Lindsay on the subject, and the result had been he agreed with him that in regard to the conduct of one Regiment a Court of Inquiry should be held. With regard to another, the conduct of the commanding Officer required explanation; and in two instances it had been found necessary to write to the Lords Lieutenant of counties. That was the present state of his information; and, until further information was received, it would be impossible to state what action the Government would take in the matter.

ASSESSMENT OF RAILWAY PROPERTY IN SCOTLAND.—QUESTION.

Colonel SYKES said, he wished to ask the Lord Advocate, Whether he proposes to take action on the Memorial transmitted to him in April last from the parochial board of the parish of Old Machar, in the county of Aberdeen, respecting the Valuation of Railway Property Act for assessment?

The LORD ADVOCATE said, in reply, that owing to the pressure of the Business of the Session it had not been in his power to bring forward a measure for the settlement of the question between the parochial board and the railway company, and it could not be expected that any would be passed in the present Session.

REPORTS OF THE OFFICERS WITH THE PRUSSIAN AND AUSTRIAN ARMIES.

QUESTION.

Mr. OTWAY said, he understood that Reports had been made to the War Office by the Officers who had been employed by this Government in the last campaign between Prussia and Austria as to the number of rounds per gun fired during the campaign. He wished to know, Whether these Reports would be laid on the Table?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he thought that the House would see at once that he ought not to produce the Papers.

IRELAND—REGULATION OF IRISH PRISONS.—QUESTION.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR said, it would be in the recollection of the House that at an earlier period of the Session he had put a Question respecting the case of a prisoner confined in Mountjoy Prison, near Dublin, who had been put on penal diet and under penal regulation for refusing to state his religion. He now begged to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If he will state to the House what new rule, if any, he has thought it advisable to lay down in respect to the treatment of prisoners in Ireland who are neither Catholics, Anglicans, or Presbyterians?

The Earl of MAYO said, in reply, that he had made careful inquiries into the subject, and had found that it was impossible to frame any general rule that was applicable to all cases. In the case of any prisoner refusing to state what his religion was directions had been given that the Governor of the Gaol should make a Special Report to the Government upon the subject, when full inquiry would be made into the circumstances of the case. It would not do to permit any prisoner, by declining to state what his religion was, to escape from all the rules and regulations of the prison.

PRIMARY EDUCATION (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

MR. O'BEIRNE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is true, as stated in the Dublin *Freeman's Journal,* that the Commissioners for investigating the subject of Primary Education in Ireland have come to the conclusion that Irishmen are not competent to discharge the duties of Assistant Commissioners, and have appointed seven Englishmen and three Scotchmen to discharge those duties?

THE EARL OF MAYO said, in reply, that the appointment of an Assistant Commissioner did not rest with the Government. He had had a communication with the Chairman of the Commission, who had informed him that, with the unanimous concurrence of his colleagues, he had selected a gentleman who had been lately engaged upon an ecclesiastical inquiry similar to that of the Royal Commission in different parts of the United Kingdom, especially in Scotland, and they were unanimously of opinion that in selecting that gentleman they were selecting a man who was best able to perform the duties to be intrusted to him.

PRINCESS OF WALES.

ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

MR. DISRAELI: I rise, Sir, to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to congratulate Her Majesty upon the birth of a Princess to the Royal Consort of the Heir Apparent. The Prince and Princess of Wales live so much among the nation that on an occasion like the present it is impossible that such a domestic event should not excite some political feeling. While I am sure that we shall cordially and unanimously assure Her Majesty of the satisfaction with which we hear that by the birth of another member of the Royal Family there is an additional security for the continuance of the dynasty with which are so indissolubly connected the liberties of the country, we can, at the same time, express our feelings of gratification at the restored health of the Princess of Wales—a fact which I am certain must be to the people of this country a source of infinite satisfaction. I move, therefore, that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to congratulate Her Majesty upon the Princess of Wales having happily given birth to a Princess, and to assure Her Majesty of our feelings of devoted loyalty and affection to Her Majesty's person and family.

MR. GLADSTONE: I rise to second the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman, to which I am sure that this House will, as on former occasions, accede with unanimity and with the greatest cordiality. The domestic relations of the members of the Royal Family have assumed, to the great satisfaction of the country, a position in recent times which is almost novel with regard to the degree in which the people of the country are permitted to become acquainted with them, and the interest of the people in those domestic relations is proportionately enhanced. All that tends to exhibit the Royal Family, and the various groups of the Royal Family, in the light and attitude before the eyes of the nation of families knit together by mutual affection, and growing and prospering in mutual love, gives cordial satisfaction to the country in all classes and throughout all parts. It is undoubtedly quite true that we derive, as the right hon. Gentleman has said, an additional pleasure from the mercy which has been vouchsafed to the Prince and Princess of Wales upon the present occasion, from observing that no new strain has been imposed upon, no renewed detriment has occurred to the constitution of one whose pure and lofty character, and whose gracious manners have, not less than her high station, caused her to be an object of the greatest interest.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to congratulate Her Majesty on the Princess of Wales having happily given birth to a Princess, and to assure Her Majesty of our feelings of devoted loyalty and attachment to Her Majesty's Person and Family.—(*Mr. Disraeli.*)

SIR ROBERT NAPIER.

MESSAGE FROM THE QUEEN.

Message from Her Majesty *brought up,* and read by Mr. Speaker (all the Members being uncovered), as follows:—

VICTORIA R.

Her Majesty, taking into consideration the important Services rendered by Sir Robert Napier, a Lieutenant-General in Her Majesty's Army, and Commander in Chief of the Army of Bombay, in the conduct of the recent Expedition into Abys-

sinia, and being desirous to confer some signal mark of Her favour for these and other distinguished merits upon the said Sir Robert Napier, recommends it to the House of Commons to enable Her Majesty to make provision for securing to the said Sir Robert Napier and the next surviving Heir Male of his Body, a Pension of Two Thousand Pounds per Annum.

MR. DISRAELI: I shall move to-morrow that the House take into consideration, in Committee, Her Majesty's most gracious Message.

Committee thereupon *To-morrow.*

ELECTION PETITION AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

MR. DISRAELI: The hon. Member for Dudley (Mr. H. B. Sheridan) asked me some short time ago what was the course which Her Majesty's Government intended to take with reference to the Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill, which stands as the sixth Order upon the Paper for to-day. I then said I thought it would be more convenient to reserve my reply until I had the opportunity of stating to the House what our intentions were generally with regard to this Bill. The important decision at which the Committee upon this Bill arrived the other night virtually brought back the Bill to the scheme originally proposed by Her Majesty's Government. Therefore, so far as Her Majesty's Government are concerned, that plan has been the result of very deep deliberation. It was of course the decision of the Committee. Although we did not think ourselves justified in adopting the course which apparently the House had rejected some months previously—or at least the course which it had not sufficiently encouraged Her Majesty's Government to proceed with—we did not think, considering the position of the House generally, and the approaching termination of the Session, that we ought to run the great risk of assenting to that proposition. We thought, on the whole, that it would be more prudent to adhere to the Bill as it was introduced to the notice of the Committee. The Committe, however, having come to a decision, and by an unequivocal majority expressed an opinion upon the subject, it appears to me it would be a matter very deeply to be lamented if we should allow any difficulties to prevent us from carrying out the proposed legislation) or from fulfilling our promises on this subject. Therefore, Her Majesty's Government have considered whether, notwithstanding the obstacles that apparently present themselves, it will not be possible to legislate upon the subject this Session, and fully enter in the spirit of the Resolution of the Committee which was the other day agreed upon. And after deliberation and taking such steps as we thought would be conducive to the success of the proposition which I am now about to make, I will very briefly state the proposition I am authorized by my Colleagues to submit to the House; and I will take care in the course of the evening to lay upon the table clauses to carry out this proposition. What we propose is the following:—We propose that at the commencement of every Michaelmas Term each of the Superior Courts of Common Law should form a rota, and by the decision of the majority one of the Judges of each of those Courts should be selected to try these Election Petitions. We propose that each of the Judges so selected should receive an increase of income of £500 per annum, but that sum is not to be taken into consideration in calculating the pension to which he would be entitled after a certain duration of service. We propose also that the chief of each of the Superior Courts shall be exempted from this duty. But considering the very great increase of business in the three Superior Courts, and the great pressure which is now experienced in getting through it, we propose that three new Judges shall be appointed to those Courts, and we shall make provision that the services of a Judge of each of the Superior Courts shall be at the command of the other Courts—such as the Divorce Court, where occasionally there is a great pressure of business. We propose that if the three Puisne Judges thus selected and forming a rota are not sufficient to transact the business of the Election Committees, which after a General Election is peculiarly heavy, to reserve this power—that if the three Judges on the rota should make a requisition to the Secretary of State or other officer of the Government, that a fourth Puisne Judge of the Court of Exchequer should be associated with them for that purpose. I must say, however, I cannot doubt without this provision there would be ample power to transact this business of Election Petitions. I have now stated one provision we propose. The remaining provision is this—After all, this measure must be considered but an experiment; and we therefore propose that if there should be any vacancy in either of the Superior Courts of Common Law it shall not be filled up without the consent of Parliament. These are the principal outlines of the scheme which is embodied in the clauses which I shall lay upon the table of the House in the course of the evening. I think it is a subject which has been well-considered; and, as time is now very pressing, I propose that the House shall meet at two o'clock to-morrow, when it may not be impossible that we may get into Committee, and resume our labours upon this Bill. I therefore propose to take the consideration of these clauses to-morrow.

MR. AYRTON desired to know how it was possible that hon. Members could propose any Amendments on clauses which they would not receive till to-morrow morning. Hon. Members would, by the course now proposed, be virtually deprived of the opportunity of proposing any Amendments; and he trusted, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman would to-morrow proceed with the other portions of the Bill instead of with these clauses.

MR. DISRAELI: I should have thought that four or five hours devoted uninterruptedly to the Bill would have been sufficient for all purposes.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he felt that this was an exceptional matter; and though hon. Members had, no doubt, a right to demand at the hands of her Majesty's Government time to enable them to propose Amendments which they desired to bring forward, he could not but acknowledge that the question of time was really a pressing one. The right hon. Gentleman, on the other hand, would no doubt give due weight to any suggestions that might be made. He desired, however, to ask the right hon. Gentleman—and if the right hon. Gentleman could not give an answer at present he might, perhaps, be able to do so to-morrow—what it was proposed to do with regard to a point of considerable importance—limiting the duration of a Bill which, after all, was of an experimental character?

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM— REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL—[BILL 215.]

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir James Fergusson.*)

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Amendments, as far as the Amendment in page 24, line 32, *agreed to.*

Page 24, line 32, the next Amendment, read a second time.

MR. M'LAREN said, the Lords had made an Amendment in the Definition Clause, which enabled him to move an Amendment thereon, within the rules of this House. He should briefly explain the objects of the Amendment. It was agreed, when the Bill was in the House of Commons, that all the words about rating should be struck out. That was done in all the other clauses; but in the Definition Clause, by an oversight, the alteration was not made. The Definition Clause says a house shall "include any part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling, which dwelling is separately rated to the relief of the poor," whereas the clauses of the Bill made it sufficient that a householder should be placed on the Valuation Roll, and not in arrear of poor rates, to entitle him to the franchise. In Edinburgh this definition would disfranchise 4,500 persons who occupied premises of a less value than £4—premises which were not rated and which, therefore, could not have paid the rates of the poor; and he believed there were other burghs which were similarly situated. The effect of the Amendment he had to propose, would be to suspend the operation of the rating sentence in the clause during the present year; and all the parties affected could be rated next year. What he now proposed was merely to add the words, "after the expiration of the present year, and," in the place pointed out after the word "levied." In the city he represented there were 4,500 householders who would not enjoy the franchise under the Amendment during the present year, because the Poor Law authorities did not think it worth while to lay on and collect the small rate they might have obtained from those persons; but he apprehended that the House was most anxious that every man who was a householder should be placed on the register.

Amendment proposed, to add to the said Amendment the words "after the expiration of the present year and." —(*Mr. M'Laren.*)

The LORD ADVOCATE said, one of the main principles of the Bill was that no person should be entitled to be put upon the register who did not pay to the relief of the poor. In the course of the discussion, however, it was agreed that the test of being rated to the relief of the poor should not be insisted on that year; but the Lords have made an alteration in the clause, by which that object was to be effected; and the result was that certain parties were not at present entitled to be put on the register because they had not been put to the test of paying to the relief of the poor. There was no doubt, however, that they would be entitled to be put on the register in future years, after they had been put to the test.

Mr. BOUVERIE said, he thought the hon. Member for Edinburgh had done good service in the Amendment he had brought forward, because the clause to which he had drawn attention was inconsistent with the Amendment which he himself proposed, and which was carried during the earlier part of the discussions on the Scotch Reform Bill. He did not think the matter ought to be passed over in quite so light and airy a manner as that in which it had just been dealt with by the Lord Advocate; and, for his own part, he should support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Edinburgh.

Mr. CRUM-EWING said, he hoped the hon. Member for Edinburgh would persevere in the Amendment he had proposed, and that it would meet with the acceptance of the House.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Edinburgh was one to which he trusted he might express a hope that the Lord Advocate would agree.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 124; Noes 104: Majority 20.

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Several other Amendments *agreed to.*

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER moved that the House should disagree with an Amendment made by the Lords in the clause relating to the voting at University elections by striking out the words, "who is personally known to me." Those words made the magistrate declare that he was personally acquainted with the voter who came before him, and they would therefore operate as an additional safeguard against personation. As the omission of the words would lessen the security against that species of fraud, he hoped the House would retain them.

One *disagreed to.*

Committee *appointed*, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed:" —Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson, and Sir Graham Montgomery:— To withdraw immediately; Three to be the quorum.

Reason for disagreeing to Lords' Amendment *reported*, and *agreed to.*

To be communicated to The Lords.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ARMY—THE HORSE GUARDS.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he is willing to produce a Return of a Copy of the censure passed by the Horse Guards upon the members of the Court Martial appointed to try an acting Sergeant Major of the Grenadier Guards, on account of the leniency of the sentence they had passed upon him, such censure having since been virtually abandoned, but without any explanation or justification of the grounds of such censure upon the members of that Court Martial, one of whom is a Member of this House, and to make a Motion. The hon. Member stated that in or about the month of April an acting Sergeant Major of the Grenadier Guards was sent to a Volunteer corps with regard to a quantity of ammunition, on which occasion the Volunteers pressed on him their hospitality, the result of which was the absence of the acting Serjeant Major for six hours and the loss of parade. For this he was tried and sentenced to be reduced to the grade of a simple sergeant, whereby he would lose 10*d.* a day. The colonel demurred to this finding, on the ground that he could have punished the accused to that extent himself, and that a Court-martial was obliged to inflict a severer penalty than the commanding officer could himself do. The Court, however, adhered to its decision; upon which the colonel appealed to the Horse Guards; and they referred the point to the Judge Advocate, who ruled that the sentence was perfectly legal. On this the military authorities quashed the sentence, re-sentenced the man to exactly the same penalty, and finally sent for the members of the Court to the Horse Guards, where a censure was read to them, of which they were refused a copy. As the President of the Court (Colonel Sturt) was a Member of Parliament, he (Mr. Darby Griffith) maintained that he had a right to bring the subject before the House, and he submitted that the question was one of no little importance, for it was whether Courts-martial were to be independent tribunals, or whether they were to be subject to dictation. He moved for a copy of the censure.

ARMY—PROMOTIONS IN THE COLDSTREAM GUARDS.—OBSERVATIONS.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN, in rising to call attention to the late promotions in the Coldstream Regiment of Guards, said, the complaint that he had to make in connection with them was that the well-known Warrant and rules of the service had been completely disregarded by the military authorities. Some two or three months ago vacancies had occurred in the regiment in question on the promotion of Lieutenant Colonel Clive, and by the rules of the service no officer could be appointed to a company if he did not happen to have served in it two years, it being also necessary that before being made a captain he should pass an examination. At the time of Lieutenant Colonel Clive's promotion there were six or seven of the senior ensigns who had not complied with those conditions. On a former occasion the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War quoted the Warrant of the 3rd of February, 1866, setting forth that the vacancies caused by officers being permitted to retire, should be given to the next senior qualified officers, who were prepared to purchase, unless it should be deemed expedient by the Secretary for War to act otherwise, and in that case officers of the same rank should be brought in from half pay, or officers of the same rank in other regiments might be allowed to purchase. These latter words in the Warrant were not read by the right hon. Gentleman, and he therefore supposed that the right hon. Gentleman was not aware of them. [SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: I was aware of them.] He wished to know why the Royal Warrants, which were plain in their language, had not been complied with?

ARMY—CONTROLLER-IN-CHIEF.—AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS.—RESOLUTION.

COLONEL JERVIS rose to put a Question to the Secretary of State for War, respecting the proposed position and duties of the Controller-in-Chief, and to move a Resolution thereon. In consequence of the disasters arising out of the defective military organization during the Crimean War inquiries were made into the state of various War Departments. A vast chaos seemed to exist, Departments being without heads, and heads without control. That came out most clearly in the Committee of 1860 on Organization, and Lord Herbert recommended that they should most seriously consider the importance of introducing the French *Intendance* system. Lord De Grey, when at the head of the War Office, very properly brought forward the question, and recommended that the Administrative Departments of the War Office, which were under a dozen different heads, should be brought under the control of one chief. They could not over-estimate the importance of such a position. In fact, the officer in that position would *bonâ fide* have the control of four-fifths of the whole army expenditure; and it might well be thought that the Secretary of State would regard him as his right-hand man, his chief adviser. Such certainly was the idea of Lord Strathnairn's Committee—such also seemed to be the opinion of the right hon. Baronet (Sir John Pakington) himself when he wrote his letter in December; but between that date and the 29th of June a very extraordinary change of feeling seemed to have come over the Treasury. It seemed then to have been thought that the Controller-in-Chief was by far too important a personage—that, in fact, they were creating a new and great power in the War Office—a sort of control over the Secretary of State. Having secured one of the greatest men in the country, Sir Henry Storks—who years ago was Under Secretary for War, and had filled the most important positions — having got him to arrange the whole scheme as perfectly as it could be done, they appeared to turn round upon him and say they did not want him any more ["Hear, hear!" *and* "No, no!"] The letter from the Treasury of the 29th of June stated that, having re-considered the whole matter, their Lordships were of opinion that the Controller-in-Chief should not have the rank of permanent Secretary of State, that he should have a salary of £1,500 a year, and that he should be either a military man or civilian, as circumstances should determine. Whether the Controller was a military man or not, he would say this, unless he was to be master over the Department it would be better not to have him at all. Their Lordships, it appeared, were also of opinion that the functions of the Controller-in-Chief should be kept entirely distinct from those of the Financial Department. If that was the case he said again, better not have such an officer. Then it was added, "all expenditure proposed by him should be referred to the Financial Department." Now, he wanted to know what were the duties of a Controller-in-Chief if they were not financial duties; and whether it was not absurd, after selecting a man like Sir Henry Storks to look after the expenditure of £13,000,000, that they should then appoint another high official to look after him? There could be no question that the action of the Secretary of State was very much cramped by the extreme difficulty of getting the heads of Departments to coalesce, because although each was anxious and willing to give the Secretary of State all the assistance in his power, they entertained considerable jealousy of each other. Lord Strathnairn's Committee was composed of some of the ablest men connected with the service, and they recommended unanimously that the Chief Controller should have the entire control of the finances under the Secretary of State. The Marquess of Hartington had stated that it was the general opinion of the War Office that the only way to economize was to bring the various Departments under one head. Earl de Grey and Ripon was equally strong on the point—namely, that there should only be one head to communicate with the Secretary of State; and Sir Charles Trevelyan was strongly in favour of one system of control. If the Controller had to submit the Estimates in the first instance to the Financial Secretary, it was obvious that he must possess some kind of control over them; whereas the only real financial authorities were the First Lord of the Treasury, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Secretaries of State, and it was for them, and them only, to sanction what Estimates should be submitted to Parliament. If the Secretary of State for War was to have a financial as well as a military wet-nurse he was not in the position in which he ought to be. Having had twenty years' experience of the War Office, he asserted that it was in the most complete confusion that it had been in for years. After a long and careful inquiry, the War Office had been empowered to seek the assistance of any man they pleased to assist in its re-organization; and that ought to be done. If it were not, he warned the right hon. Baronet that a new Parliament would insist on such a searching inquiry as had never taken place before. He hoped that the right hon. Baronet would have strength of mind to carry into effect the well-considered changes which he had determined, after eight months' consideration of the subject, to adopt. The hon. and gallant Member concluded by moving his Resolution.

Captain VIVIAN, in seconding the Motion, said, he agreed with the remark of the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich (Major Jervis) that for the last ten or twelve years the War Department had been remarkable for confusion, extravagance, and blundering. It had been with some feeling of relief that those interested in the subject looked forward to the Report of the Committee presided over by Lord Strathnairn, as they saw in it germs of future change, which would alter not only the regulation of this Department, but also those of other important branches of the administration of the army. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, by showing a determination to carry the recommendations contained in that Report into effect, had earned the gratitude and the approbation of all parties. There was a general desire on the part of the country that the army should be more economically and more efficiently administered. While the present administration of the War Office might appear ludicrous to lookers-on it was death to the army. The spirit of self-immolation upon which the right hon. Gentleman had relied for effecting improvements in the administration of the War Department was not likely to show itself in any marked manner, because every clerk in the Department was sure to be willing to admit that changes should be effected in every Department but his own, which, in his opinion, would require to be extended, instead of being reduced. It was on the 1st January that Sir Henry Storks had been appointed Controller-in-Chief, to introduce the proposed reforms. He had been told that he was to alter the weak, inefficient administration of the Civil Department of the army, and to try and revise the organization of the War Office itself. Sir Henry Storks had shown the greatest aptitude for the post to which he had been appointed, and, in fact, the only objection that could be urged against his appointment was that he was a soldier. He thoroughly believed that Sir Henry Storks, Sir Edward Lugard, and other officers of high military rank would perform their duty to the Secretary of State without betraying that duty for their own personal advancement. The theory at the War Office was that they could not serve God and Mammon—that they could not serve the War Office without a breach of allegiance to the Horse Guards. It was true that the interests of the War Office were antagonistic to those of the Horse Guards; the sooner they were reconciled the better it would be for the country. He was certain that a man like Sir Henry Storks would never accept any office under the Secretary of State and neglect that duty for his own advancement. He could not believe that the interest of military men and those of the administration of the army were antagonistic. Sir Henry Storks had been in office for six months, and it was right the House should know what had been done in these Departments, and what the obstacles were which he had to encounter. The right hon. Gentleman had placed on the table of the House a full account of the proposed changes; but, without wearying the House with details, he might describe them as a greater concentration of responsibility, and a better division of labour, as opposed to the present system of a great concentration of labour in one office and a greater division of responsibility among various Departments. The effect of those changes out-of-doors would be to place the various Supply Departments under one responsible chief, who would be answerable to the officer in command as far as discipline was concerned, but who would be answerable to the Secretary of State for War through the Controller-in-Chief of his departmental administration. At present there were four departmental officers at Malta and Gibraltar—namely, the Surveyor General, the Purveyor of Stores, the Commissary General, and Barrack Master; but it was proposed to place one officer over these four Departments. The result of such a change would necessarily lead to economy of time and money, and be a material check upon expenditure. To prove that this would be the case he need only point to the fact that at present the correspondence of these four Departments was carried on quite independently of one another. But it was objected by the Treasury that the Control Department would interfere with the present constitutional financial control. For his own part, he did not see how the Controller-in-Chief could appropriate one farthing from one purpose to another. He certainly had no objection to the details of the Estimates being submitted to the Finance Department for the purpose of having their accuracy tested; but he objected, and objected very strongly, to any manipulation. He had no objection to a Financial Secretary arranging the figures and performing similar duties; but if he were once permitted to manipulate the details—to say that too much was being spent in this direction and too much in another, it would be utterly impossible that they could secure the services of any one who could keep these large Departments in a state of efficiency, because this could not be done unless they placed sufficient confidence in the officer they selected, and gave him an uncontrolled command. Without in any way desiring to detract from the merits of Sir Robert Napier, it was to the adoption of this principle that the success of the Abyssinian Expedition was in a great measure attributable. There, perhaps, was some danger in putting two men into the same position at the War Office, and he therefore thought that the Controller-in-Chief should be the superior. If the Financial Secretary was upon the same footing it might lead to dispute and to discussion. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Department would persist in a policy to which he was strongly inclined, and that he would seize the opportunity which was now offered, and which might not speedily recur, and carry out that policy undeterred by those who sought to thwart him from motives of obstinacy or self-interest.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Controller in Chief should be an Under Secretary of State; and that the audit of the War Office accounts should be entirely independent of the War Office,"—(*Colonel Jervis,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

General DUNNE remarked that confusion had not always existed in the War Department; it began in 1852 and 1854, through the proceedings of the then Secretary of State for War and his successors, who pulled the whole system to pieces, and, as children over a puzzle, had pulled the Department to pieces, and had been unable to put it in any sort of shape since. He was glad to find the right hon. Baronet (Sir John Pakington) had begun to try his hand at putting this Department in order, because, if for no other reason, his action in the matter acknowledged the necessity of speedy reform; and the nearer he approached the system of the old Ordnance Department, which the Duke of Wellington and so many other high authorities had said was the best in the world, the more perfect he would make it. It was said that the framing of the Estimates and the Department to which this responsibility was to be entrusted, was now a subject of discussion, but as to the framing of the Estimates, nothing, it seemed to him, could be more plain. Whatever system was in vogue, the Cabinet must always decide on the amount of money to be spent on the army, and the heads of Departments, whatever their office, would be obliged to keep their expenditure within that limit. But when the sum was decided, the Executive should alone frame the application and be responsible for the expenditure. In his opinion it would be easy to form a Department which should work harmoniously under one or more heads. He approved the proposal to keep the Audit Department entirely separate from others, and trusted special attention would be given to surpluses of Votes and transfers in future. This year many sums had been transferred from one Department to another, but no account of them had been rendered to Parliament. For instance, the House voted a sum for the Training of the Irish Militia; the Government of that country had determined not to call them out, and the sum voted for that purpose must have been saved, but neither the amount nor the purpose to which it was transferred had been stated. He hoped this oversight would be remedied before the end of the Session. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would proceed to frame a system which would relieve the War Office from the complaints of which they heard so frequently. The Committee over which Lord Strathnairn presided had recommended a re-organization of the War Department, and it was understood that a distinguished organizer, Major General Storks, was to be placed at its head; but it was now said some unseen influence had been exerted within the Office to alter this wise determination, and it was to place the new Controller in a position which the Major General could not accept. If he was to be the head of this Department, he should have the application of whatever sums might be allotted by the Cabinet for warlike purposes without control from any subordinate, and be accountable for that application. It was clear something must be done, if we wished to decrease the expense and incompetence of former Secretaries for War.

Colonel NORTH complimented the Mover and Seconder of the Resolution for the manner in which they had introduced the subject. He was surprised at the delay of the Government. The Secretary of State had promised that the system should be tried on the 1st of April in Ireland, and it could have been tried under most advantageous circumstances under Lord Strathnairn, who was not only Chairman of the Committee, but Commander-in-Chief in Ireland as well; but it seemed as if the authorities had had their nightcaps on ever since. At length, however, we had a scheme produced by two most able men — Sir Henry Storks and General Balfour; but the whole thing seemed to be regarded by the Treasury from a pounds, shillings, and pence point of view. [The Chancellor of the Exchequer: A very important matter.] He had no doubt of that; but contended that pounds, shillings, and pence should not be allowed to interfere with the efficiency of the army and the proper administration of its Departments. The Crimean War had shown what expense was entailed by niggardliness in time of peace. He was surprised that they should expect the Controller-in-Chief to be subordinate to the Financial Secretary. Now, the Minute proposed that the new official who should advise the Secretary of State for War should be either a military man or a civilian; but, excepting Lord Dalhousie and the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel), every Secretary for War had been a civilian; and what would happen if future civilian Secretaries should have civilian advisers on military matters? In his opinion, the military adviser of the Secretary of State should under no circumstances be a civilian. Then the Controller-in-Chief was to be without the rank of Under Secretary of State and have £1,500 a year. But was Sir Henry Storks to be set aside in order that somebody else might be put over him? [Lord ELCHO: Hear, hear; *and* "No, no!" *from the Treasury Bench.*] Did the Secretary for War and the Chancellor of the Exchequer suppose Sir Henry Storks would submit to such treatment? The Government might say there was no desire to get rid of him; but, if the Minute meant anything, it meant, "We will get anyone we can to take the post, and we will treat Sir Henry Storks as an occasional waiter." [Lord ELCHO: Hear.] Sir Robert Napier, as had been said, owed much of his success to the absoluteness of his control. What he wanted he ordered, and what he ordered he got; but the Treasury set out with two Kings of Brentford, and all he had to say was, Heaven help them from confusion! He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept the scheme of Sir Henry Storks; that Sir Henry Storks would not be set aside in order that some other person might carry out his scheme.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, though under no obligation to defend the recommendations of the Treasury, was bound to say he was much obliged to the Government for the part they had taken in the matter, and consequently disagreed with every hon. Member who had as yet spoken on the subject. If the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich (Major Jervis) had correctly described the duties of the Controller, his Motion would follow as a necessary consequence. If they gave a man the control of an expenditure of £13,000,000, and decided that he should be really independent and nobody should have a right to call in question his action, in what respect would his powers differ from those of the Secretary of State, except that the latter would be responsible to that House, and the Controller would be responsible to nobody? Although he entirely disagreed with the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich, both as to the duties and the position of the Controller-in-Chief, he was not sorry that the hon. and gallant Gentleman had raised the question in that manner, because his Motion raised with tolerable distinctness a question which the House would sooner or later have to consider—namely, whether there was to be a real financial control, independently of all the spending and executive departments of the army, whether those departments were attached to the Horse Guards or to the War Office itself. It seemed to him that the official Correspondence which the Government had laid on the table was not very complete, and he understood it had been admitted earlier that evening that a Letter containing the Royal Warrant by which that Department had been already constituted had been inadvertently omitted from the Papers presented to the House.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he was not conscious until that evening of that omission, and he was quite willing to supply it.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he thought it very important to have the Letter, not only as showing the views of the Secretary for War, but also in order that any just criticisms might be passed upon the document. It had been the prevailing opinion out of doors—whether with or without sufficient foundation he did not know—that it had been the intention of the War Office to establish a new Department, with such powers and authority that the financial control of which he had spoken would be, if not altogether destroyed, at least very seriously weakened. If any such proposal as that made by the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich were adopted, the financial control would be entirely done away with. But, even short of the re-organization recommended by that hon. and gallant Member, a system might be adopted which, although not entirely doing away with that control, would yet very seriously impair it. Whatever fault might have attached to the War Office—and it had enjoyed the distinction of being about the best abused Office in the kingdom—there had always existed control of a civilian character perfectly independent of the military element. As Sir Charles Trevelyan's letter in *The Times* of that day showed, there had existed a sort of outpost of the Treasury to control the expenditure of the army. The Board of

Ordnance had officers whose duty it was to keep a watch over that expenditure. Ever since the constitution of the present War Office there had always been some control of that sort, which was at one time more powerful, and at another less so. Every Minister, he believed, who had filled the office of Secretary of State for War had held the opinion that there should be such a financial control as that. It was evident from his correspondence with the Treasury that the late Lord Herbert held that opinion; and it had also been shared by that noble Lord's official successors. In the contemplated re-organization of the army was there anything which made it less necessary than it had heretofore been to maintain a separate financial control over the Executive Departments? In his opinion the answer to that question should be given in the negative. He thought too much fuss—if he might be allowed the phrase—had been made about that contemplated re-organization. It had been written and talked of as a very large affair indeed. It was, no doubt, an important matter, and, if properly carried out, would be very useful. But he did not think the projected changes were of the magnitude that had been supposed. On what was the necessity for them founded? On inquiry it was found that the supply of food to the army, the supply of hospital stores, of warlike stores, and of stores for barrack accommodation—it was found that the supply of all those articles for the army was the duty of different departments within the War Office itself, and the duty of different departments at every station and with every army. It appeared also that the local head of each of those different departments had to correspond directly with the head of his own department at home, and that although there migh be great similarity in the duties of each of those departments; a great deal might be done and a saving effected for the public by a proper correspondence among themselves, and by a knowledge on the part of one department of what was going on in another, they all corresponded separately with their own chiefs at home, and there was a greater subdivision of duties than was at all necessary for the public service. It appeared, moreover, that there was no Department charged with the duty of providing transport for each of those different services. Well, the obvious remedy that occurred to the late Lord Herbert seven or eight years ago was that all those departments should be merged into one and combined under one head. That idea was approved by the Treasury, and circumstances only prevented it being carried out before. It was revived by Lord de Grey, and was subsequently matured by the Committee which was presided over by Lord Strathnairn. But although the Supply Department was a great and powerful Department there was no necessity for making it all-powerful or practically supreme in the War Office, which had many other duties to perform. The War Office had also to provide arms for the army, either by contract or through the Government manufacturing establishments. It was necessary there should be distinct Departments for that and for other duties, and although the Supply Department might possibly be the largest and most important, he did not see why it should necessarily be raised to a rank altogether superior to the other departments which likewise performed duties under the War Office. He had admitted that the Controller-in-Chief should be a person of great power and authority at the War Office; but he saw no good reason why he should be more than the head of any of those other departments which he had mentioned, or why he should be exempted from all criticism. No one proposed that the Director of Works should be authorized to frame what Estimates he pleased, without having his acts called into question by any other authority. Nobody proposed that the Director of Ordnance should be authorized to spend in the manufacturing departments whatever sums he might think fit for the purpose of adding to the buildings or plant of those establishments without being subject to the control of the Secretary of State. And if such propositions were not made with regard to other departments he could not conceive on what ground another department of an analogous character was to be left entirely without financial control. In the letter to which he had already referred, and which appeared in *The Times* of that morning, Sir Charles Trevelyan stated that it appeared to be deliberately intended to create a new dualism at the War Office. With the greatest respect, however, for the source from which that statement emanated, he must be allowed to express a doubt as to its correctness. Nothing of the sort was, so far as he could see, intended; and, in his opinion, it was the Secretary of State alone who would be the responsible Minister, not only for efficiency, but also for economy. [Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: Hear, hear!] But how was it proposed that the Secretary of State alone should be thus responsible to the House of Commons if the means were taken away from him of knowing how economy was to be obtained? The Chief Controller would advise him in reference to everything connected with the supply of stores, &c., for the army, the Director of Ordnance with respect to anything connected with the manufacturing Department and the supply of new arms, and the Director of Works as to works; but how was he to be advised as to the expediency of making reductions unless the financial head of the Department were placed in a position to know what was going on, to make his recommendations, and, if necessary, to secure that they should be acted upon? All that was proposed was that the head of the Financial Department should be made aware constantly of what was going on; that the Estimates should pass through his hands in order that he might know in what particulars it might be desirable to increase or diminish them; and that if he thought he could point out any respects in which retrenchment might easily be effected, his opinion should go before the Secretary of State with adequate power and authority. The Secretary of State would in that way have, on the one hand, the views of the person representing the question of efficiency, while, on the other hand, the economical view would be presented to him by his financial adviser. It was all very well to say that the two things must go together; but everybody was aware that the question often arose as to whether a certain expenditure would conduce to efficiency, or whether the extra efficiency which it would secure was worth the outlay which it was proposed to incur. But then it was suggested that each department might frame its own Estimate, and be responsible to the Secretary of State not only for efficiency, but economy. Now, it was very easy to make the head of a department responsible for efficiency; but how he could be made responsible for the economy of his department if all power of interference were taken away from the Financial Department, he was at a loss to understand. The Secretary of State could not, without assistance, make himself acquainted with all the details of economy, and it was only by such aid as was afforded by inquiry made by the Accountant General's Department that it was possible to know whether his Department was conducted economically or not. The proposed regulations would, he hoped, be submitted to further revision, and if necessary be further corrected; for, as the Treasury Letter was dated the 29th, and the revised Regulations had been sent back the next day, it was possible that they might not in all respects carry out the principles which the Treasury had laid down. He must express his gratitude to the Treasury for the line they had taken, and he hoped the Secretary of State would concur in the Regulations laid down by the Treasury. In what he had said he hoped not a single word had fallen from him which might be regarded as disrespectful in the slightest degree to the present Controller-in-Chief. He was fully sensible of the high reputation which Sir Henry Storks so deservedly enjoyed, and the re-organization of the Department could not be entrusted to abler hands; but he was at the same time of opinion that it was not desirable that any Department of the War Office should be raised to that pitch of superior power over every other for which some hon. Members contended.

LORD ELCHO said, that although many questions of importance had been brought before Parliament in the present Session, the question of the proper control of our Army Department was the most important administrative question of the day, inasmuch as it dealt with an expenditure of £13,000,000. He was, afraid, however, that the good which it was hoped would arise from the appointment of a Chief Controller was in great danger of being obviated, seeing the views which were entertained on the subject by the occupants of the Treasury and the front Opposition Benches. His noble Friend the late Secretary for War (the Marquess of Hartington), for instance, had got up, and, after nearly every previous speaker had expressed himself strongly against the existing as well as against the proposed system, as laid down in the Papers which had been placed on the table, argued in favour of a check being maintained by the Treasury over the Controller—a view in which he was apparently supported by his hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), who cheered him at the close of his speech. The House, nevertheless, would do well, he thought, to pause before it accepted the dicta of right hon. and hon. Gentlemen who were, or who had been in Office, and to take the matter, in a great measure, into its own hands. No doubt, to judge by the appearance of its Benches during the discussion, the subject was one in which the House of Commons seemed to take very little interest. The five Benches on the Opposition side below the Gangway, which were usually occupied by hon. Gentlemen who, when they should address their constituents, would be likely to lay the greatest stress upon the necessity of peace, retrenchment, and reform, had been left during the progress of this discussion without a single Member, though within the last half-hour the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill) had re-appeared; but it was a great mistake to imagine that the question would be regarded with equal apathy out-of-doors, or that Secretaries of State *in esse* or *in posse* would be allowed to have, in dealing with it, entirely their own way. Knowing the unsatisfactory state of things, he brought the subject before the House a short time ago, thinking that a Commission of Inquiry should be appointed, and he expected to be told that a Commission was unnecessary, as the attention of the War Office and two able officers was already engaged on the matter. His right hon. Friend (Sir John Pakington), however, did not give that answer, and perhaps he was right in not doing so; for it did not seem that the organization of the War Department was proceeding with that success and harmony which would justify the hope of a good result, and it was a question whether there was any Controller at the War Office at all. Military organization meant a sufficient supply of men, with means for renewing the supply; a sufficient supply of material with ready means of renewal; and an organization in time of peace so economically conducted that those supplies of men and material could be efficiently brought to bear, in time of war, in any direction and at the shortest notice. Now, as regards men, the state of things was that 40,000 men could not be brought together in line in this country. But his right hon. Friend the Secretary for War stated that in time the country would have a Reserve of 50,000 men. The present Reserve was 15,000 men, and, according to the progress at which matters advanced, it might be thirty or forty years before this Reserve of 50,000 men was formed. Moreover, the officers of the Militia, from which source the Reserve was expected to be derived, were divided in opinion as to whether the men could be obtained from that force. In respect to material there were, no doubt, abundant supplies and stores. Many people thought that the supplies were over abundant, and that great waste prevailed. Only recently an hon. and gallant Member (Major Anson) brought the whole question of stores before the House, and the result was that the Secretary for War accepted a practical revolution in the mode of conducting the War Department with respect to stores, and an impression had gone forth that a most salutary change was likely to be introduced in the mode of keeping the War Office accounts with regard to stores. On a former occasion he endeavoured to show that there existed no organization for economically and efficiently working up the men and material; and no answer was given to his statement. They had not had a foreign army landing on the shores of this country; but there had been something like an insurrection in Ireland, and in March, 1867, Lord Strathnairn wrote to the effect that the action of the military Departments under his command during the Fenian insurrection made him sensible of the want of a superior military officer to act as Controller, in order to insure the efficient execution of his orders. When it was understood that the Secretary for War had determined to act on the Report of Lord Strathnairn's Committee, and to appoint a Controller General, with another distinguished officer as an assistant, it was supposed that order was likely to come out of chaos, and that, instead of the military Departments of this country being the most extravagant and inefficient of any in the world, they would, by the supervision of Sir Henry Storks, assisted by that able officer, General Balfour, be brought under proper control. All these hopes, however, were fated to be dashed. Instead of a Controller, they had something like the two Kings of Brentford, and those two officers were wholly powerless to carry out the system which they thought absolutely necessary. He could not understand how the Secretary of State, who was responsible for the efficiency of the army, could consent to submit to such a control in the matter of finances as the Treasury proposed to establish. The Treasury ought only to have the power of simply auditing accounts, and seeing that they were properly kept and checked. The Secretary of State for War, who was responsible for the efficiency of the army, should be subject only to the control of the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who should have the power of saying he could not give so much money in a particular year. The Secretary of State for War would, therefore, still be responsible even if this control-in-chief were carried out. When they all hoped that everything was going on smoothly, the Controller-in-Chief was checkmated by the Treasury. The arrangement, as laid down in the last Treasury Minute, had been accepted by the right hon. Baronet; but had it been accepted by Sir Henry Storks? Sir Henry Storks and General Balfour were the very best men that could be selected to bring order out of a chaotic Department; but did they approve that arrangement? He said deliberately they did not. He believed the resignation of Sir Henry Storks was written out, and only held back at the request of the Secretary of State for War; and General Balfour, when he (Lord Elcho) saw him lately, said to him, "I do not think we can stay here, because it is impossible we can assent to the system proposed to be established." His answer to the General was that he hoped he would resign, as it was only by such a step that they would have any hope of the plan recommended by Lord Strathnairn being adopted. But if they did resign, whatever Secretaries of State *in esse* or *posse* might say, the country, the Press, and the House of Commons would insist on a better administration. If Sir Henry Storks and General Balfour had had their will on the 1st of April last a perfect system of control would have been in active operation—not in this country but in Ireland. To begin with he would give the House an opportunity of testing their opinions on this project in the most practical way. On the next Supply day he should move—

> "That it is the opinion of this House that the system of control and army supply proposed to be introduced into Ireland on the 1st of April last, as set forth in the letter of the 6th of March, 1868, addressed to the Treasury, be forthwith put into operation."

That would afford a clear test whether the House would stand by the Controller General as regarded the new system which it was proposed to establish, and he hoped the House would back him in bringing the Motion forward.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON agreed with the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) in regretting that the attendance in the House should be so thin on an occasion when a question of such great importance to the interest of the country was being discussed. He attributed the non-attendance of hon. Members at that period of the evening to the fact that most of them were under the impression that the subject would not come on for discussion until Vote 18 was proposed in Committee of Supply, and he himself was rather surprised that the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich (Major Jervis) should have brought the matter on unexpectedly. He further expressed his regret that hon. Members should come down to that House and make speeches on subjects of this importance, and then run away without stopping to hear the answer which the Minister had to make to their remarks. He begged the House to consider the position in which he stood at that moment. With the exception of his noble Friend the Member for Haddingtonshire, not a single Member who had addressed the House on this subject that evening was present to hear what he had to say in answer to the statements that had been made. The hon. and gallant Member for Harwich commenced the discussion by finding fault with Her Majesty's Government for the course they had taken upon this subject, and he now looked round in vain for that hon. Member. He had listened to the various speeches that had been delivered with an interest proportionate to the question before them, and he had observed with pleasure that the great characteristic of the debate had been an entire absence of party feeling. It was not a party subject, but one affecting their finances and defences, and which every one ought to regard with anxiety as being connected with the best interests of the country. Another characteristic of the debate was the extraordinary amount of misrepresentation that had distinguished the majority of the speeches, and none more remarkably so than the speech of his noble Friend the Member for Haddingtonshire; and he (Sir John Pakington) hoped before he concluded his observations that he should be able to show him that his alarms had really no foundation. Another speech singularly remarkable for its misapprehension was the speech of the hon. and gallant Officer the Member for Harwich who opened the debate. As the subject had been discussed without party feeling, he wished it to be considered without prejudice or misunderstanding; and therefore the best course he could adopt was to take *seriatim* the remarks that had been made by the various speakers, and to offer such observations in reply as they seemed to him to require. In the first place the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich had stated that he (Sir John Pakington) had asked Sir Henry Storks to accept the office of Controller-in-Chief as a financial and not as a military man. Sir Henry Storks was asked to undertake this important office partly because he had discharged with honour to himself his military duties wherever he had been engaged, but also, and to a great extent, no doubt, because of the very great change which it was hoped he would introduce into the expenditure of the country. For his own part he believed that he had been most fortunate in the selection of Sir Henry Storks, and he hoped and fully anticipitated that he would have the good fortune to see him for a long time to come in the office he now held. The next extraordinary misapprehension and mis-statement of his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Harwich who, he regretted had not returned to his seat, was that having selected Sir Henry Storks on account of his high character and distinguished abilities, and a confidence that he more than almost any other man was the man to discharge those difficult duties, he had now turned round upon him and declared that the Government did not want him any more. He could not understand how any hon. Gentleman having such long experience of Parliament as his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Harwich could use such wild, unfounded, and unjustifiable language. There was not a shadow or pretence of a foundation for it, and he was only sorry that the hon. and gallant Gentleman was not now present that he might tell him so to his face. He had not the slightest complaint to make of the calm and dispassionate manner in which his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro (Captain Vivian) had spoken, though he leant somewhat heavily upon the War Office, which he imagined to be a mass of confusion, extravagance, and blundering. The noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) stated with great truth that whatever the merits or demerits of that Department, it was undoubtedly the best abused under Her Majesty's Government. That there had been difficulties since its first establishment everybody must know, and no one better than the noble Lord who had been first Under Secretary and then Secretary of State for War. His own personal experience led him to believe that, on the whole perhaps, it was not the most parsimonious Office he had ever acted in; but great alterations and improvements had been effected, and he was simple enough to believe that it would hereafter work much more harmoniously. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro seemed to apprehend that they would not fulfil their promise of reform with reference to that Department; but he must tell his hon. and gallant Friend that his belief was that they would effect the reform which they had held out, and his confident belief was that if the House would only take a fair, dispassionate, and unprejudiced view of what had been done, they would find in them at least the germ of great reforms for the better working and administration of the army. His hon. and gallant Friend then adverted to Sir Henry Storks being a military man and the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) also made some remarks in that direction, and complained of the military element being so strong as it now was at the Board. He was aware that the subject had attracted attention out of doors, and that some very unfair comments had been made upon it. But with regard to Sir Henry Storks being a military man he ventured to remind the House that one of the reasons for his appointment was that he was a military man. His selection was further made in deference to the recommendation of Lord Strathnairn's Committee, which, rightly or wrongly, laid it down that, whatever course might be taken afterwards, the first Controller-in-Chief ought to be a military man. The Committee thought, and rightly thought, that a military man would be the most competent person to start that great change. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro said the Controller ought to be absolute; but he ventured to think that was a doctrine wholly at variance with constitutional principle. If any one were to be absolute in a Department, it must be the responsible Secretary of State, and to him all the officers in their several stations ought be subordinate. He never could agree that the Secretary of State was not absolute. In their system of government he must work in harmony with the Cabinet, and although he ought to be supreme in his own Department, he must, of course, be subjected to those checks and limits which the Constitution imposed on the whole of their system of government. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Oxfordshire (Colonel North) spoke in terms he was sorry to hear him use, and which he hardly expected to hear from him, but against which he entirely protested from its utter extravagance, that Sir Henry Storks had been reduced to a subordinate. The noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) had approached the subject, he was glad to say, in a singularly calm and temperate manner, and in the greater part of the speech of the noble Lord he most thoroughly concurred. With regard to the Letter, the omission of which had been commented upon, the occurrence was purely accidental, and there was no objection whatever to its production. As regarded the dates of the Regulations, these almost spoke for themselves; for evidently they had been the subject of very careful revision long before the day upon which they bore date. The noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire laid great stress upon the improved management of stores, and referred to the adoption by the Government of the greater portion of the plan proposed by the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield (Major Anson). He might add that it was after conference with Sir Henry Storks that he had accepted this portion of the plan; and, even if the hon. and gallant Member had not brought forward his proposals, they would have been carried out in substance by the authorities. He would ask the House to consider the nature of the objections which had been urged in the course of this debate to the proposals of the Government — chiefly by the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich, whom he was glad now to see in his place. Hon. Members seemed to think that the great objects for which the Controller-in-Chief was appointed had been abandoned; that he had been deprived of all the power which he ought to possess, and that an element of financial control had been introduced into the Administration. The noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire complained of the extravagance of the present system. But that was precisely one of the reasons why the Government had adopted this great change, in the hope of introducing economy. The noble Lord went on to say that the hopes which had been entertained and the prospects which had been held out were all dashed to the ground by the Papers which had been laid upon the table, and that instead of the Controller-in-Chief performing the functions for which he was appointed the Controller was himself to be controlled. He challenged his noble Friend, who had laid down these opinions without the slightest argument or proof in their support, to point out to him in what part of these Papers there was anything to show that Sir Henry Storks had been interfered with or subjected to undue control. Now, in answer to what had fallen from his hon. and gallant Friends the Members for Harwich and Oxfordshire, he might say that Sir Henry Storks was strongly of opinion that the Controller-in-Chief ought not to be an Under Secretary of State. Sir Henry Storks also fully admitted that constitutionally whoever held the office of Controller-in-Chief must be and ought to be subjected to financial control and check. Now, a great deal had been said about the Estimates, and the hon. and gallant Member for Truro had alluded to the impolicy of taking out of the hands of the Controller-in-Chief the preparation of the Estimates of his Department. But no such proposal had been made. The word employed in these Estimates was not to "prepare" but to "compile" the Estimates, as the following passage would show:—

> "Their Lordships think it should be the duty of the Finance Department to compile the Estimates of all army expenditure, as hitherto."

The Estimates had always been prepared by the different Departments to which they related, and it was not now intended to alter the present system in that respect. Unless, therefore, it was laid down—a principle that the noble Lord distinctly avoided—that the Controller-in-Chief was to be, as the hon. and gallant Member for Truro said, absolute in the War Office, unless he was to have higher authority than even the Secretary of State himself—["No, no!"]—it was impossible to allow him to prepare Estimates which were to be subject to no financial examination whatever, because it was clearly laid down in these Papers that the financial officer should not upon his own authority be at liberty to veto any proposal. The whole power, beyond preparing the Estimates of his own Department, would be in the hands of the Secretary of State alone, and the financial officer would have no more than the power which the financial officer ought to have of examining the financial results and the financial effects of the plans brought forward in the particular department. In following the speeches of hon. Members he had been struck with their declamatory nature—["No, no!"]—with the sort of general objections urged against these Papers, those objections being unsupported by anything like argument. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Oxfordshire (Colonel

North), for instance, had compared the position of Sir Henry Storks to that of a waiter.

Colonel NORTH said, he had not stated that the position of Sir Henry Storks was like that of a waiter. What he had said was that his position resembled that in which the two kings of Brentford found themselves—that there was another on an equality with himself, and that it was utterly impossible that such distinguished officers as Sir Henry Storks could be induced to submit to such a position.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: If the hon. and gallant Gentleman maintained that the Controller-in-Chief was in that position, all he could say was that that was not his opinion. His hon. and gallant Friend laboured under a great misapprehension, and he, for one, would not have been a party to those Regulations if he had thought for one moment that they would have affected the high, distinguished, and powerful position which the Controller-in-Chief, whether that Controller-in-Chief were Sir Henry Storks or any one else, did and ought to occupy to enable him to carry out the important duties intrusted to him; but he could not help feeling that the view taken by his hon. Friend behind him was one which tended unduly to exaggerate the position in which the Controller-in-Chief ought constantly to be placed. When, however, he was asked if Sir Henry Storks had not written out his resignation, and whether that resignation had only been withdrawn at his earnest request, all he could say was that this was the first he had heard of it, and he did not believe that Sir Henry Storks would at this moment abandon the very important duty which he had undertaken, and which now appeared likely to be soon brought to a successful completion. The noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) had remarked that it had been intended to introduce this system into Ireland on the 1st of April, and that that had not yet been done. That was so, but it arose from the fact that before they could attempt to introduce and bring into actual operation this great and mighty change it was necessary to consult the Treasury. There had been a good deal of correspondence on the subject, and he could not think that it was a matter for great surprise that in so great and important a change as this the Departments of the State interested should have time for consideration. When, however, his noble Friend (Lord Elcho) said that on the Army Estimates again coming before the House he should move that this introduction should be made forthwith, he could only tell him that on the previous day Sir Henry Storks had said to him, "I suppose when the debates in the House of Commons are over it will be introduced immediately." It would, he could assure his noble Friend, be introduced as soon as it was constitutionally possible to do so. He would, in conclusion, ask the House calmly to consider whether they ought not rather to look at the great magnitude of the change they were now seeking to introduce, than be too apt, as some of his hon. Friends had been, to find fault with comparatively minute and petty details of the scheme. It had been no easy matter to take five different departments, hitherto under five separate heads, and place them under one person; and though such a change would, he fully believed, tend to greater efficiency and economy, it was impossible to carry out such a scheme without some of the details being exposed, with more or less justice, to the criticisms of these who felt an interest in the subject. The great object, however, was to start the scheme, and if the House would now give it their sanction, as he trusted they would, a great improvement would in his belief have been effected in our system of administration.

Mr. CHILDERS said, it was disheartening to one who, like himself, thought the proposed change would be conducive to good administration, to find that speeches on the subject had been delivered to an audience consisting at one time of only thirteen Members, nine of whom were soldiers, two officials, and two independent civilians. But however disheartening this might be, he would venture to offer a few words on the subject. And in doing so he was speaking under considerable disadvantage, because, in one sense, this was essentially a question of detail, and some of the most important Papers were really not placed before the House. The Royal Warrant of the 28th of April was the subject of a long Paper by the Treasury, and that important Letter was by accident omitted to be published. The other Papers did not touch some of the questions raised by the Treasury; and it was very embarrassing not to have the real facts before them, but to have to dig them out from letters which only answered the express proposal and to go back to Lord

Strathnairn's Committee, and by that process to know what was the real controversy. One part of the omission had been amusingly made up by the noble Lord (Lord Elcho), who told the House of a conversation he had had with Members of the Government, in which he informed them the best thing they could do was to resign. This was like his noble Friend's story in the Reform debates of 1866, when he described his own proposal to resign with the right hon. Member for Calne on Lord Aberdeen's Reform Bill. His noble Friend appeared very fond of these harmless resigning conspiracies. Having, however, a sincere respect for the two gentlemen, he trusted that they would persevere, in which case they could not fail to render the country very important service. In this case he did not look forward to the disastrous consequences apprehended by the noble Lord. He had a right to take some interest in this subject, because the original appointment of Lord Strathnairn's Committee was made on the recommendation of the Treasury when he was Secretary. A proposal of the War Office of a limited kind came before the Treasury; but, instead of carrying out the inquiry in detail in a particular part of the country, the Treasury, feeling the deep importance of going to the root of the matter, saw that the application of the principle in question must go a great deal further, and bring up the whole question of the re-organization of the army. Accordingly, on the 6th of January, 1866, he wrote a letter to the War Office, the result of which was the appointment of Lord Strathnairn's Committee. But the Instructions to that Committee, dated the 29th of June, 1866, distinctly referred only to the arrangements in regard to stores, military train, and transport. The great object of the Committee was to inquire to what extent a combination of the non-combatant Departments in regard to the matters referred to them could be carried out. But the proposal to swallow up, in the new Controller's Department, all the financial check now exercised by an office, subordinate to the Secretary of State for that purpose, was made by the eminent military officers on the Commission, unasked. With regard to the details of the financial control system as now suggested by the Treasury he confessed he could not understand the precise difference between the two parties. Of course he did not treat as party to the controversy his noble Friend (Lord Elcho) whose ideas of financial regulation were probably shared by no one, in or out of the House. It was impossible to argue with with anyone who imagined seriously that the Treasury was simply an Office for auditing the Public Accounts. As to the noble Lord's scheme, if they wanted to have financial confusion, extravagance, and bankruptcy, the best way of securing it was to leave everything to the Departments, and say that the Treasury should have no control over the expenditure. No one who had any knowledge of the administration of our finances would deny that it was absolutely necessary that the expenditure of the various Departments should be checked by financial officers independent of administrative officers. The House would entirely throw away its power over its public Departments if it acceded to the views of the noble Lord. As to the control over the military expenditure, and to the confusion being due to the existence of too many checks, he would remind the House that during the Peninsular War there was a greater civilian check over the War Office expenditure than there had been since, and that the Minister who exercised that check, Lord Palmerston, was a civilian, not a Secretary of State, or even a Member of the Cabinet. Whatever faults existed in our army administration at that period, the check on the expenditure was certainly satisfactory, and nobody would then have thought of laying down the doctrine of undivided control of the military expenditure which had been advanced to-night. As to the arrangements of France and India, they pointed in a direction quite opposite to the conclusions of those who resisted a proper check on military expenditure. In France the War Office was divided into several Departments, and the Department of Finance was perfectly distinct from that of Administration, and embraced almost exactly the duties which were proposed to be assigned to the Financial Under Secretary. With regard to India, he had before him the valuable evidence given before Lord Strathnairn's Committee by General Balfour, to whom, with General Jameson, the present efficient organization of the Indian army was so largely owing. At first there was a Military Finance Commission, and this resulted in a Military Financial Department; General Balfour being at the head of it. Its functions were to examine into all sources of military expenditure, and control all permanent and contingent military expenses; while at the same time it was not to interfere with the functions of the local governments, of the established military authorities, or the executive heads of the several branches of the service. The Military Finance Commission and Military Finance Department were expressly founded on the principle that they were not to have executive or administrative functions, their sole duty being to examine, check, and control the expenditure and the arrangements made by the responsible military officers. If India, therefore, was an example, and General Balfour an authority, we ought to follow the system which had there succeeded so admirably, and have a control exercised over the expenditure entirely distinct from the executive control. He did not wish to enter into the important question whether the proposal now made by the War Office and the Treasury could be deemed a final one, and whether it would set at rest all the disadvantages under which the War Office laboured. He was inclined to think that the War Office would require further and gradual improvements before it was brought into an efficient state. He entirely agreed with Sir Charles Trevelyan that the financial duties of the War Office were too great to be entrusted to an Assistant Under Secretary; and that as now proposed the nominal Under Secretaries would soon have nothing to do. All this pointed to questions as to the Horse Guards, which he should not now touch. As to the question of audit, he would warn hon. Members against supposing that an external audit was a very simple matter. It was quite impossible that everything could be audited by a department outside the Military Department. There must be a certain amount of detailed audit inside as well as an independent audit outside, and our policy ought to be to draw the line between the two at the proper point. He believed it was not so drawn now, for the simple appropriation audit to which the Controller and Auditor General was now confined was not sufficient, and it must be carried much further with respect to voucher and authority. Still he was sure that the entire audit of military accounts could not be carried out efficiently and cheaply by a department outside the War Office, and he trusted, therefore, that the House would pause before adopting such a Resolution. On the whole he would repeat that the relations between the War Office and the Commander-in-Chief were of a very delicate nature, and if the present organization of the former was too violently interfered with without dealing with the Horse Guards we might bring upon ourselves much greater difficulties than those now confronting us. Many people looked forward to the time when we might have a simple and uniform system, under which all the executive functions of the War Office and the Horse Guards would be concentrated, and, those functions being so concentrated, there would be no difficulty in organizing a simple financial check upon them. The decision come to by the War Office and Treasury was, on the whole, the best that could be come to under the circumstances, having regard to its being beyond doubt only a make-shift, in view of far more important changes.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY—TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES.

OBSERVATIONS.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he had heard with surprise that officers returning home from Abyssinia had been deprived of their travelling allowance. He had given Notice to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient that officers returning home on account of wounds or diseases contracted in Her Majesty's service shall be deprived of the usual travelling allowance."

He did not wish to trouble the House with a formal Motion; but he hoped he should have from the Secretary for War an assurance that officers returning home should no longer be deprived of this allowance.

ARMY—INCREASE OF MILITARY EXPENDITURE.—OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Before the Secretary for War replies to the hon. Baronet who has just sat down, I should like to introduce one other subject to the notice of the Committee, as this may be the last appropriate opportunity of doing so this Session. Two months ago the Secretary for War made some observations regarding the expenditure of the present Government, and accompanied them by an attack upon the administration of the late Government. The right hon. Baronet referred principally to the increases in the Votes for Men and for Armaments, and the effect of his observations was to give currency to an impression that the increase which the present Government found it necessary to propose had been brought about, at least to some extent, by the negligence and parsimony of the late Government. Respecting the first item the right hon. Baronet said, "Look at the state in which you left the ranks and look at their state now." But I deny the late Government was negligent in this matter. In the first place the House will remember that the two or three years before the late Government left Office were most trying to the recruiting staff. Many of the men who enlisted at the time of the Crimean War were claiming their discharge, so that a great want of troops suddenly arose, and this unfortunately occurred at a time when employment was plentiful, and when men were consequently scarce. The Government considered its position in the light of this extraordinary combination of circumstances, and concluded it would not be wise to take immediate steps to meet the difficulty; they were especially unwilling to resort to offers of increased pay or larger bounty, and thinking the whole subject of sufficient importance, they referred it to a Royal Commission. These being the facts of the case, I do not see that the increased expenditure which has been incurred by the Government on account of the men can fairly be attributed to the negligence or parsimony of the late Government. Now, respecting the armament, the right hon. Baronet has said on one or two occasions—and he has been supported by the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel)—that the late Government did next to nothing in the shape of armaments. I have explained the policy of the late Government on this head already; I have asserted the late Government provided fortifications only for those forts it was absolutely necessary to arm, and I maintain the late Government acted wisely in this respect; indeed, the right hon. Gentleman confesses as much himself in the speech to which I allude. He said he could not give the late Government credit for knowing what was likely to occur, and he held that the fortunate result was perfectly accidental and could not be put down to prescience. But is it possible that at the time when the controversy between Sir William Armstrong and Mr. Whitworth was going on, when the 7-inch gun was being tried against the 9-inch, and when the best method of rifling was as yet undecided—is it possible those who were superintending those inquiries could have been unaware that we were still far from perfection in the construction of heavy armaments? We all knew in those days that while we could make an efficient and expensive gun it was probable that in the next year we should be able to make a better gun at less cost, and that in the following year greater perfection and greater economy would most probably be secured. We have been told it would be necessary to spend £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 on that item. I should be very glad to hear what are the details of that Estimate; but, taking the calculations made by the right hon. Gentleman, it is impossible to discover how that estimate has been arrived at. He says it will be necessary to provide 1,000 heavy guns, and about 3,000 guns of lighter construction. Assuming that it would be necessary to arm the forts with 1,000 large guns, I think that estimate was made when guns were made smaller than they are now, and that a fewer number of our present large guns would suffice. I presume the right hon. Gentleman would say that it would not be necessary for those large guns to be on an average of a larger calibre than nine inches. I suppose that some other guns, 7-inch or 8-inch, will be necessary; but I think we shall not be wrong in taking the average as 9-inch. Nine-inch guns could be made for about £800 each, and 1,000 of them would therefore cost £800,000; and doubling that sum for carriages and ammunition the total cost would be £1,600,000. A further sum of £1,200,000 for the smaller guns would raise that total to £2,800,000, and he was curious to know how the right hon. Gentleman had doubled that already sufficiently large Estimate. The right hon. Gentleman has said, "Look at the state in which you left the breech-loaders. The late Government have done nothing with regard to breech-loaders." I think that assertion hardly justified. I will remind the House very briefly what has been done. Two years before the accession of the present Government to Office the late Government appointed a Committee which decided in the first place that breech-loaders ought to be introduced into the army. That may not seem much; but at that time there was great difference of opinion on the subject among military men. That Committee having decided in favour of breech-loaders, the late Government instituted an inquiry as to the best mode of converting muzzle-loaders into breech-loaders. The result was that no system was presented to them which was entirely satisfactory. But experiments were conducted under the orders of the late Government which resulted in the adoption of Mr Snider's method, and in the perfection of the cartridge which bears the name of Colonel Boxer. In moving the Estimates of 1866 I was able to state that 40,000 muzzle-loaders would be converted that year. Now, what is the statement of the right hon. Gentleman? He has said, if reported correctly, which I can hardly believe, that we had only converted eighteen or nineteen, but had ordered 40,000 to be converted, whereas my successor undertook to convert 200,000 by machinery, at the cost of a £1 apiece. Now, when the right hon. Gentleman informed the House that circumstances had made it necessary in his opinion that conversion should go on faster than we had intended, he stated that there was nothing in the conduct of the late Government which he could find fault with. Now, the eighteen or nineteen muzzle-loaders that were converted were only intended as samples; we had resolved to convert 40,000, and all that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Huntingdon did was to increase the number that was to be converted in the Small Arms Factory and also to be made by the trade. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir John Pakington) had shown that it cost £1,300 to test a 9-inch gun; but that was a process which was seldom resorted to, and then only to test the endurance of any new gun which might be adopted. The Estimates which I had the honour of moving in 1866 amounted to £14,095,000; the Estimates of this year amount to £15,455,000, showing an increase of £1,360,000. Vote 1, which is the Vote for Pay of the Men, has been increased within these two years by £387,000; Votes 12 and 13, which bear the whole expenditure of the Manufacturing Departments have been increased by £98,000; making an increase under these heads of £485,000. Therefore, on a total increase of £1,360,000, only £485,000 are due to the increase under both these heads; and therefore the total expenditure on the army in two years has been increased at the rate of 9 per cent, while on these two Votes the increase has been only 7 per cent. Now, it is impossible for me, or for any independent Member of Parliament, to go through the Votes and say what Votes have been unduly increased. On the contrary, I think that, when there is not one Vote in the Army Estimates which has not been increased, it is for the right hon. Gentleman to come down and show the House what the necessity was for that increase. I say it is impossible for independent Members to criticize the Votes in detail, or to say where reductions might be made, because we have not got the information. There is only one Vote in which I could say that there has been a perfectly unnecessary increase and that is the Militia Vote. There is one thing about which no complaint has been made, and that is as to the number of men in the Militia and Volunteers, and yet there has been a very large increase in the Militia Vote. That increase has been due to these two circumstances—the pay of the Militia has been raised 2*d.* a day, in my opinion a perfectly unnecessary and wasteful increase; and in the next place the right hon. Gentleman has raised the Militia establishment from two-thirds, at which a great many of the regiments stood for some years, to the full establishment. I think, and a great many Militia officers agree with me, that 1,000 men is a greater number than it is possible to train within a period of eight weeks. If they were in garrison it would be a different thing. It may be said that this increase of the Militia establishment is part of the Reserve plan; but it is no part of the plan of the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon. I have reason to believe that whenever an emergency arose it would be easy to get as many men as would be required; and therefore I say that this increase of the Militia establishment is perfectly unnecessary. As I have said before, it is impossible for independent Members to go through every Vote in detail; but I have made these few remarks because the statement of the right hon. Gentlemen has led to the impression that the increase in the expenditure was due to parsimony of the late Government.

General Peel: I came down here with great curiosity to know how my noble Friend) the Marquess of Hartington) was to justify that address which he has made to his constituents—in which he has said that the present Government have greatly raised the Army Estimates without securing increased efficiency—while he is prepared to maintain that the Government to which he belonged maintained the army in efficiency with an expenditure much less than that which is now incurred. Now, there can be no graver accusation brought against a Government than an increase of Estimates without a corresponding increase of efficiency. As I am responsible for much that has been done, I wish to say a few words. If the Army was in that state of efficiency which my noble Friend wishes us to believe, why was it necessary in 1866, before any of those events occurred on the Continent, which made nations look to their defences, that my noble Friend should appoint a Royal Commission—to do what? Why, to ascertain how it was that they could not get the men they wanted. If the army was in the state of efficiency he describes, why was the late Government called upon to appoint a Commission? Of whom did that Commission consist? There were five politicians upon it. Among the Members were Lord Dalhousie, Viscount Eversley, the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread), and the hon. Member for Longford (Major O'Reilly) sitting on the other side of the House, and the subject of recruiting was not the only point on which they reported. Another question referred to them was how we were to obtain an Army of Reserve. Then, again, will my noble Friend say that the army was in a state of efficiency when it had not enough men, when it had no Army of Reserve, and when it was armed with muzzle-loaders? Does he imagine that he could provide the army with breech-loaders without an increase of expenditure? As to the additional *2d.* a day which was given to the troops, I do not believe there is a man in or out of this House who grudges this addition. The House will bear in mind that in 1867, in addition to the ordinary casualties amounting to more than 50,000, there were 22,000 men entitled to their discharge — not, as my noble Friend supposes, on account of the recruiting which went on during the Crimean War, but of the second battalions raised during the Indian Mutiny. I can tell you that these men were waiting to know what you would do for them; and if you had not added then to the pay of the army, every one of them would have taken his discharge. Do not therefore let it go forth, just before a General Election, that the present Government were extravagant in increasing the Estimates, whereas the late Government reduced their Estimates, at the same time maintaining the efficiency of the army. But then my noble Friend says, "Were not your Estimates increased?" No doubt they were, and why? Because you made wrong calculations from beginning to end. There was a deficiency in the first seven of your Votes to the amount of no less than £300,000. Then, says my noble Friend, "Why increase the number of the Militia?" Because this arose out of the recommendation of your own Royal Commission. Instead of 40,000 breech-loaders, as you proposed, the supply to the troops was raised to 200,000. If this had not been done, not only would you not have been able to send them to Canada, but I doubt whether your troops in Abyssinia would have been supplied with them. If the Government are accused of extravagance on account of this extra expenditure, I question whether the country will find fault with it. I have no personal interest in this matter. It is not my intention to go into Parliament again; but I warn the noble Lord that, so far from finding fault with increased Estimates, if he comes into Office again he will probably have to increase them still further. With regard to the fortifications and their armaments, the noble Lord says that under the late Administration these were proceeding gradually. Yes, they certainly were—very gradually. The Fortification Vote is not one for which the present Government is responsible. You had planned the fortifications, and you did not provide a single gun for them. Surely, my noble Friend does not pretend to say that all this can be done without an increased expenditure? At any rate, when he declares that the late Government were excessively economical, and the present Government excessively extravagant, I agree with him, that the country must judge between us.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: I am sorry to have to add anything to the not very long, but very effective speech of my right hon. and gallant Friend (General Peel). But the noble Marquess referred so directly to me, especially in connection with a speech made by me in this House, that I must be allowed a few words in reply. In addressing his constituents the noble Lord says that under the present Administration the Army Estimates have been largely increased, and he is prepared to maintain that, while under their predecessors the military expenditure gradually decreased, the efficiency of the army was in no degree diminished. Now, I do not wish to make any unfair imputations; but it is difficult to read this extract without coming to the conclusion with my right hon. and gallant Friend that there seems to be some desire to impress the country with the idea that, while the late Government was extremely careful, the present Government was extremely extravagant. In justice to the present Government I must state distinctly that I do not think the noble Lord has it in his power to justify that address. There has been no extravagance on the part of the present Government, and, moreover, I maintain there has been no increase of Estimates which the noble Lord himself would not have been obliged to adopt if he had remained in Office, and a change of Government had not occurred. He says to his constituents that under the late Government the efficiency of the army was in no degree diminished. Well, but our object was that the efficiency of the army should be increased, and that efficiency could not be increased until, in some way or another, breech-loaders were supplied to the army. That is, in fact, the question of the hour. With regard to the speech which the noble Lord criticized, he was unable to establish anything like inaccuracy in it; and he admitted the truth of my statement that when he went out of Office there were only 20,000 or 30,000 breech-loaders, made by hand, at a large expense. I do not mean to say that he was going to provide the whole army with them at that rate of expenditure. But that was the state of things which compelled my right hon. and gallant Friend (General Peel) to increase our expenditure upon that item. The noble Lord says that I accused the late Government of negligence and undue parsimony. I made no such charge. The speech to which he refers was not made as an attack upon the late Government. It was made because the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone), without any notice, assailed the Estimates of the present Government, using harsh language, and declaring that our conduct respecting the Estimates was a subject of discredit and dispraise. Surely, the House will admit that, although I had no notice whatever of that attack, it was my duty to vindicate the Government as far as I could, and in doing so I referred to the fact which the noble Lord has entirely admitted, that it is to the present Government and the administration of my right hon. and gallant Friend (General Peel) that the credit was due of providing the army with those breech-loaders, which were indispensable to their efficiency, and which of course could not be provided without an increased charge. But let me deal with the statements of the noble Lord a little more closely; and as the noble Lord gave me private notice of his intention to mention the subject I am able to do so. Let us see the amount of the Army Estimates for the last five years. In 1863-4 they had risen to the large sum of £15,000,000. The noble Lord boasts that the late Government gradually decreased them. Well, in 1864-5 they were decreased by £200,000—I give the round numbers. In 1865-6 there was a further decrease of £500,000. 1866-7 was the last year in which the noble Lord prepared the Estimates, and they were then £14,340,000. In the summer of that year there was a change of Government, and what was the first act of my right hon. and gallant Friend (General Peel)? It was to ask the House to assent to an increased expenditure of £245,000 in order to effect that great object of providing the army with breech-loaders. Including that expenditure, the Estimates stood at £14,340,000. In 1867-8 the Estimates were prepared by my right hon. and gallant Friend; but it devolved upon me early in the year to undertake the administration of this Department. Well, that is the only year in which there was an increase of Estimates. And what was it? It amounted to £912,000, and I can account to within 1*s*. for that increase, so as to show that the present Government are not open to the charge of extravagance. The main cause of the increase was the addition of 2*d*. to the pay of the Army, wisely proposed by my right hon. and gallant Friend. He adopted this plan in deference to the Report of the Royal Commission, which, under the pressure of absolute necessity, from want of men and difficulty in recruiting, was appointed by the noble Lord opposite. The Commission advised certain modes of improving the condition of the soldier. It was thought advisable to improve their rations, to give them certain articles of clothing, and in various ways improve their condition. But my right hon. and gallant Friend (General Peel) said, "If you want to improve the condition of the soldier, and tempt a better class of men into the Army, give more money;" and he decided on giving the soldier an extra 2*d*. a day. What would have been the financial result if the plan of the Commission had been carried out? Would there have been any economy? No, Sir; I believe that if my right hon. and gallant

Friend, instead of taking the course he did, had carried out the recommendations of the Commission, the financial result would have been an expenditure far larger than that occasioned by adding 2*d.* a day to the pay of the soldier. This addition of 2*d.* accounts for nearly one-half of the £912,000 increase in the Estimates of that year, and I have a statement of the items which constitute the other half. They are as follows:—Furlough pay, £20,000; increased pay to medical officers under the Medical Warrant, £18,000; unavoidable expenses caused by the extent to which recruiting was resorted to on account of the number of "expired" men which fell within the year, £69,500; increased cost of provisions and forage, £92,700; the taking over of the Straits' Settlements, £76,000; additional charges in connection with Ceylon, £32,000; additional charges for Australia, £20,000; biennial extra issues of clothing, £67,000; and head-dresses of Cavalry and Artillery issued quadriennially, £11,300, making a total for clothing of £79,100; leap year, £24,700; miscellaneous charges (including £14,800 for rewards to inventors, £19,600 on account of contagious diseases, and £13,000 for the hospital ship at Hong Kong), £47,400; capitation grant to Volunteers, £15,800; retired full pay of non-effective infantry, artillery, and engineers, £12,040; and out pensions (higher pensions being on an average granted to men on discharge), £9,000; all these items making a grand total of £516,240. These items and the extra 2*d.* give an inconsiderable amount beyond the difference between the Estimates of the two years. I hope the statement will satisfy the House that the noble Lord has no right, either in Lancashire or here, to accuse the present Government of having indulged in extravagant Estimates. I have shown that the Estimates must have been submitted by himself if he had remained in Office, and that there is really no ground for the charge he has made. Referring to the Estimates of the probable expenditure to which the country sooner or later must be put in order to arm our fortifications with proper guns, the noble Lord alluded to this passage in my speech—

> "According to the calculation of scientific men competent to give an opinion on the subject, it will be necessary, in order to arm the fortifications which are being constructed, to provide 1,044 additional guns of large calibre—12-inch, 9-inch, and 7-inch guns—and also 2,500 guns of a lighter character. The right hon. Gentleman says that if a change of Government occurs the future Government must effect a large reduction of expenditure. Now any future Government must and ought to endeavour to effect every economy consistent with the efficiency of the public service; but I presume that the right hon. Gentleman will not be prepared to contend that we are to leave the fortifications of this country without guns in them. It is the duty of the Government to arm these fortifications; and this aggregate number of 3,500 guns of large and small calibre, indispensable as they are for the safety and protection of the country, cannot be manufactured under an expenditure of from £4,000,000 to £5,000,000."—[3 *Hansard*, cxci. 1755.]

The noble Lord says this is an exaggerated calculation. In his Estimate the noble Lord brought up the cost of these guns to £3,000,000. I will not enter into the question whether the noble Lord is right or I am; but I made my statement after reference to the most competent authorities. I must remind the noble Lord that not only will a number of guns be required for the new fortifications in progress, but a number of guns will be required on account of the changes in the armament of our fortresses in all parts of the world. With regard to the cost of testing guns, about which my statement was said to be inaccurate, the fact is my figures greatly understated the cost. I believe they were correct as to the 9-inch guns, to which I referred, and the testing of which cost £1,300. With guns of a large calibre the expense is much greater; and since I made my speech I have been informed that in one case the cost was between £2,000 and £3,000; but that applies not to every gun, but to new patterns as they are invented. Therefore, I think that in that speech I did not make any exaggerated statements, and the noble Lord was not justified in casting the imputation he did on the present Government. In reply to the question of the hon. Member for Devizes (Mr. Darby Griffith), I must decline to produce a copy of the censure passed by the Horse Guards upon an officer of the Grenadier Guards. We are fortunate in having at the head of the army a most efficient Commander-in-Chief, to whom no one will be inclined to attribute undue severity; and it would be a most dangerous precedent as affecting the discipline of the army to lay on the table such a document as that referred to. In answer to the hon. Member for King's County (Sir Patrick O'Brien,) who has brought forward a case of promotion in the Coldstream Guards, I have to state that it appears to me that what I have already said on that subject is correct, and that the Commander-in-Chief has exercised a sound discretion with regard to it. With reference to the Question about travelling allowances to officers on sick leave, the House will naturally suppose that there is an individual case in point of an officer who came home on sick leave; and he was not in strictness, under the warrant, entitled to the particular allowances that were refused him.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £1,291,400, be granted to Her Majesty (in addition to the sum of £200,000 already voted on account), towards defraying the Charge for Military Store Departments, for the supply and repair of Warlike and other Stores, including Manufacturing Departments, which will come in course of payment from the 1st day of April 1868 to the 31st day of March 1869, inclusive."

MAJOR ANSON said, he had on a former occasion gone into this question at some length, and therefore he would not trouble the House farther than to say that they had no information whatever how this Vote was to be applied. Much had been said about army control; but the fact was that the House had no control whatever over the Manufacturing Departments. They had no information before them as to what would be the result of this addition to the plant of the Department. He begged, therefore, to move that the Vote be reduced by £43,442, the sum required for new machinery. He would divide the Committee upon his Amendment.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON appealed to his hon. and gallant Friend not to press his Motion to a division. It was a mistake to suppose that this sum of £43,442 was required for the purpose of extending the operations of the manufacturing establishments. These operations would not be extended, and, indeed, he shared in the opinion of his hon. and gallant Friend that to a considerable extent, at all events, we ought to obtain our supplies of stores by contract with private firms. The explanation of the increase was that it was caused by such items as these—That in the Gun Carriage Department iron had been substituted for wood in the manufacture of the carriages; in the Gun Factory a new forge was wanted, and there were numerous alterations in the Royal Laboratory, in the Small Arms Department, and in the Gunpowder Department. After making this explanation, he hoped his hon. and gallant Friend would not press his Motion.

GENERAL DUNNE inquired whether a gun of any heavy calibre had been fixed on for arming the fortifications now in course of construction; and whether any changes in the field gun now in use had been adopted for the army? The late military Government—if it could be termed a Government—did nothing in regard to this matter; they had left the service practically unarmed, while other European nations were adopting improvements; and he wished to know whether we were still in a state of transition, or whether any definite conclusion had been at length arrived at?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he was not aware that any change had been made with respect to field guns. Fortification guns were of various sizes, including some very large ones. The question of small arms was still under the consideration of a Committee, which he hoped would present its Report before the close of the year.

COLONEL BARTTELOT said, he had always been opposed to the increase of our manufacturing establishments, as he believed that they checked private enterprize, which would supply the country better than these public departments. The question he wished now to press upon his right hon. Friend was this—Had he yet come to a definite conclusion with respect to the guns that were to be adopted? If not, he thought the hon. and gallant Member (Major Anson) would do right to press his Amendment, because they might soon be called upon to vote money for a different article than that they were now using.

MR. AYTOUN said, it was clear that if this sum of £43,000 were granted for improved machinery, the result must be an extension of the manufacturing establishments, unless, indeed, a corresponding quantity of the old machinery were thrown out of use.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON explained that, although the Government had no intention of extending the operations of the manufacturing establishments, yet they desired to render them as efficient as possible by the introduction of new machinery. In answer to his hon. and gallant Friend

(Colonel Barttelot) he had already explained that they were now manufacturing guns for fortifications of various calibres and sizes.

Major ANSON said, the articles manufactured in the public Departments amounted to £200,000, while those furnished by private enterprize amounted only to £10,000. This was not sufficient inducement to the private manufacturers to cause a competition. He was convinced that the only way to stop the Government making such an unaccountable expenditure as that proposed in this Vote was by taking the sense of the House by a vote on the subject.

General PEEL said, he hoped his hon. and gallant Friend would not persevere in dividing the Committee, because if he did so he would fail in securing the object he had in view. It had been distinctly stated that the money was only required to alter and improve, and not to extend the machinery establishments of the Government. He trusted that his hon. and gallant Friend would not persevere with his Amendment.

Mr. M'LAREN said, that if the Government establishments were conducted on the same principles as those on which private workshops were managed, the keeping up of existing machinery would come into the profit and loss of the year. He thought that the present discussion showed how deceptive were all the statements made respecting Government manufactures, and the sooner these establishments were dropped the better.

Mr. MONSELL said, that if his hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) had read the Report of the Committee which on this question sat two years ago, he would have seen that a very minute investigation was made by that Committee, and that very careful calculations then showed that ordnance was manufactured at Woolwich at considerably less cost than in the works of private manufacturers, for this reason — that private manufacturers would not turn their attention to making breech-loading guns and other articles only used for military purposes without having a reasonable certainty that there would be a continued demand for them. Now, the Government could give no guarantee on the subject, because they could not anticipate what might be required at a future time.

Major ANSON said, he had studied the Report of the Committee referred to by the right hon. Gentleman; but all he could derive from it was the conclusion that it was utterly impossible to make out whether there was a profit or a loss, so badly were the accounts of the Manufacturing Departments kept under the existing system. With regard to what had been said about the private trade not turning their attention to the manufacture of guns and gun-carriages, he thought that fact was to be attributed to our keeping up those establishments. Why was it that ours was the only Government which did not go to the private trade for such articles? If we went to them they would turn their attention to the manufacture of guns and gun-carriages suited for the artillery. Sir Benjamin Hawes stated, in his evidence, that the private trade of the country had never had a fair chance, in consequence of the large establishments being provided.

Motion made, and Question put,

"That a sum, not exceeding £1,247,958, be granted to Her Majesty (in addition to the sum of £200,000 already voted on account), towards defraying the Charge for Military Store Departments, for the supply and repair of Warlike and other Stores, including Manufacturing Departments, which will come in course of payment from the 1st day of April 1868 to the 31st day of March 1869, inclusive."—(*Major Anson.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 31; Noes 100: Majority 69.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £119,300, to complete the sum for Military Education.

(3.) £93,600, to complete the sum for Surveys.

Mr. CHILDERS doubted the necessity of increasing the sum annually voted for this purpose.

Mr. Alderman LUSK wished to know how long the survey was to continue?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that it was so steadily going on that it would take sixteen years to complete it.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE also deprecated any increase, remarking that it was a practice on the part of Governments always to increase the Votes, though, when not in power, they were fond of complaining that their opponents were not economical in their proposals.

General DUNNE observed, that the increase was principally for civil assistants, and preparation of maps for civil purposes.

Mr. WYLD said, that this Department, though originally established for a temporary purpose, figured year after year in the Estimates for a very large sum, and much money had been wasted in this survey, inasmuch as the results it had produced might have been attained at a much smaller outlay. It had already cost something like £2,000,000; an amount enormously exceeding what the French paid for their survey, which was as good or better. It was, perhaps, too late in the Session to propose to dwell at any length on the subject; but a new Parliament would, he trusted, see that the public money was not expended in so ill-considered and extravagant a manner as it was at present. He thought that the Estimate should not form part of the Army Votes, but should be placed to a separate account, and then proper attention would be given to it. In his opinion the increase proposed was unnecessary. The cost of engraving the survey was excessive; and if a Committee were granted to inquire into the whole conduct of the Department—though it was too late in the Session now to hope for such a thing—he believed it would be found that at least half the present cost of the Ordnance Survey could be saved. In fact, the surveying, the engraving, and the commercial parts of the business were all ill-managed, while the Director General also had the most unlimited and uncontrolled power.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON vindicated the Department which the hon. Member for Bodmin (Mr. Wyld) had impugned, and also the distinguished man at its head, who, he said, was carrying out an important work in a manner which everyone ought to approve.

Lord ELCHO said, he was glad if the advanced period of the Session had prevented the hon. Member (Mr. Wyld) from moving for another Committee, because that question of the Ordnance Survey had suffered greatly through the alternate hot and cold fits which that House had exhibited on the subject. In consequence of an objection taken some years ago to the scale of the survey by the late Mr. Ellice, a full inquiry was instituted, and the Committee came to the deliberate conclusion that the survey was both based on sound principles and was being admirably conducted. The survey was executed not only most accurately, but economically; and he was told that at the present moment a Prussian officer, a good authority on such a subject, who had come to this country, was surprised to find that so perfect a survey had been carried out so cheaply.

Mr. KNIGHT complained that the maps of certain counties were fallacious and untrustworthy. They ought to have a correct map which, if they wanted to lay out a road, would be of some use to them, which was not the case at present. He hoped there would be no stinginess or any undue delay in supplying that *desideratum.*

General DUNNE bore testimony to the general accuracy of the maps of Ireland produced by the Ordnance Department. He himself did not see the great advantage of the very large survey, except for the towns. It was maps on this large scale that would answer for plans for railways projected; and ordinary maps for the purposes of owners of property; but it must be recollected that for the former more accurate levels than those given on the largest Ordnance maps were requisite, and in the latter that changes of boundary and other objects were so frequent that even on the Irish maps, not many years published, great changes in the face of the country would be seen; but of course, if one part of the country was surveyed upon the large scale, they could hardly avoid executing the remainder of the work in the same uniform manner. The delay, however, had arisen very much from the adoption of the large scale.

Lord ELCHO testified to the great accuracy of the Ordnance maps of Scotland; and pointed out that the length of time occupied in completing the survey of the whole kingdom depended on the amount of money which Parliament was ready to vote for the purpose. The calculation, he believed, had been that the entire work in England and Scotland would be executed in fifteen years with a grant of £100,000 a year.

Mr. BOUVERIE thought that if by an additional outlay the result would be attained of having the work thoroughly done it would be a great advantage to the country. He had himself known large estates to be transferred by means of those maps, the map of the district being attached to the transfer.

Mr. POWELL said, he hoped that no false economy would stand in the way of the extensive circulation of these maps. They would become a source of national wealth.

Colonel W. STUART asked for some explanation as to the medical Bills mentioned in the Vote.

Mr. LOCKE said, he never heard of a man denying that an Ordnance Survey was a good thing. It appeared to him that there was no question before the Committee.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, with respect to the question of the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel W. Stuart), that it was scarcely matter for surprise, considering how the officers and men engaged in the survey were dispersed over the country, that they should sometimes want a doctor.

Mr. WYLD complained that at the present moment it was impossible to obtain a complete set of these maps in London, and he suggested that the publication of the maps should be transferred to the Stationery Office instead of their having to be got from Southampton.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £102,700, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Services.

Mr. MONSELL said, it had been the practice of the War Department to reward officers for meritorious inventions. In 1856 Colonel Boxer received £5,000 for some inventions of his, and lately Mr. Fraser had received £5,000. Since 1856 Colonel Boxer had distinguished himself by seven or eight other inventions, and several of them, including the invention of a lubricator for the Armstrong gun, had been found of great service. He wished to know, whether it was the intention of the Government to take his case into consideration, with the view of conferring on him some additional reward?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON replied that it was not his intention to give any further money reward to Colonel Boxer. He doubted the policy of conferring large money rewards on men in the Government employment for discoveries made in their own particular line, and thought they should rather look to some honorary distinction, or increased emolument in their office. When the Government selected an officer on account of his peculiar personal fitness to discharge the duties of the situation to which he was appointed, they were, he thought, entitled to the full exercise of his professional talents, although he would not go the length of saying that in no case should a grant of money be made. He thought he had taken the last course when he lately offered Colonel Boxer a greatly increased salary.

General DUNNE expressed his concurrence with what had fallen from his right hon. Friend as to the impolicy of giving large money rewards in these cases as a general rule, and he felt sure that he also spoke the feelings of the corps of Artillery and Engineers in saying so. They felt that when an officer of a scientific corps was employed in the arsenal or laboratory his talents and inventions were due to the service; the latter he tried and perfected at the public expense—what could not be done by a private inventor—and the credit he was sure to receive, and such professional advancement as would follow, were the rewards a soldier should look to. The inventions of private manufacturers came under the knowledge of the Government officers, and of rival inventions they had the opportunity for pirating from the inventions they were called on to examine, and as a fact such accusations had been made, but as it was desirable that the latter should be above suspicion he thought that the Secretary for War had wisely determined to give them promotion and encouragement in the way of their profession rather than money rewards.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he had heard with regret the reply of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War with reference to rewarding the inventors. The principle had never before been laid down that officers of the Government were not to be rewarded for inventions, and it was not fair that this new principle should be applied in the case of Colonel Boxer without warning. Mr Fraser had been rewarded with the sum of £5.000. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had offered Colonel Boxer an increase of salary to the amount of £200 or £300; but as Colonel Boxer's appointment would only last two years longer, he would receive no more than £600 from his additional pay if he had accepted the offer. He thought Colonel Boxer had done right in refusing it.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that he had lately refused an application for another reward made by Mr. Fraser.

Colonel JERVIS congratulated the right hon. Baronet on his sudden conversion, for last year he was not able to convince the right hon. Baronet it was not right to allow officers to take out patents for inventions of a similar character to those on the merits of which they might have to decide.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £154,600, to complete the sum for Administration of the Army.

Lord ELCHO asked the Secretary of State for War to postpone the Vote, in order that he might submit a Motion to the Committee upon the subject.

MAJOR JERVIS complained that the salaries of the Controller General and the General in charge of the Reserve Army were not included in this Vote.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he hoped his noble Friend the Member for Haddingtonshire would throw no obstacle in the way of proceeding with the Vote. The subject alluded to by his noble Friend had been very fully and ably discussed, and although the House was not very full at the time, still those who were present were the Gentlemen who were most competent to deal with the matter. He was most anxious not only that the Vote should be taken, but acted upon, in the first instance in Ireland. In reply to the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich (Major Jervis) that the salary of the Commander of the Reserve Army was not included in the Vote, he said it was because it would give rise to a good deal of discussion, and it was thought better to take it separately.

MAJOR JERVIS said, he would like to know whether the Controller General was to rank as an Under Secretary of State?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON replied in the affirmative.

GENERAL DUNNE said, he could not understand why the system of control should be tried first in Ireland—a subordinate branch—and not at once in the Head Department in Pall Mall. The organization of the Irish Department would not serve as any test of the success of the system proposed, and if anything effectual was to be done there must be a complete and radical change in the present system, which rendered every military Department inefficient.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £13,700, to complete the sum for Rewards for Distinguished Service.

(7.) £36,000, to complete the sum for Pay of General Officers.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £389,800, be granted to Her Majesty (in addition to the sum of £81,000 already voted on account), towards defraying the Charge for Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, and Half Pay, which will come in course of payment from the first day of April 1868 to the 31st day of March 1869, inclusive."

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

(8.) £98,000, to complete the sum for Widows' Pensions, &c

Lord Elcho

(9.) £11,800, to complete the sum for Pensions for Wounds.

(10.) £15,600, to complete the sum for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals.

(11.) £839,600, to complete the sum for Out Pensions.

(12.) £97,200, to complete the sum for Superannuation Allowances.

(13.) £8,700, to complete the sum for Militia, Yeomanry, Cavalry, and Volunteer Corps.

On Motion for reporting the Resolutions to the House.

MR. OTWAY said, he hoped the next Parliament would take up the question of the constitution of the War Department of the country, because if such were done it would be found to be the worst administered and the most expensive part of the public service. The question, moreover, of the relationship between the Secretary at War and the Commander-in-Chief also required serious consideration.

LORD ELCHO said, it would be in the recollection of the House that at an early period of the Session the question was raised as to whether the Capitation Grant was or was not sufficient. An impression then prevailed that before the close of this Session a Commission would be appointed to decide the question. He had asked the Secretary of State whether he would appoint a Special Commission to ascertain who was right on the question.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he did not intend to refer the question of increasing the Capitation Grant to the Volunteers to a Commission; but the question would be considered by the Government from time to time with reference to its varying circumstances.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE, &c. BILL—[BILL 149.]

(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy.*)

COLONEL W. STUART said, that if any trust which was in debt was not allowed to be renewed for more than one or two years, he was convinced there would be a more satisfactory state of things than at present. As long as the present system was continued they would never get rid of the Turnpike Act. He suggested that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee for the purpose of allowing certain persons to be heard with regard to it.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee,"—(*Colonel William Stuart,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. GLADSTONE doubted whether any benefit would arise from referring the Bill to a Select Committee at this period of the year; otherwise, he thought it might be advisable to do so. The practice into which the House had gradually fallen upon this subject was very objectionable. Persons had lent money for making turnpike roads, and obtained a lien over the tolls for a certain number of years. He could not conceive anything more clear in principle than that those persons were bound by their bargain for a term of years, and that that bargain affected no other persons whatever. If they had had to deal with individuals, did anyone think that an individual standing in the place of the trust who had entered into a covenant of that kind would have allowed the term to be renewed and the tolls to be continued for the benefit of the other party to the contract who had entered into a wrong bargain? But here the bargain was between an individual, on the one side, and that patient animal the public, on the other. When individual claims came into contact with public rights, they obtained a sanction to which they were not entitled, and the public went to the wall. They had thus got into a difficulty with respect to a series of facts for which the right hon. Gentleman was no more responsible than others who had gone before him; but abuses so gross derived a certain amount of authority from the long lapse of time and the repetition of the offence. Any proceeding adopted on the impulse of the moment would probably substitute a practical injustice for what was a gross injustice in principle; but he hoped the House would be prepared, when there was time for consideration of the subject, to take some serious proceeding for the settlement of the whole question. He knew that the tolls in Lancashire, for instance, were not maintained for the benefit of the public, but simply for the purpose of reimbursing creditors who had advanced their money upon a security which had expired. If there was a case which deserved the application of such epithets as monstrous, it was a case like this. He hoped, therefore, that there would be a consensus amongst official men for the practical examination of these matters, and to consider what, on the whole, was the course that ought to be adopted; and that thus the practice into which the House had probably slidden imperceptibly would be brought to a conclusion, as soon as any fair and legitimate plan for the purpose could be devised.

MR. GOLDNEY said, that all who, like himself, took an interest in the state of turnpike trusts would be happy to hear from the right hon. Gentleman the explanation he had given of his views on the subject. The Turnpike Continuance Act had grown to be considered a matter of course; and at present no less a sum than £400,000 was paid annually under it. A certain indefinite time might be fixed for its termination, and a Schedule of particulars annexed, so that parties connected with the trusts would know at what time they would expire; and he hoped that a measure for this purpose would be introduced next Session.

MR. NEATE thought that the statement of the case by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire a very unjust one. He contended that a limit was fixed in the first instance, not with a view to the discontinuance of the tolls at the end of the period, but in order to give Parliament a power of revision where that might be necessary.

MR. LOCKE remarked that the invariable plea urged by turnpikes for an extension of the period allowed them was that they were in debt. In all cases where this was alleged strict inquiry ought to be made, because in several instances an investigation had shown that turnpikes which pleaded indebtedness were perfectly solvent.

MR. KNIGHT reminded the House that £20,000 per annum, which was formerly expended in Private Bills for renewing turnpike trusts, was saved by the present procedure. He hoped that if a Select Committee was appointed all the trusts in the kingdom would be referred to it, and that some solution of the question other than that of throwing the roads on the parishes would be arrived at.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY explained that his object in framing the present measure had been to facilitate a settlement of this controversy. He admitted the force of the objection to what was called the secret examination into the trusts at the Home Office, and he had added the Schedules to the Bill with the view of referring them next Session to a Committee, so that the real condition of the trusts might be ascertained, and inquiry might be made as to what ought to be done. There would be great hardship in throwing the maintenance of the roads on small parishes, some of which had comparatively little interest in them. He hoped the House would go into Committee, and he should then consent to reporting Progress.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 10, 1868.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report*— Construction of the House.

Public Bills—*First Reading* — Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies* (238); Indorsing of Warrants* (240); Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit* (237); Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* (241); Tain Provisional Order Confirmation* (242); Hudson's Bay Company* (244); Colonial Governors' Pensions Act Amendment* (239).

Second Reading — University Elections (Voting Papers) (201); Libel (Ireland)* (209); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (206); Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (177).

Committee — Renewable Leasehold Conversion (Ireland) Act Extension* (184); Consular Marriages* (198).

Report—Curragh of Kildare* (195); Renewable Leasehold Conversion (Ireland) Act Extension* (184); Consular Marriages* (198); Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings (228).

Third Reading — Petroleum Act Amendment* (178); Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts (Lanarkshire) Amendment* (202); New Zealand (Legislative Council)* (197); Admiralty Suits* (182), and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment* (229); Lodgers' Property Protection (186); Children, &c. Protection* (187).

IRISH CHURCH COMMISSION.

QUESTION.

Lord DUFFERIN, seeing the noble Earl (Earl Stanhope) in his place, wished to be permitted, without proper Notice, to ask him, Whether the Report of the Irish Church Commission was likely to be presented to Parliament before the prorogation; and, if not, whether it was likely to be circulated before the dissolution?

Earl STANHOPE: My noble Friend would more properly have addressed his Question to my noble Friend the Earl of Meath, the Chairman of the Commission; but, Lord Meath being now absent from town, I will very readily give the information the noble Lord seeks. I have, then, to state that the Commissioners on the Established Church in Ireland have agreed to their recommendations, and have settled even the very terms of their Report. There is only one reason why they have not been able to present their Report, and that is that it has reference to certain statistics, the entire accuracy of which can only be determined by a Schedule to the Report, which is not yet complete. Your Lordships will agree that we ought not to present any Report on this important subject without being entirely satisfied of the accuracy of the statistics contained in it. We have, therefore, delayed the signatures until the Schedule has been obtained. One of our number is at present in Dublin to expedite that Schedule as much as possible; and we have every reason to believe that in a fortnight or three weeks the Report will be signed and presented, and that very soon after it will be in the hands of your Lordships. The noble Lord properly forbore to ask information as to the recommendation of the Commissioners; but there is one point which it will not be a breach of confidence to refer to, and it is that whatever our recommendations may be they will be unanimous, and that the Report will receive the signatures of everyone of the Commissioners. This is no unimportant result to have attained when it was remembered that the Commission was composed of men of very different politics, some of whom sit on opposite sides of your Lordships' House. I therefore hope that the unanimity which attends our recommendations, whatever they may be, will bespeak at the hands of your Lordships and of the country a respectful consideration. Without imputing that the question has been a little too much in the domain of party politics, and that it has sometimes been argued on that ground, we shall leave our Report to the dispassionate consideration of the Government and country, upon these two grounds—that it will contain much authentic information not at present known or accessible, and that it will bring forth some practical and useful recommendations.

SIR ROBERT NAPIER.

THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE.

Order of the Day for the Consideration of the Queen's Message of Yesterday read.

Message read.

Moved, That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to return Her Majesty the Thanks of this House for Her Majesty's most gracious Message informing this House "That Her Majesty, taking into consideration the important Services rendered by Sir Robert Napier, a Lieutenant-General in Her Majesty's Army, and Commander-in-Chief of the Army of Bombay, in the Conduct of the recent Expedition into Abyssinia, and being desirous to confer some signal Mark of Her Favour for these and other distinguished Merits upon the said Sir Robert Napier, recommends it to the House of Lords to concur in enabling Her Majesty to make Provision for securing to the said Sir Robert Napier and the next surviving Heir Male of his Body a Pension of Two thousand Pounds per Annum;" and to assure Her Majesty that this House will cheerfully concur in enabling Her Majesty to make such Provision.—(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

LORD MELVILLE said, he could not withhold the expression of his opinion that in granting this pension to Sir Robert Napier for two lives only their Lordships were establishing a bad precedent instead of following a good one. He was not aware of any pension having been granted for such distinguished services for less than three lives. Taking into account the distinguished character of the operations, the obstacles which had been overcome in the campaign, and the signal ability displayed by this distinguished officer, he hoped the Government would re-consider their determination, and grant the pension on the terms which had been invariably followed heretofore—namely, for three lives.

EARL RUSSELL expressed his entire concurrence in the Address which had been moved by the noble Earl.

Address *agreed to Nemine Contradicente*, and Ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Ordered, That the Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill and the Bills appointed for Third Reading be taken before the Notices and the other Orders of the Day.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 235.)

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS.

Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendments and Commons' Reason for disagreeing to One of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to Order); One *disagreed to.*

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: My Lords, I interrupted the Business of the House last night, thinking it my duty to inform noble Lords on both sides of the House that it had come to my knowledge that a very important Amendment had been made in this Bill by the House of Commons. My object was that nothing should occur which would appear to be either inconvenient or unfair in the proceedings of the Government with respect to that Amendment, which we thought it our duty to oppose. It was the impression of the Government, and probably of most if not all your Lordships, that when we sent down the Bill to the House of Commons it was finally settled, as far as any important alteration was concerned. We did not expect that an Amendment, affecting, in our opinion, the principle, not only of this Bill, but of the three Bills forming the great scheme of Parliamentary Reform, would have been brought forward and carried. The principle of this Bill, as of the other Bills, has always been that the payment of rates should be a *sine quâ non* for the enjoyment of the franchise: but the Commons' Amendment would strike at the very root of that principle, for it proposes to enable persons to vote without having been assessed to the poor rates, and therefore without having *bonâ fide* paid their rates. In Edinburgh the effect would be to enable a very large number of persons to be placed on the register this year, and therefore to vote in the election next November, who afterwards might very likely not pay rates at all. The probability is that nine out of ten would be in the category of those exempted on the ground of poverty; and therefore a very large number of what I may call factitious voters would take part in the election, and would afterwards virtually cheat the constituencies by not paying any rate. The proposal was not brought forward when the Bill was originally discussed in the House of Commons, but is a new attempt to change one of its great principles; and with all respect to that House I must say I am surprised that it should have been adopted by them on this occasion. I therefore move that this House disagree with the Amendment of the House of Commons in the interpretation clause, and I trust noble Lords on both sides will support the Government in that course.

Moved, "That this House do disagree to the Amendment made by the Commons to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 24, line 32."—(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: I think Her Majesty's Government are quite entitled to ask your Lordships to reject this Amendment, and we on this side of the House do not in the least oppose the Motion. I do not think the Amendment would have quite so important an effect as the noble Earl apprehends; but still it is no doubt one of some importance. It would appear from the Reports of the proceedings in the House of Commons that it was represented that Amendments had been made in this House by your Lordships in a restrictive sense, and that this Amendment was described as having for its object the removal of those restrictions. Now, I am sure the noble Earl and the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack will bear me out in saying that no Amendment was made here in a restrictive sense; but that, on the contrary, the few words proposed by me and assented to by the Government were intended to meet the case of one or two towns where there are no poor rates, and were therefore, of an enfranchising character. In rejecting the Amendment we are, in fact, adhering to the Bill as it came up to us from the House of Commons.

EARL RUSSELL said, he should cordially support the Motion of the noble Earl. Had the Bill come up to their Lordships originally with this provision in it, there might, no doubt, have been much argument in favour of it; but, introduced at this period, when they were all agreed that no alteration should be made in the principle of the Bill, it was impossible for their Lordships to assent to it.

The Earl of Malmesbury

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) is perfectly accurate in what he has stated. When the Bill originally came up to us it provided that a dwelling house should include any part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling house and the occupier of which was separately rated to the relief of the poor. It was pointed out—I think by the noble Duke—that there are several parishes in Scotland where no poor rates are levied, and that consequently persons who would be otherwise entitled to vote in those parishes would lose their vote as the clause stood. It was, therefore, with the object of enfranchising a large number of persons who otherwise would not vote that your Lordships made an Amendment. It was an enlarging and not a restrictive Amendment; and having been made by this House, the House of Commons had last night the opportunity of considering it, and then they introduced the very objectionable words to which my noble Friend (the Earl of Malmesbury) has referred.

Motion *agreed to.*

Other of the Commons' Amendments *agreed to:* and Lords' Amendment to which the Commons disagree *not insisted on;* and a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords disagreeing to One of the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords to the said Bill; the Committee to meet *forthwith:* Report from Committee of a Reason prepared by them, read and *agreed to:* and a Message sent to the Commons to return the said Bill with the Reason.

LODGERS' PROPERTY PROTECTION BILL.

(*The Marquess Townshend.*)

(NO. 186.) BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE MARQUESS TOWNSHEND said, that the object of the Bill which he would ask their Lordships to read a second time was to protect the property of lodgers against unjust seizure on the part of the landlord, and he trusted their Lordships would assent to his Motion and thereby affirm the principle. The present state of the law with regard to the property of lodgers was very unsatisfactory, and frequently gave rise to great hardship to large numbers of poor but deserving people. Lodgers were liable to have their property seized for the debts of their landlord without any reason being given for the seizure, and without the smallest hope of recovering what was taken away. A landlord let his house, not upon the security of his tenant's lodgers, but upon their belief of the tenant's solvency, and it was very unjust that lodgers should be made to suffer for debts with which they had nothing to do. The present Bill would remove many of the evils of the existing law without interfering in any way with the equitable rights of the landlord. That some such measure was needed could be abundantly proved. Scarcely a day passed without applications being made at the metropolitan police courts for protection against liability to the seizure of goods belonging to lodgers. The very clothes of the lodger were liable to seizure. He proposed by this Bill to give the Justices power, where the case appeared to call for it, to grant an order protecting the property of lodgers, and he hoped that what he had said would be held to be a sufficient justification for urging upon the House the propriety of passing a simple, just, and properly devised measure for the protection of people, very numerous and very poor, who were not able to protect themselves.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Marquess Townshend.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that if the object of the Bill was to protect lodgers against the general creditors or execution creditors of the owner of the house it was quite useless, because those creditors had no right whatever to seize the goods of the lodger. But if, on the other hand, the object was to protect the lodger against distress levied by the superior landlord, then the noble Marquess proposed to alter the whole law of distress in the country. The way that should be done was not by arming the Justices with power to give protection to the beds, tables, and chairs of the lodger against distraint, but to say once for all that no landlord should have the right to distrain anything on the premises except what belonged to his own tenant.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH said, that whatever Amendments it might be desirable to introduce into the Bill it was necessary that something should be done. He was himself personally acquainted with a case of great hardship, in which a lady had taken unfurnished lodgings in Belgravia, and had not only paid her rent, but had given money out of her pocket to relieve the distress of her landlord, and yet the furniture was seized by the superior landlord, and put into the hands of bailiffs for sale. Some effort ought to be made to remedy so great an injustice. The present Bill might not be the best for the purpose, but it might be altered so as to afford some remedy. He hoped the noble and learned Lord would allow the Bill to be read a second time, and to go into Committee, in order that some progress might be made with the question.

THE MARQUESS TOWNSHEND said, after what had fallen from the noble and learned Lord he would not persevere with the Motion.

Order *discharged.*

Bill, by leave of the House, *withdrawn.*

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT—THE STATUES IN WESTMINSTER HALL.

QUESTION.

VISCOUNT HARDINGE asked, Whether the Statues now in Westminster Hall were permanently placed there? He believed he spoke the opinions of many most competent judges when he said that these modern statues were not in harmony with the ancient character of the Hall. But he objected to the statues on other grounds—he thought they were inferior works of art. He would not wish to say anything offensive to the artists who had executed them; he did not even know the names of any, except one; nor would he say that they were "vulgar productions" as was said in "another place;" but he did not think they were creditable to the artists to whom they had been entrusted. These statues had been shifted about from place to place, and it would seem that those who had charge of them were glad to find a place for them anywhere. They were first placed in the Royal Corridor, but were found too large for that passage, and then the question arose what was to be done with them. A council of war was held, and some one suggested that they should be removed to Westminster Hall; but he would ask their Lordships to judge for themselves what were their merits from an artistic point of view in that position. No doubt it would be said that a majority of the House of Commons had approved of the statues being placed where they were, but that was no reason why their Lordships should be prevented from expressing their opinion against their being continued to be kept there. A decision of the House of Commons was not necessarily final, and he did not see why they should accepted as absolute arbiters in matters of art. He begged to ask the noble Lord the Privy Seal, Whether any definite and final arrangement had been come to with regard to these statues and their ultimate destination?

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: It is not my duty nor my intention to defend in an artistic point of view the statues which have been placed in Westminster Hall. When my noble Friend (Viscount Hardinge) rose to call attention to the subject I was in hopes that he was going to suggest a better site for them, seeing he considers that the present one is unsuitable and undesirable. It might have removed a difficulty had he done so. The noble Viscount has informed your Lordships of the history of these statues. They have led rather a wandering life. They were in the first instance placed in the Royal Corridor; but they looked so gigantic that they had to be removed. Mr. Barry suggested that they should be placed in Westminster Hall, and that proposition was approved of both by Mr. Cowper and Lord John Manners, and ratified by a majority of 157 Members of the House of Commons. The opinion of those two Gentlemen, who have had great experience in such matters, is one to which deference should be paid; and as that opinion has, as I have said, been backed up by the House of Commons, I cannot hold out any hope that the statues will be removed from their present position. I do not see where else we can put them except into the street—where, at all events, they would not be in keeping with their surroundings. I believe that the only suggestion which has been made by way of improving the appearance of the statues is that the wall behind them should be made of a darker colour. I hope that when this has been done that they will be placed in chronological order.

LORD REDESDALE hoped that if the statues remained in their present position they would at least be dusted once a week. The effect of the dust which had lodged upon them was to destroy all the finer outlines.

EARL STANHOPE said, that in their present position the statues were very incongruous and out of keeping with the Hall. Waiving altogether the merits or demerits of the statues, no one could differ from this opinion; but he did not think that those who expressed it should be bound to find another site. He did not understand that the House of Commons had finally determined in favour of the present site, and he hoped that during the Recess some attempt would be made to find one where the statues would be more in harmony with what was around them.

COASTING TRADE OF FRANCE.

ADDRESS FOR A PAPER.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE rose to call attention to the exclusion of British ships from the French coasting trade, and to move an Address for Correspondence relating thereto. As the matter now stood when our ships discharged a cargo at a French port they could not load another cargo for any other French port. Last year an application was made to the French Government on the subject. However favourable personally the French Emperor might be to the objects of the deputation, he could only, of course, refer the deputation to the Minister of Commerce, who said it was quite impossible to relax the existing laws in favour of British vessels, and that the exclusion must be strictly maintained. He begged to ask what had been done upon the subject, and hoped that whatever documents were in the possession of the Foreign Office would be produced, in order to enable their Lordships to form a judgment on the matter.

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of any Correspondence that may have taken place between the Foreign Office and Her Majesty's Ambassador at Paris, and of any Communications from British Shipowners, in reference to the Exclusion of British Vessels from the Coasting Trade of France, and to the existing Treaties between France and Spain or any other Country relating to that Trade.—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, that Her Majesty's Government had for some time directed their attention to the important subject which the noble Marquess had brought under their Lordships' notice, and Lord Lyons had been requested to avail himself of every opportunity of endeavouring to induce the French Government to take a more liberal course upon this subject. There was, however, no treaty to bind the French Government to do so, and we must continue to hope that they would consider the subject in the liberal spirit in which they negotiated the commercial treaty. In the present state of the negotiations it would not be desirable to publish the Papers which the noble Marquess asked for; but he might rest assured that the Government was not inactive on the subject, and maintained communications with the French Government upon it.

Lord TAUNTON did not quite agree with the noble Marquess in the way he had put the case. No doubt we had no direct treaty claim on the French Government on the subject; but he thought we had a good ground of appeal to them under the "most favoured nation clause," which entitled us to claim that we should be placed on an equal footing with the most favoured nation; and we were, he thought, under that entitled to the same privileges that had been conceded to Spain.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE offered a few words in explanation, and said he would not press his Motion.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

UNIVERSITY ELECTIONS (VOTING PAPERS) BILL.—(No. 201.)

(*The Lord Clinton.*)

SECOND READING.

Lord CLINTON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said that its only object was to extend to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge the same facilities in the employment of voting papers at elections which had already been granted to the Scotch Universities and the London University.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord Clinton.*)

The Earl of DERBY said, he doubted the propriety of the relaxation proposed. The subject of voting papers in relation to the two Universities had been largely discussed during the passage of the English Reform Bill, and provisions had been inserted by which two checks against personation were retained—which were that the voter should be personally known to the magistrate in whose presence the voting paper was signed, and that the voter should be further identified by the person who presented his proxy. Now, he understood that the object of the Bill was to do away with the second security. Under the plan now proposed it was quite clear that any man who had no reason to believe the contrary could solemnly declare—although he had no knowledge of the voter—that he believed the voting paper to be signed by him; and this seemed to offer facilities to agents for obtaining voting papers by scores. It seemed to him that this was one of those checks which were necessary on the voting paper system, and therefore he thought the Bill proposed an experiment of a doubtful character. Still, as a similar method had been adopted in the Scotch Reform Bill, and it had received the sanction of Her Majesty's Government, he would not oppose the second reading of this measure.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said, that if the security were necessary it ought to be taken in the Scotch Bill.

Lord CLINTON said, the Bill put the English Universities on the same footing as the Scotch Universities were left by the Scotch Reform Bill.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY said, the Act by which voting papers were introduced at the Oxford and Cambridge Universities was applied to the University of London by the Reform Act of last Session; but it was thought desirable in the latter case to relax the provision which required personal knowledge of the voter in the person who presented the voting paper. The circumstances of the London University were materially different from those of the other Universities. In the latter there were a large number of resident members who were acquainted, generally, with the members of the constituent body; but in the case of the London University there was no such resident body, and the voters were scattered all over the country. If in their case the same restrictions were imposed as existed in the case of the older Universities, so few Members of the London University would be able to vote that there could scarcely be said to be a fair representation of the University. It was this difficulty with respect to London which was really the cause of the Bill being introduced; and then it was represented that to avoid distinction the other Universities must be placed upon the same footing.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: It is desirable that your Lordships should exactly understand the position in which this question stands with reference to the Scotch Bill. In the Scotch Reform Bill, which has passed the House of Commons and has also passed your Lordships' House, you have already provided that the Act regulating the elections for the English Universities shall, with respect to voting papers, be applied to the Scotch Universities; but with this exception—

> "Except so much of that Act as requires that the person delivering the voting paper shall make attestation of his personal acquaintance with the voter."

You have therefore already enacted in the Scotch Bill that a University voting paper may be handed in without the attestation of the person handing it in that he is personally acquainted with the voter. I have no doubt there is a good reason for making that exception in the case of the Scotch Universities, and no doubt there is equally good reason for extending it to the case of the London University. Then the question you have to consider is this —if you make exceptions for the Scotch and London Universities, can you possibly maintain different regulations for Oxford and Cambridge? It was the feeling that that could not be done which led to the introduction of this measure. A little misapprehension has arisen with regard to the Amendment of the Scotch Bill, which at first sight seems connected with this, but is really quite different. In the Scotch Reform Bill as it came up from the other House there was in the Schedule a form of attestation to be signed by the magistrate who received the voting paper, and who had to declare that he was personally acquainted with the voter, who signed it in his presence. Your Lordships struck out the words which made the magistrate declare his personal acquaintance with the voter, and the words so struck out have been re-inserted by the House of Commons. With that Amendment your Lordships to-night have agreed; but this is quite a different matter from the Bill, which will apply to the English Universities, and assimilate them to the others.

The Duke of ARGYLL said, the circumstances of the Scotch Universities were different from those of the English Universities. There was a comparatively small resident body, and it would disfranchise a large number of voters if they could not transfer their voting papers except to personal friends—a restriction which, it seemed to him, did not provide much security against personation.

Lord REDESDALE approved the relaxation on the ground that it offered a precedent for introducing voting papers generally. He did not see why any voter, as well as a member of a University, should not go before a magistrate who knows him, and fill up a voting paper, which might be tendered in the same way as a graduate's voting paper.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

ARTIZANS' AND LABOURERS' DWELLINGS BILL.—(No. 228.)

(*The Lord Chelmsford.*)

REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

Lord CHELMSFORD said, he desired to explain to their Lordships the alterations which had been introduced into the Bill by the Select Committee to which it had been referred. The Members of the Committee had given their most careful consideration to the whole subject, and every point underwent the closest and most minute examination, no alteration having been made without the fullest discussion. But although the Amendments which had been introduced had, on every occasion, received the unanimous approval of the Committee, the House could hardly be expected to place such confidence as to take upon trust all the alterations which they had recommended. The changes proposed were certainly very considerable —and indeed the features of the Bill were so altered that on its returning to the House of Commons it would be hardly recognizable. The difficulty of devising a proper remedy for the evils against which this Bill was directed could only be properly estimated by those who had closely considered the subject from every point of view. It was quite clear, however, that no Bill could be of any avail unless it were compulsory. Permissive Bills had been tried and had signally failed. On the whole he believed the Committee had succeeded in framing a measure which was sufficient to attain the end in view, having a due regard to the rights of property. The first subject to which the attention of the Committee was directed was the Authority in the metropolis to which the powers of the Act ought to be intrusted. The Local Authority proposed by the Bill as it was introduced into the House of Commons, was the Metropolitan Board of Works. Petitions, however, had been presented to their Lordships' House from the vestries of many of the great parishes in London, complaining of that arrangement.

As the Bill originally stood most important works would probaby have had to be undertaken by the Board, and provision was made to raise the sums required for such works by means of a local rate. It was objected to this arrangement that it would be a very hard thing to make persons residing at a distance from the place where the nuisance existed contribute to a rate raised for a purpose in which apparently they had no interest at all. Now, perhaps, on principle it might be said that the whole of the metropolis was interested in preventing disease and infection in any part of it; but the Committee had deemed it right to alter the Bill, so as to obviate the objection. They came to the conclusion that, under all the circumstances, it would be better to impose the duty of carrying the Act into execution on the vestries and district Boards in the metropolis, as being more closely and immediately interested in the matter than the Board of Works. The next point considered by the Committee was as to the appointment of the Medical Officer—a most important agent in the carrying of the Bill into effect, as on his report all the subsequent proceedings depended. It was originally proposed that he should be appointed by the Metropolitan Board of Works; but as the Local Authority had been since changed it was deemed desirable by the Committee that the vestries and district Boards should not have the power of appointing and removing the Medical Officer without some check and control. The Committee, therefore, resolved that the appointment and the removal of the Medical Officer should only be made with the sanction of the Poor Law Board. The next point the Committee had to consider was what should be done in cases where structural alterations were necessary. As the Bill stood originally it was provided that on the Local Authority receiving the Report of the Medical Officer they should send it to their Engineer or Surveyor, whose duty it would be to take it into his consideration, and to state what alterations would, in his opinion, be necessary. Now, the Committee thought it most desirable that the Local Authority should be required to appoint a Surveyor to examine the premises after the Report of the Medical Officer had been sent in, and to determine and report whether the defects were such as required to be remedied by structural alterations, or whether it would be necessary that the premises, or any part of them, should be demolished. The Bill only provided for the sending of the Report of the Medical Officer to the owner of the premises; but the Committee had thought it right that the latter should also receive the Report of the Engineer or Surveyor, and should further be afforded an opportunity of appearing before the Local Authority and objecting to any Order being made. In the original Bill no provision was made to meet a state of things which was very likely indeed to arise—the event of the owner of the property alleging that its condition did not arise from any default on his part, but was owing to some defect in his neighbour's premises, or some drain which the parish were bound to keep in repair. To meet such a case the Committee had recommended if the Local Authority decided against the objection the party aggrieved might appeal to the Quarter Sessions against the decision, giving notice to the person or persons whom he had alleged to be in default. From the decision of the Quarter Sessions there would be an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench. Another point of very material importance, in which the Committee found it necessary to make considerable change in the Bill, was this—As the Bill stood when it came before the Committee, suppose the owner should not like to make the necessary repairs or alterations, power was given to the Local Authority to either shut up the premises or purchase them, and provision was made in the Bill as to the amount of compensation to be paid to the owner, and for intrusting to a building society the works undertaken by the Local Authority. The Committee deemed it objectionable that the Local Authority should have anything to do with the purchase of such property. They therefore introduced a provision to confine the operations of the Local Authority to either such demolition or such building as ought to be done by the owner, at the same time making the owner responsible for the cost. In the Bill as it originally stood there was no provision giving persons, and particularly nominal owners, the expenses of such improvements as it was desirable to have made. The Committee had, however, introduced a clause providing that when alterations had been made under the order of the Local Authority, and to the satisfaction of the superintending Surveyor, the owner might get from the latter a certificate, and proceeding to the Local Authority might obtain a charging order for the outlay he had made. That certificate was to be filed and recorded by the Clerk of the Peace; and that having been done the owner was to have a charge on the premises of 6 per cent on the outlay for thirty years. The Committee had also provided that under similar circumstances the Local Authority might proceed to the Quarter Sessions with the certificate and vouchers, and that certificate having been filed the Local Authority should have a charge, by way of mortgage on the premises, for the outlay which had been incurred. He believed he had now put their Lordships in possession of the alterations which the Committee had made in the Bill, and which he thought had effected very great improvement in it.

Lord PORTMAN was of opinion that the Bill had been very materially improved by the Select Committee, and that the noble and learned Lord who had just addressed the House, and to Lord Westbury, their Lordships were deeply indebted for the care and pains they had bestowed upon it. Under the guidance of those two noble and learned Lords the legal portions of the clauses had been carefully framed. The Bill was now one which might be made to work. All that was unworkable in it when it came from the Commons had been struck out. If they compared the Bill as it stood now with the Bill as it left the Commons, the comparison would satisfy their Lordships that it was wise to examine in a Select Committee Bills coming up from the Commons, even though they might have been in the House of Commons more Sessions than one. He thought it was right to have determined to prevent vestries from purchasing house property, and to have struck out the clauses for giving powers to building companies to speculate through the aid of vestries, but above all to have given to the vestry the powers which the House of Commons had proposed to give to the Metropolitan Board of Works. He believed that the only value which this Bill possessed over the Nuisance Removal and other Acts consisted in its giving power to the Local Authority to demolish buildings that ought to be removed.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY quite agreed that the alterations effected in this Bill by the Committee were good ones, and he desired to express his thanks to the two noble and learned ex-Chancellors who had been alluded to for the time and attention they had given to the measure in the Select Committee. He felt assured that if the House of Commons accepted the Bill it would produce very beneficial results. What had been done with it in their Lordships' House would show the country that their Lordships were always ready to do what was for the benefit of the working classes.

Bill to be read 3^a on *Monday* next.

THE VOLUNTEER REVIEW AT WINDSOR.—QUESTION.

Earl SPENCER, on rising to put a Question to the Under Secretary for War on the subject of certain occurrences in connection with the recent Review at Windsor, said the subject was one of great importance to the Volunteers, more especially just now, because it was expected that another Volunteer Review would be held in the course of two or three weeks. The circumstances of the case which formed the subject of his Question were as follows. Her Majesty had recently held a Review of Volunteers at Windsor, At that Review there was, he believed. a larger attendance of Volunteers from all parts of the country than there had been on any previous occasion of a similar character. The Volunteers marched past before Her Majesty, and afterwards went through some manœuvres with which the illustrious Duke at the head of the army had found himself able to express his satisfaction. But that satisfaction, so gratifying to all Volunteers, had been very much clouded, in consequence of some circumstances which were reported to have occurred after the Review. It was in reference to those circumstances he wished to say a few words. There were two routes by which it had been arranged that the Volunteers were to return from the Review—one the Great Western line, from Windsor; the other the South Western, from Datchet. He believed he was right in saying that no difficulty had been experienced on the part of those who returned by the former route. By eleven o'clock, he believed, there was not a Volunteer about the Windsor Station of the Great Western line; but he was sorry to say that a very different state of things had been experienced at the Datchet Station of the other line. A noble Friend of his (Lord Elcho) had stated in "another place" that he and his Volunteers were from ten o'clock on Saturday evening till two o'clock on Sunday morning obliged to remain by the banks of the Thames before they could be sent away. He regretted to think that the circumstance stated by his noble Friend showed what might be regarded as almost a breakdown in the railway arrangements between Datchet and London. No doubt, on the occasion in question there were causes of confusion. He should refer to these; but he hardly thought they were sufficient to account for the delay which actually occurred in the conveyance of the Volunteers on their return to town. He therefore wished to ask his noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for War in what manner that delay was really to be accounted for? He did not know whether there had been anything wrong in the arrangements between the War Office and the Volunteers; but certainly no such occurrence had happened on the occasion of any previous Review of Volunteers. He now came to another subject. At Datchet the greatest possible confusion existed; a large number of stragglers from different corps were wandering about without officers and naturally in a state of complete disorder. He was sorry to say that still graver charges were brought against them —they were accused of insulting the Inspector General and his Staff, and committing other acts of insubordination. He had done all he could to ascertain the facts with accuracy, and he believed, as far as his information went, it was correct. It would seem that the disorder commenced immediately after the Review. It was very natural that on such a hot day the Volunteers should fall out of the ranks with a view of getting some refreshment, which they very much needed; but having done so, they ought to have returned to their ranks, and this, he feared, they had failed to do. But further, he believed, some regiments left the ground without any order whatever. Now, on this point the regulations issued by the War Office were very distinct. Brigadiers commanding upon such occasions were directed not to leave their command till they had seen the various regiments of which it was composed, so to speak, embarked in the railway train. But if a regiment left the ground without any order to do so, it was clear that this injunction could not be carried out. Under any circumstances, he was assured it would have been very difficult for some brigadiers to carry the order into effect, for the regiments under their command were so arranged that they had to go, perhaps, to three or four different places. He hoped his noble Friend would be prepared to state that in future arrangements would be made which would obviate any such inconvenience in returning by the trains, and at the same time would be prepared to state whether in those brigades which kept together there were any corps which left the ranks in opposition to the orders given. He was told that, among those who returned by way of Datchet several corps almost raced to the river in order to get first to the pontoon-bridge, and some of those corps, he was informed, in doing so, were left almost without any officers. Under such circumstances, it was no wonder that disorder should have been occasioned. He asked, in the name of the Volunteers, that this matter should be fully investigated. The Volunteers of this country were proud, not only of performing their manœuvres creditably, but of being efficient and soldierlike in their bearing whenever they were under arms. And he fully believed that upon this occasion the great majority of the regiments did behave in a soldierlike manner. Although the circumstances to which they were exposed were very trying, and although their patience was much exhausted by the delay, they remained steadily under arms, endeavouring to assist their officers, as far as possible, to stop the stragglers, and it was only due to them that their services should be pointed out and recognized. He was aware that inquiry had been made to some extent into the circumstances; and therefore he was anxious to ascertain from his noble Friend the nature of that inquiry. He hoped the Government would go into the matter fully and thoroughly; and speaking for the Volunteers and the country, he was sure that whatever might be the decision of the authorities, they would be supported in carrying it into effect firmly, and even sharply, if necessary. The Question he had to ask the Under Secretary of State for War was, Whether any inquiry had been made into the causes of the confusion reported to have taken place at Datchet on the return of the Volunteers from the Review held by Her Majesty at Windsor; and, if so, whether any steps had been taken to prevent the recurrence of such disorder at future Reviews?

Lord TRURO said, he thought the Volunteers must feel greatly indebted to the noble Earl (Earl Spencer) for the

Question which he had put to Her Majesty's Government, and for the temperate manner in which the matter had been dealt with. It was quite possible that under a feeling of irritation some hasty action might have been taken, for the offence given to the Inspector General of the Reserve Forces was one which had rendered the whole Volunteer force justly indignant. It must, however, be evident that in organizing such a force as was hastily got together at Windsor, great difficulties necessarily arose. The War Office possibly was to blame, in some respects, for the want of arrangement which was observable; but it should be remembered that the Inspector General was comparatively new to the duties of his position, and had a great deal to learn in connection with the Volunteer force, although during the period which he had held office he had displayed an urbanity, kindness, and ability calculated to exercise the very best effects upon the organization and efficiency of the force. There had been an error, he thought, in not dividing more equally the force which was to proceed from either railway station; and their Lordships also might possibly entertain the opinion that where so large a body of country and metropolitan Volunteers were brought together it would have been advisable to keep them in check by a larger number of officers of the regular service. As regarded one suggestion which had been made by the noble Earl, he was in a position to give practical information upon the subject. The men in the brigade which he had the honour of commanding had been under arms from four or five in the morning, and he heard many of them say that they had hardly broken their fast during the day. What happened was this — After the Review was over these corps, having provided themselves with tents and commissariat in different parts of the ground, asked to be broken off for a period of not less than an hour in order to recruit themselves. The difficulty of keeping brigades together was shown by the fact that the brigade which he commanded was composed of corps coming from four counties, and therefore being unable to accompany them all to their respective stations, he was obliged to break up the brigade upon the ground. It was obvious that the difficulties which were experienced could not be attributed wholly, or even mainly, to any neglect on the part of the authorities, but was the natural consequence of assembling Volunteers in such numbers as 20,000 or 30,000 men, thereby putting a great strain upon the railway service. The present, however, was not the time for discussing that question; but he hoped that if Volunteers were again brought together in such large numbers it would not be without the valuable assistance of a sufficient number of officers belonging to the regular army.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, that the case mentioned by the noble Earl was one in which the War Office would have been fully justified in acting with some severity. An inquiry had been directed with regard to the conduct of three corps in which irregularities had been specially brought to the notice of the authorities. It was possible that more than three corps might have been properly the subjects of inquiry; but the Secretary of State thought that the case would be sufficiently met by a circular addressed to the Volunteers generally, and by come stringent rules to be observed upon the occasion of their assembling in large bodies hereafter. In the case of the Windsor Review the regulations were quite adequate for the purpose, had they been attended to. The noble Earl opposite had mentioned some of them, relating to the order of distribution and the order of march upon the railway stations; these regulations were such as had proved successful in keeping order upon former occasions; and it was very much to be regretted that the conduct of a portion of the Volunteer force had tended upon this occasion to bring discredit upon the body at large. The noble Earl asked what had been the cause of all this confusion. He himself had mentioned the cause—a frequent source of military disorder—when he used the word "straggling." In the old wars this had been a frequent source of military disaster. During the Peninsular War many soldiers had been hanged by the Provost Marshal for crimes which had originated in "straggling." In fact, when once a soldier left his place in the ranks without permission he seemed to forget all laws, human and divine, and gave himself over to the Devil and all his works. The same cause to which the executions in the Peninsula were traceable was the beginning of the disorder at Windsor. The noble Earl had correctly described many of the irregularities; but even before the Review commenced there were many men who left the ranks and mixed with the spectators, while during the Review there were many more who quitted their places, some without orders, and some expressly contrary to orders. He had been further informed that there were many men who left the ranks upon the march from the Review ground, in their impatience to reach the bridge; and thus a large body of stragglers was collected in the vicinity of the river, blocking up the approaches to the bridge, and preventing those corps from crossing which had retained their formation. The blame must be laid in the first place upon every individual Volunteer who left the ranks without permission; next, upon those officers who did not keep them in their places; and likewise, according to reports which cannot be doubted, upon those officers who did not remain with their regiments. There were defects in the railway management which of course contributed to the delay; though it is obvious that if all had remained in the ranks the delay and consequent disorder would not have been anything like the discreditable scene which actually occurred. Hitherto the control of the Volunteer force had been left in a great degree—and very properly—to the Volunteers themselves. But he might suggest that if, instead of the usual complimentary notice of the Review an Order were issued regimentally stating that Private A, B, and C had left the ranks, and for that breach of discipline were discharged summarily from the service, under the section applicable in that case, the measure would have a better effect than any official answer which might be given by the Secretary of State. It was supposed that the War Office could prevent the recurrence of such disorderly scenes. Undoubtedly, if there was reason to suppose that such disorders would be repeated hereafter, it might be the duty of the Secretary of State to consider the propriety of advising Her Majesty to dissolve the corps; but he was not disposed to take so extreme a course on account of one defect. This occurrence would show to all ranks the necessity of maintaining exact discipline under all circumstances, and how a small neglect might become a great disorder. And the Secretary of State hoped—and in that hope he entirely concurred—that the same spirit which had produced and maintained the Volunteer force would induce them to cultivate and observe the military virtues of steadiness and silence in the ranks, and of patient obedience to orders, without which the Volunteer force would be an incumbrance rather than a support to the military power of the country.

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE: My Lords, although individually I had no sort of concern in the arrangements for the Review, yet I cannot help thinking that the matter is one of great importance in a military point of view. I think that everyone here and elsewhere must have regretted that anything such as we have heard described to-night should have occurred in Windsor Park. But I must candidly say that I had not the least idea that it was a growing habit on the part of the Volunteers to fall out of the ranks without permission. There can, however, be no doubt that on this occasion a number of isolated men were straggling about with arms in their hands, which showed that they must have gone down with their corps to this Review. The very first characteristic of a Volunteer force is to be ready and willing to obey orders, and stick to their ranks as long as their regiment is under arms. They enter freely, they come of their own accord, their names are registered at their own request, and there is no sort of compulsion. But if they agree to appear they are bound to be orderly, and from the moment they enter the ranks of their corps to the moment when they are either dismissed or have permission from their commanding officer to leave the ranks, they are bound to remain exactly in the same way as any soldier in the army. If that rule is strictly obeyed, as it ought to be, no sort of irregularity such as that complained of can possibly happen. I was not present, but I believe the whole arose from that laxity of discipline in leaving the ranks which is so serious a drawback to the efficiency of the Volunteer force that I cannot point out too strongly that such laxity should not be tolerated for a moment. All Volunteer officers ought to agree that if any Volunteer leaves the ranks without permission, or without some good reason, he should be struck off the rolls of the regiment. If that were carried out in all cases straggling would be put an end to. I have been told, but I cannot vouch for the fact, that it is the custom for many officers to leave the ranks the moment a review is over. If there is a moment when it is important that the officers should remain in the ranks it is after a review is over. It is far more important that they should remain in the ranks after the review than before it, for it is much easier to get the men to the review than to get them away. There are always a number of strangers and sightseers who mix with the troops, and it is just then that the officers are wanted. It should be laid down as a rule that no officer should leave the ranks unless with the sanction of the commanding officer; but this permission should be extremely rare, and should not be given without some good and sufficient reason. I sincerely concur in the opinion that the Staff of the army ought to be called upon to assist on these occasions more than it has hitherto done. I do not think this is necessary on ordinary occasions; but when you have 25,000 men under review the case is very different. It is desirable that the Staff should go with the Volunteers to the place of debarkation on the railroad, where their services are far more necessary even than on the field. I understand, with respect to the railway arrangements, that the trains were not to be filled by the Volunteers as they arrived, but that each corps was to be carried on separately by its own train. The result would naturally be that the troops belonging to that train would possibly be the last regiment on the line of march, and would have to pass along narrow lanes through the other troops while the train was waiting their arrival, and stopped the way. Of all the extraordinary arrangements I have ever heard of that is the strangest. Each train ought to have taken the first body of men that came; but to say that one particular train was to be kept waiting till a particular regiment arrived, which might, perhaps, be at a distance of about a mile and a half, was so preposterous that I hope we shall never hear of such a thing again. I regret that such an event should have occurred, but I am not sorry that your Lordships' attention has been called to it, and to the important subject of the movement of troops. I think the railways ought to adapt themselves to the requirements of the military service, and what has occurred ought to be a good lesson to them as well as to us to consider how large bodies of troops can be easily and rapidly moved from one place to another. I am glad that there is to be an inquiry; but I feel that great excuses may be made for the Volunteers, and I trust the result will be to prove that they are ready to correct little errors, and that the railway authorities will assist the War Office in making such arrangements for the future as to prevent the recurrence of such deplorable irregularities.

The Duke of Cambridge

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, it was very desirable that what had occurred at the Windsor Review should be fully discussed and inquired into, and that the Government should show every disposition to bring the facts to light. The practice of straggling among the Volunteers was very objectionable, and likely to lead to the greatest confusion. The law had provided very effectual means for repressing disorders that might occur in the field; because, although there was no military discipline capable of being exercised with regard to the Volunteers in time of peace, yet the law provided that the commanding officer should have the power of placing under arrest any officers or men who might misconduct themselves. He did not know whether this regulation had ever been put in force; but it afforded an effectual means of striking at such irregularities. He trusted that when the Government had investigated the matter they would not hesitate to take such steps as might appear necessary to prevent the recurrence of evils of this description. There was no want of power if they chose to exercise it. With regard to errors committed by officers in charge of brigades, there was the simple method of not intrusting brigades again to any officer who had proved himself unfit. In case of more serious delinquency, the Secretary of State could advise Her Majesty to deprive the officer misbehaving of his commission, and in still more serious cases there was the power, which it was once his painful duty to exercise, of disbanding a corps. He could conceive nothing more unjust than to blame the whole of the force for what occurred on this occasion; but with respect to any individuals or corps that were to blame, he hoped there would be no hesitation in exercising the authority possessed by the Government. He was bound to say that the Volunteers were placed in a trying position, for he believed there was no doubt that while the Great Western Railway did its duty well the South Western performed its duty very ill, and that no disorders had been spoken of in respect to troops taken away by the former line. The blame must be fairly shared between the Volunteers and the railway; and it must be admitted that when men who had left London, or a more distant place, at a very early hour, with defective commissariat arrangements, were kept waiting many hours after a long and fatiguing day by the misconduct of the railway company, it was very irritating and would try the temper of any body of men. He would suggest that in future the War Office should so arrange the brigades as to put together those which were to arrive and return by the same route, and so that the orders to brigadiers to remain with their brigades until they returned might be capable of being strictly carried out. When such arrangements were made the War Office could insist on the orders being strictly obeyed. He believed great good would result from this discussion, and he hoped the public, bearing in mind that the number of corps affected was not really very large, would not hastily and unjustly conclude that more than a temporary slur had been cast upon the Volunteer force.

VISCOUNT HARDINGE said, he thought the officers should be made responsible for the good conduct of their men. It must be remembered that they had the power of dismissing men on the spot, and he once saw that power exercised. He was in command of his regiment at a county review, and some men in a particular corps refused to be told off for the purpose of having their files equalized. The captain of the company at once struck off the roll every man who had so refused, and their rifles were taken away, and the result was that at the close of the review they said they were very much ashamed of the disgrace they had brought on their corps, and begged to be re-attested. Now, if Volunteer officers gave strict warning to their battalions that stragglers would be thus summarily dealt with, the evil, he believed, would be checked. Volunteer officers did not sufficiently understand the powers vested in them; but if those powers were explained, and if an appeal were made to the public spirit of the men, there would be no recurrence of the scenes so much complained of. He was glad to learn that the straggling and want of discipline were confined to four or five regiments. The whole force ought not to be blamed for the misconduct of a small portion of it.

EARL GRANVILLE remarked that the evil of straggling, whether on the part of officers or men, was obvious even to a civilian; but if it were true that some of the Volunteers had started at 4 a.m., and had been kept twelve or fifteen hours without food, the temptation to straggle in such a locality as Windsor must have been enormous. Some regulations, it appeared to him, should be made to prevent the men from suffering from starvation.

VISCOUNT MELVILLE said, that the hissing and hooting to which General Lindsay was exposed on his placing men to guard the pontoon bridge and prevent confusion was most unjustifiable. The mismanagement of the railway company was no justification for such conduct towards a distinguished officer. There was a regular and military way in which complaints against the railway should have been represented. It had been stated that the officers did not pay sufficient attention to their duties, and he feared they were the weakest part of the force. If there was some regulation by which they underwent an examination, or otherwise proved their efficiency, irregularities of this kind would not occur. He would suggest that the Secretary for War should issue an order pointing out what the consequences would be if such scenes ever occurred again.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, there was no disposition on the part of the War Office to limit the inquiry to three corps if a more comprehensive investigation was required; but in the confusion which occurred only three had been brought under the notice of the Secretary of State.

HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for enabling Her Majesty to accept a Surrender upon Terms of the Lands, Privileges, and Rights of "The Governor and Company of Adventurers of England trading into Hudson's Bay," and for admitting the same into the Dominion of Canada — Was *presented* by The Duke of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS; read 1ª. (No. 244.)

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 10, 1868.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee —Resolutions* [July 9] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee*— Danube Works Loan.

Ordered—Danube Works Loan *; Militia Pay *; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3) *; Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London.*

First Reading — Militia Pay*; Danube Works Loan* [227]; Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London* [228]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3)* [229].

Second Reading—Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment* [218]; Public Departments Payments* [212]; Vaccination (Ireland)* [217]; Liquidation* [220].

Committee — Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* [223]; Tain Provisional Order Confirmation* [224]; Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-comm.*) [63]—R.P.; Court of Sessions (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [214]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment* [206]; New Zealand Assembly's Powers* [216]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* [222]; Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment* [181]—R.P.

Report — Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* [223]; Tain Provisional Order Confirmation* [224]; Court of Session (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [214]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment* [206-226]; New Zealand Assembly's Powers* [216]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* [222].

Considered as amended—Larceny and Embezzlement* [157].

Third Reading — Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* [223]; Tain Provisional Order Confirmation* [224]; Colonial Governors' Pensions Act Amendment* [202]; Promissory Oaths* [113]; Larceny and Embezzlement* [157], and *passed*.

The House met at Two of the clock.

POOR RATE ASSESSMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. WHITE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of Government to bring in a Bill this or next Session to give effect to the Recommendations agreed to by the right hon. Gentleman and a majority of the Select Committee on Poor Rate Assessment—namely, that so much of any Public or Local Act as permits composition for Rates in other than Parliamentary Boroughs should be repealed, and that all Local Rates should be merged into one (Consolidated) Rate, to be assessed and collected together, so as to make the future Parliamentary Franchise for Boroughs dependent upon the payment of all or any Local Rate other than the Poor Rate, as is now the statutory qualification by the Reform Act of 1867?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY in reply, said, that he was scarcely in a position, so recently after the Committee had made their Report, to give any intimation as to what the intentions of the Government might be on that subject. For himself personally, however, as a Member of that Committee, he could state that he concurred in the recommendation that all those rates should be combined and should be collected by instalments as the best mode of procedure. But how the plan should be carried out must be a matter for future consideration.

BATTLE OF KONIGRATZ.

QUESTION.

MR. OTWAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House any Reports or Extracts from Reports made by our Military Attaches at Vienna and Berlin, relating to the quantity of ammunition used by the armies in Bohemia in the campaign of 1866, and especially of the number of rounds per gun fired at the battle of Königrätz?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, that he had made inquiries in the Department that morning with the view of answering the Question of the hon. and gallant Member, and he found that they had no statements of that nature which he could lay on the table with any confidence in their possessing official authority. The subject was, indeed, mentioned by the military correspondents in some of their letters, but he was told there were no documents in the Office which could be presented to the House as affording authoritative information which they could rely upon.

HOUSE OF COMMONS ARRANGEMENTS.

QUESTION.

MR. HEADLAM said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government will undertake that the Report of the Select Committee on the House of Commons Arrangements shall be carefully considered during the Recess, so that provision according to the views of the Government may be made in the Estimates for next year?

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, that though the Question was addressed to the First Lord of the Treasury, it might be desirable, he apprehended, for him to give an answer. During the Recess Her Majesty's Government would give their most careful consideration, not only to the Report of the Committee over which the right hon. Gentleman presided, but also to the Report which he understood from the right hon. and gallant Member for

Roscommon (Colonel French) was to be presented by the Kitchen Committee, with the view of proposing such alterations as might be deemed necessary in the next Session of Parliament.

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 63.]

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Stafford Northcote*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress, 6th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 10, 11, 12, and 13, *struck out.*

Clause 14 (Mode of Trial of Election Petitions).

MR. DISRAELI moved, in page 6, line 12, after the word "Act," to insert a clause consisting of nine sections regulating the mode of trial of Election Petitions, embodying the decision arrived at on Monday last on the Motion of Mr. Ayrton as to the mode of trying Election Petitions.

First Section read, as follows:—

"1. The trial of every Election Petition shall be conducted before a puisne judge of one of Her Majesty's Superior Courts of Common Law at Westminster, to be selected from a rota to be formed as herein-after mentioned."

MR. MONSELL said, that the Bill ought to apply to Ireland as well as to England, and for the purpose of raising the question he begged to move that the words "or Dublin" be inserted after the word "Westminster." It was perfectly obvious that there should be the same law on the subject for England and Ireland.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he was desirous that the Bill would be made to apply to Scotland also. Election Petitions were very rare in that country, but he thought it would be well to provide for the contingency.

MR. GOLDNEY observed that the adoption of the Amendment would necessitate an alteration of the whole framework of the Bill.

SIR ROBERT COLLIER said, he took the same view. If the Amendment were carried, it would be almost impossible to pass the Bill in the present Session, for it would have to be sent back to the draftsman to be re-cast. A better mode of proceeding would be to have separate short Bills for Scotland and Ireland.

MR. DISRAELI said, he had no objection to the principle of the Amendment, if Irish Members on both sides were satisfied that the fulfilment of those duties could be intrusted to Irish Judges, who, he thought, would require no addition to their staff for the purpose. Supposing that they legislated for Ireland on this point, they must also legislate for Scotland, and he was of opinion that it would not be necessary to increase the number of the Scotch Judges for the fulfilment of such duties. But he feared that in adopting the Amendment the Committee would be embarking on a sea of troubles, and would not be able to go on with the Bill as at present framed, and, therefore, if they legislated for Ireland and Scotland, they must do so, he apprehended, by separate measures. However, after the Bill as it stood was considered in Committee, it might be found possible to introduce a clause in respect to Ireland and Scotland, and the Government would consider that point.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he wished to know distinctly whether, if the present Bill passed, the Government would introduce similar measures for Ireland and Scotland? If they did not, the result would be that as regards those countries the trial of Election Petitions would still be conducted by a tribunal which the House declared to be incompetent in reference to England. And yet the right hon. Gentleman (the First Minister of the Crown) might, perhaps, say in the end that the function of trying Election Petitions could not be entrusted to a single Irish Judge, who might have been, before his elevation to the Bench, noted for being of a different party complexion from the man whose seat he had to decide on.

MR. SCHREIBER said, that the Irish Bench was composed of men who in many instances had been Members of that House, and had discharged their duties on Election Committees with impartiality, and was it to be supposed that on being made Judges they become incapable of properly discharging the same functions? On the contrary, hon. Members, when transferred to the Bench, lost their politics. Mr. Whiteside was a strong partizan when in that House, but, by the consent of all men in Ireland, he was declared to be a conscientious and impartial Judge.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, he thought the statement of the right hon. Gentleman (the First Lord of the

Treasury) was perfectly fair and satisfactory.

Mr. MONSELL said, the assumption was that this Bill would be a good measure as against corruption. Now, in some of the Irish boroughs corruption had prevailed to a very great extent. He desired the same legislation should extend to the whole kingdom. He did not want to impede the Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman would give a pledge that if this Bill passed for England he would introduce another Bill for Ireland and Scotland, he would be satisfied. He did not care how the thing was done; all he wanted was a distinct understanding that the same legislation should be applied to the three kingdoms.

Mr. ROEBUCK said, he did not think this was dealing fairly and honourably by the right hon. Gentleman (the First Lord of the Treasury), who had distinctly stated what he should do. It was childish to go on as they were doing. The real object was to obstruct the Bill.

Mr. DISRAELI said, he did not wish to be misunderstood. He had not said he would proceed by separate legislation for Ireland and Scotland, but he did pledge himself to this—that when this Bill was carried through they might introduce some clause that might apply to Ireland and Scotland. So far he would pledge himself. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) said first that it was impossible to apply this legislation to Ireland; and, second, that he would never consent to this legislation for England unless it should be applied to Ireland. What was the inevitable inference from the two propositions but that the attempt to apply it to Ireland was a side-wind attack on the Bill itself?

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. AYRTON said, he objected to the whole scheme of the rota. The Government in this clause seemed to lose sight of the fact that the object of the Bill was to meet two entirely different classes of cases. The first embraced Election Petitions that would result from the General Election, and the second the more casual Election Petitions arising during the continuance of Parliament. There was no real resemblance between those two classes of cases. The Petitions arising out of the General Election would all be presented and brought into the Court of Common Pleas on the same day or within a week. Of these there might be forty; the casual Election Petitions did not exceed two in the course of a six months' Session. Now, they were attempting to deal by the same machinery with both sets of Petitions. They proposed to select three Judges, and if they thought they were not sufficient to deal with the number of Petitions within a convenient time, to appoint new Judges to the Courts at Westminster, the reason of whose appointment would expire whenever these forty Election Petitions were disposed of. Was that a reasonable mode of treating the question? There was a defect in the clause which should at once be remedied. They left it to the Judges to say what time was reasonable—whether one or two months—within which the Petitions should be determined, whereas they ought to insist on a guarantee that the Petitions presented should be determined within a reasonable time. He would suggest an arrangement under which all difficulties would vanish. The Election would be about the beginning of the November term. Petitions would not be presented within forty days after the Election, or forty-five days when the recognizances were questioned. That would bring them to the middle of December, when the Judges were about to go all over the country to hold their winter criminal assize. Why, then, should they not avail themselves of this arrangement which Providence placed in their way, when the Judges and the Bar were in the country, to dispose of these Petitions? They were entitled to have an effort made at that time for the trial of the Petitions, and, if necessary, that other business should be postponed. The rota would interpose unnecessary difficulties in the way of the accomplishment of their object. But, to go further, it was extremely inconvenient that three particular Judges should be selected to discharge this duty. It would be much better for the whole of the Judges to meet together when the Election Petition list was complete and decide how they should all distribute themselves about the country for the purpose of trying these Petitions, just in the same way as they distributed themselves at the spring, summer, and the winter assizes. Of course, if it were thought desirable, the Chief Justices of the three Common Law Courts could remain in London. It was absurd to appoint a rota of three Judges to try casual Petitions, of which only two or three might be presented in the course of a twelvemonth. Another objection to the rota was that the particular Judge whose turn it was to try an Election Petition might be particularly required to discharge some of the ordinary business of the Courts just at the time he was taken away to try the Petition. It would be far better to place in the hands of the Judges the power to determine which of their number should try any particular Election Petition. He hoped that the Government would consent to the omission of the words relating to the rota. He begged to move to leave out the words "to be selected from a rota to be formed as hereinafter mentioned."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he failed to see any practical objection in the speech of the hon. and learned Member to the proposal that the Judges should elect three of their number to try Election Petitions. The word "rota" was well known to the Judges, because they attended by "rota" to try prisoners at the Old Bailey. The "rota" for Election Petitions was ordinarily to consist of three Judges, but in case of a General Election power was to be given to appoint other Judges. When the hon. and learned Member proposed that all the Judges should be liable to discharge this particular duty, did he mean that they were all to have an increase of £500 per annum in their incomes? The hon. and learned Member could not have attended the Bar very lately, or he would scarcely have stated that all the Judges went the winter circuit. The fact was that but few of them went the circuit. Did the hon. Member seriously propose that a Judge should "turn to" and try first a prisoner and then an Election Petition alternately? The idea was perfectly preposterous. The hon. Member had further said that the Bar went the winter circuit, but he must have forgotten that only the junior portion of the Bar, who were just beginning to learn their profession, went that circuit. He hoped that the words the hon. Member proposed to omit would be retained.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he was greatly surprised by the flippancy of the observations of the Solicitor General upon the speech of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton). In his (Mr. Serjeant Gaselee's) opinion, the Judges to try these Petitions should be selected by ballot, and not by rota. As he understood, the selected Judges were to be on the rota for the whole year, or how would they get the extra £500? He had no objection to an increase in the salaries of the Judges generally, as he thought they were underpaid; but he objected to this £500 a year being paid them as a sort of bribe to induce them to undertake the duty. He saw no reason why a Judge should not try a prisoner one day and an Election Petition the next, in the same way as a Judge on Circuit tried a prisoner one day and a civil cause the next. He objected, in the first place, to the Judges being appointed to try Election Petitions by rota; secondly, to those Judges being appointed for a year; and, thirdly, to its being known beforehand which of the Judges would have to try the case. He should support the Amendment on the ground that it would carry out more fully the original plan, which unquestionably agreed with the opinion of the majority of the House—namely, that the Judges trying Election Petitions should occupy the position more of Jurors than of Judges.

Mr. SANDFORD said, he wished to point out an objection to the appointment by rota of the Judges to try the Election Petitions, which had apparently escaped the learned Solicitor General; which was that each of three Judges might have to try ten or twelve of these Petitions, instead of the whole of the Judges dividing the responsibility of deciding these cases among them. He thought they were running a risk of placing the Judges in a very invidious position. The greatest lawyer in the House had pointed out in a previous debate that one Judge might be more or less objected to than another, but here they were to have the same Judges over and over again. He wished to know why these three Judges should have £500 per annum more that the rest of the Judges for deciding a few of these cases once in every six years —because it was impossible to take the casual Petitions into consideration. Was the £500 intended as an equivalent for travelling expenses? He hoped that there would be some further explanation of the matter on the part of the Government.

Mr. MONK said, it would be more satisfactory if instead of appointing a rota of three Judges the whole of the Judges were to take the trial of Election Petitions in turn. He wished to direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that the £500 a year which was to be paid to the Judges appointed for the purpose of trying Petitions was intended by way of extra salary and not in lieu of expenses, which, by another provision, were to be defrayed out of the Treasury. He certainly could not see any reason for paying an additional £500 a year to the three Judges to be appointed for the trial of these Petitions.

Sir ROBERT COLLIER said, that the proposal to select Judges from a rota was in accordance with the plan adopted at the trial of criminals at the Old Bailey. In the course of three or four years all the Judges went through that work. They ought to trust the Judges and consult their convenience. He believed that the proposal made by the Government would be the most convenient for the Judges, for the Bar and also for the public.

Mr. DISRAELI said, he would beg to remind the Committee that they were not now discussing the question of an additional £500 a year being given to the Judges appointed for the trial of these Petitions. The question before the Committee was as to the selection from a rota, and it would be better perhaps if the Committee adhered to the plan usually followed, and to discuss only that portion of the measure which was immediately under consideration.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, he thought it would be better to permit the appointment of as many Puisne Judges as the pressure of Election Petitions might require, instead of determining at once on the selection of a certain number for a rota.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. BOUVERIE said, he wished to remind the House that the Lord Chief Justice of England had written a letter to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government upon this subject. That letter contained the following passages:—

> "In conformity with your wishes, I have consulted the Judges, and I am charged by them, one and all, to convey to you their strong and unanimous feeling of insuperable repugnance to having these new and objectionable duties thrust upon them. We are unanimously of opinion that the inevitable consequence of putting Judges to try Election Petitions will be to lower and degrade the Judicial office, and to destroy, or, at all events, materially impair the confidence of the public in the thorough impartiality and inflexible integrity of the Judges when, in the course of their ordinary duties, political matters come incidentally before them. . . . I have only, in conclusion, to protest in the name of all the Judges and my own, most earnestly and emphatically, against the proposed scheme, as one which, besides being unconstitutional and unjust towards the Judges, is calculated to degrade the character of the Bench, to impair the confidence and esteem now happily entertained for the Judges, as well as their influence and utility, and most seriously to interfere with the administration of justice."

Mr. Monk

He now desired to ask the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown whether he had had any fresh communication with the Judges, and whether as the scheme now proposed to the Committee was practically the same as that of which the Lord Chief Justice had written so strongly, he had received any retraction of the opinions which he had just read, or whether, indeed, the fact was that the scheme, in its present form, had never been submitted to the Judges at all?

Mr. DISRAELI: I will observe only that the opinion referred to was expressed a considerable time ago, and that it is now generally admitted that time influences even unanimous opinions. That opinion was, moreover, expressed at a harsh period of the year, when people are not sanguine in their temperament. I have, therefore, every hope that her Majesty's Judges will now take a larger and more expansive view of the circumstances of the case and of their duties; and if the House will but agree to the Bill we have introduced, Her Majesty's Judges will, I have little doubt, carry out its provisions to the utmost of their ability.

Mr. BOUVERIE: I must remark that the right hon. Gentleman has not answered my Question.

Mr. ALLEN pointed out that practically the House was saying to every one of its Members, including the Attorney General and all Members of the Bar among them, that they were incompetent to try an Election Petition as long as they were Members of the House, but that as soon as any learned Member was raised to the Bench he immediately became endowed with superior ability.

Sir FRANCIS GOLDSMID said, it must not be lost sight of that they were giving the Judges power to provide one of their number with an extra £500 a year. He presumed there would be some sort of canvassing among the Judges for the post, though he did not suppose they would issue election addresses. He could not, therefore, refrain from expressing a hope that the House would not hereafter hear of Election Petitions against the Judges themselves.

Mr. OSBORNE said, he thought the Committee ought to consider that the Government were placed in considerable difficulty in this matter, and that they deserved credit for touching this question at all. He looked upon the Bill as an experiment, and, although he did not approve all its provisions, he would vote for it, because it would enable the House to escape from one of the very worst systems with which it had ever been hampered. But an unnecessary difficulty had been imported into the scheme in the shape of the £500 a year proposal. He recommended the Government to get rid of that proposal, and all would go smoothly. There was no necessity for it; the work of the Judges would be made much lighter by the Bill, and they could arrange for this extra work among themselves as they arranged for for the transaction of all other business; the Judges would, at the same time, be rid of the odium which might possibly attach to their voting £500 a year to one of their number. No doubt the increase of pay would induce the Bench to look with more favour on the Bill; but the House had but one duty before it, and that was to put an end to bribery. His own opinion was that a Judge going down to a borough would strike terror into the hearts of the corrupt, and do great things for enforcing purity of elections.

MR. ROEBUCK said, he thought that the question before the Committee should be decided before other matters were discussed.

Question, "That Section 1 stand part of the proposed Amendment, "put, and *agreed* to.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the last Amendment, to add the words "2. The members of each of the Courts of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, shall, on or before the first day of Michaelmas Term in every year select, by a majority of votes, one of the puisne judges of such Court, not being a Member of the House of Lords, to be placed on the rota for the trial of Election Petitions during the ensuing year."—(*Mr. Disraeli.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. AYRTON moved an Amendment, providing that the Judges should meet from time to time to arrange among themselves for the trial of all Election Petitions within two months after issue should have been joined. He proposed to supplement this by moving that, instead of paying the Judges appointed an extra salary, they should have a certain allowance on account of expenses for each Petition tried, in the same way as was formerly done in the matter of Assize. He saw no just ground for giving additional salary, because the Judge engaged in the country on an Election Petition would be secure from work in town, so that he would not, in consequence of being elected Bribery Judge, be saddled with extra work. The object of his present Amendment was to limit as much as possible the time occupied in the trial of Petitions.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

By leaving out from the word "Exchequer," to the end of the said proposed Amendment, in order to add the words "shall meet together from time to time to arrange amongst themselves a rota for the trial of all Election Petitions within two months after the same shall be at issue,"—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

—instead thereof.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the Amendment divided itself into two parts. First, the Judges were to meet on receipt of a Petition, and arrange who should try it; secondly, the trial was to terminate within two months. The first point was practically decided on the last section, when the House decided there should be a rota; and as to the second, he had to say only that a proposal to legislate that a trial should be completed within two months had never before been entertained in any civilized country.

LORD HENLEY said, he preferred the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton).

MR. MONK said, he understood the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets to intend, not that all the trials should be completed within two months, but that they should be commenced within that period.

MR. AYRTON said, his proposition was that they should fix a term for the commencement of the trial. If two months were too short they could alter the period, or insert the words—well known to the law—"within a reasonable time."

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 148; Noes 83: Majority 65.

Then the following Sections of the proposed Amendment read, and *agreed to*.

"3. If in any case the Members of the said Court are equally divided in their choice of a puisne judge to be placed on the rota, the Chief Justice of such Court (including under that expression the Chief Baron of the Exchequer), shall have a second or casting vote.

"4. Any judge placed on the rota shall be re-eligible in the succeeding or any subsequent year.

"5. In the event of the death or illness of any judge for the time being on the rota, or his inability to act for any reasonable cause, the Court to which he belongs shall fill up the vacancy by placing on the rota another puisne judge of the same Court.

"6. The judges for the time being on the rota shall, according to their seniority, respectively try the Election Petitions standing for trial under this Act unless they otherwise agree among themselves, in which case the trial of each Election Petition shall be taken in manner provided by such agreement."

Section 7,

"Where it appears to one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, upon a certificate under the hands of the judges on the rota, after due consideration of the list of Petitions under this Act for the time being at issue, that the trial of such Election Petitions will be inconveniently delayed unless an additional judge or judges be appointed to assist the judges on the rota, each of the said Courts (that is to say) the Court of Exchequer, the Court of Common Pleas, and Court of Queen's Bench, in the order named, shall, on and according to the requisition of such Secretary of State, appoint one of the puisne judges of the Court to try Election Petitions for the ensuing year; and any judge so appointed shall, during that year, be deemed to be on the rota for the trial of Election Petitions—"

read.

Mr. AYRTON said, he wished to call attention to the way in which the section was framed. Its effect would be to put Election Petitions under the control of an Officer of the Crown. Any Secretary of State was to have power to regulate the trial of Election Petitions. In certain cases, if there was no interference by any such officer, the Petition could not be tried. If hon. Members accepted everything that was proposed to be put into the Bill because it was called a Bill for the Prevention of Corrupt Practices at Elections, they would deserve to be compared to those animals who swallow bait which, though smeared with something savoury, contains poison. In his opinion, the interposition of a Secretary of State was wholly unnecessary, and the natural course of proceedings would be to leave the matter in the hands of the Chief Justice, who could ask the members of his Court to make proper arrangements. He proposed as an Amendment to leave out the words "one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State," in order to insert the words "Chief Justice of the Court."

Mr. ROEBUCK said, he thought it would be better still that the matter should be left in the hands of the Judges on the rota, and suggested that the words "Chief Justice of the Court" should be struck out of the Amendment.

Words "Chief Justice of the Court" *struck out;* Amendment amended by the insertion of other words.

Section, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Section 8,

"Her Majesty may, in manner heretofore in use, appoint an additional puisne judge to each of the Courts of Queen's Bench, the Common Pleas, and the Exchequer; but no judge appointed in pursuance of or after the passing of this Act shall be placed on the rota for the trial of Election Petitions until the expiration of two years from the date of his appointment—"

read.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the proviso in this section was a most unhappy one. It was proposed to enact that Judges should sit in the Superior Courts with the stigma of Parliament upon them, to the effect that they could not be trusted to do some of their duties. Anything more offensive to a Judge it was difficult to conceive. It seemed that they were to have two years of purification; but he (Mr. Ayrton) never before heard of any system of purification which extended over so long a period as two years. In converting a wretched Hindoo into a Brahmin it was only necessary that he should be steeped in a jar of oil for nine days, and at the end of that period he came forth a Brahmin. Surely some shorter mode of purifying a Judge might be found; but, in his opinion, it would be better to leave out the latter part of the section altogether, and he therefore moved to omit the proviso.

Mr. DISRAELI said, he had no objection to omit the words objected to.

Mr. BOUVERIE said, that the danger which it was intended to guard against was that of having partizans acting as Judges. A Gentleman who had taken part in the heated conflicts of that House might be transplanted to the Bench, and might, but for some such provision as this be at once engaged in trying Election Petitions. Whether he had to try the case of an opponent or that of a political friend the result was sure to be that there would be a charge of partiality brought against the Bench. The principle of the Bill was that such a man was to be distrusted as one of a Committee; but the moment he got upon the Bench he was to have full confidence placed in him.

Mr. ROEBUCK suggested that the

right hon. Gentleman had better move that no Member of Parliament should be made a Judge.

Proviso *struck out.*

Section, as amended, *agreed to.*

Section 9,

"The expression "the Court" shall, for the purposes of this Act, mean the Court of Common Pleas, and such Court shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, have the same powers, jurisdiction, and authority with reference to an Election Petition and the proceedings thereon as it would have if such Petition were an ordinary cause within their jurisdiction—"

read.

Mr. AYRTON said, they had now arrived at that part of the Bill which provided that the Petition should be tried not before the Judge, but by the Judge without the assistance of a jury. It was proposed that he should not only without the intervention of a jury determine questions of fact, but also decide questions of law affecting the seat of a Member, his capacity to sit in Parliament for seven years, and the qualifications of electors. This was an enormous power to give to a single Judge. If an act of corruption was to be tried, involving a comparatively small punishment, the question of fact must be decided by a jury; but where the act of bribery was to affect the validity of the Election and deprive a Member of his seat, the Judge alone was to determine it. In fact, the person tried for bribery—it might be in the same Court, if not at the same sitting—might be acquitted by the jury, so that there would be an absolute reversal of the decision of the Judge by the verdict of the jury. That was a very unfortunate position in which to place a Judge. Would it be competent in such a case to sue out a pardon from the Crown against the decision of a Judge in these circumstances? Looking at the penal consequences of a conviction under these petitions, it was necessary that the case should be tried, as in other criminal cases, by a jury. The consciences of twelve men afforded a better guarantee for impartiality than that of a single Judge did. If the Committee assented to the proposition that all matters of fact were to be tried by a jury, it would be easy enough to adopt a course which would secure a jury whose minds were unbiassed with reference to the matter under inquiry. He begged to move as an Amendment, to leave out all the words in the clause after the word "tried" in line 15, for the purpose of inserting the words "by a jury to be selected as hereinafter provided." If that Amendment were adopted, all matters of law relating to these Election Petitions would be tried by a Judge, while all questions of fact would be decided by a Jury of the people of this country.

Mr. ROEBUCK pointed out a more convenient method by which the questions before the Committee could be put, and concluded by observing that in the multitude of words there was not much wisdom.

The CHAIRMAN said, possibly the course proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) was a more convenient one than that which had been taken. Still the hon and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets had a right to put his Amendment in the way he had done.

Sir ROBERT COLLIER said, it was utterly impossible that the scheme proposed by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) could be carried out practically. A jury might decide one or two issues of fact easily enough; but it was too much to expect them to come to a unanimous decision upon questions of the complicated character that were sure to arise at the trial of Election Petitions, where they would have to agree upon not one, but perhaps twenty issues of fact. The result would be that in every case the jury would have to be discharged without giving a verdict.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. GOLDNEY moved in line 22, after "Petition," to insert, "in which Corrupt Practices are charged or alleged shall."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that these words would confine the trial on the spot to cases in which corrupt practices were charged; but he thought that in other cases—for instance, in the case of a scrutiny—there should be a local proceeding.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Mr. AYRTON said, he would beg to move an Amendment binding the Judges in their procedure to respect the decisions and judgments of the House. The inquiries of Election Committees were various in their character, and there was only one way by which proper relations between the House and the new tribunal could be preserved, and that was that the authority of the House should be fully recognized, and that the new tribunal should be guided in everything they did by the course followed by the House, whether that course were right or wrong. It was quite clear that unless they did that there would at no very distant date be a continual conflict between the House and the Court they were now setting up.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause, to add the words "Provided always, That no court or judge shall call in question, or suffer to be called in question, in any proceedings under this Act, any resolution or order of the House of Commons touching the privileges of the House, or of any Member thereof, or the duties of any returning officer, or of any officer of the House of Commons; and a printed copy of the Journals of the House, or of any such resolution or order printed by the printer of the House, shall be sufficient evidence thereof; and such order or resolution shall be binding and conclusive on such court or judge, and all parties appearing in any such proceedings."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL objected to the Amendment, because he regarded it as unnecessary, and feared that it would be dangerous. Indeed, he looked upon it as the last effort on the part of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) to retain the jurisdiction in the House of Commons by making the House a kind of Court of Appeal to the tribunal they were now establishing. There was nothing in this Bill which gave the decision of the Judge any greater effect than the decision of an Election Committee; and, therefore, if any danger would exist after this Bill was passed, it had existed a long time. The Amendment served no good purpose, and could lead to nothing but ill.

MR. BOUVERIE said, that the House had had control over Committees, but the Judges might treat the Orders and Resolutions of the House as waste paper. There had been a struggle for centuries between the House and the Bench, and now the House with their eyes open were going to part with their privileges. They were about to rush with haste into what those who came after them would repent at leisure. He would support the Amendment as calculated to mitigate the evils the Bill would entail.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided*: — Ayes 53; Noes 185: Majority 132.

On Question, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill,"

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he had intended, before the clause was finally agreed to, to make some observations in vindication of a plan which was embodied in three pages of Amendments that stood on the Notice Paper in his name. As the Committee had, however, already virtually decided against his plan, he would not now press his Amendments.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 15 (House of Commons to carry out Report).

MR. BOUVERIE said, he hoped the House, out of regard for its own dignity and character, would reject that clause, which was without parallel in the history of their legislation. Surely, when the law had been declared by a tribunal over which the House was to have no control, it was not to be supposed that the House would break the law. It should be left entirely to the House itself to say what it should or should not enter on its own Journals.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL pointed out—as a precedent for that clause—that by the 86th section of the 11 & 12 *Vict.* c. 98 it was enacted that the decisions of Election Committees should be entered on the Journals of the House.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided*:— Ayes 174; Noes 54; Majority 120.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 16 *agreed to.*

Clause 17 (Report of the Judge as to Corrupt Practices).

MR. SANDFORD moved to leave out the clause, and insert a new clause in its stead. His object was to provide that in every case in which a Member was unseated for corrupt practices a Commission should be issued to inquire into the extent of the existence of corrupt influences on the spot; for as matters now stood it was often the wish even of the Petitioner to stifle the circumstance of their extensively prevailing, in order that a new writ might be issued. The best way, he might add, to put a stop to bribery was in his opinion to make it the interest of the inhabitants of a locality to put it down, and a candidate would no longer be looked upon as popular, but rather as a pest, if his conduct in promoting corruption should lead to the imposition of an additional burden on the rates.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause, to add the words "And in every case where a Member for a County or a Borough may be unseated for corrupt practices, then and in every such case a Commission shall be issued according to the provisions of the Act of the Session of the fifteenth and sixteenth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, intituled 'An Act to provide for more effective inquiry into the existence of Corrupt Practices at Elections of Members to serve in Parliament, for the purpose of inquiring into the prevalence of Corrupt Practices in such County or Borough; and the expenses of such Commission and such inquiry shall be defrayed by the County or Borough to which such Commission shall be issued."—(*Mr. Sandford.*)

MR. AYRTON said, that the latter portion of the clause cut two ways, and would be likely to do more harm than good. If, in the case of corrupt practices, all the inhabitants of the locality were to be fined by paying the expenses of a Commission, the result would be that everyone of them would be interested in preventing corrupt practices being proved. The real danger of the Bill already was that it tended to prevent the discovery of corrupt practices, and this provision would add another motive to those which already prevailed to induce persons to refrain from giving evidence. He hoped the hon. Member for Maldon (Mr. Sandford) would leave out that portion of the clause which threw the expenses of Commissions on the locality.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, it was the opinion of the Committee, which sat on the subject last year, that the object to be kept in view was rather the prevention of corrupt practices in the first instance than the disclosure of such practices when they had taken place. They thought that to throw the expenses of the inquiry upon the locality, where it was proved that corrupt practices had prevailed, would have the effect of preventing those corrupt practices being committed. It appeared, however, to him that the addition moved by the hon. Member would inflict injustice in certain cases.

MR. LOWTHER said, he thought the most effectual way of preventing corrupt practices was by charging the expense of the inquiry upon the locality.

SIR FRANCIS GOLDSMID said, he objected to the expense being thrown upon the whole of the inhabitants of a locality, as it would be making the innocent suffer with the guilty. He feared that such a provision would render it the interest of the inhabitants of a borough where bribery had prevailed to have no petition presented.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he was happy to be able, on the present occasion, to vote with the Government.

MR. HENLEY said, that if the object was to prevent bribery, they had better not throw the expense of checking it on the offending locality, or they never would be able to discover the commission of corrupt practices, as people would band together in order to keep them from becoming known.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked whether it was necessary to carry the delusion further, that the respectable inhabitants of a borough knew nothing about the corruption which took place in their midst? In some boroughs it was necessary to settle the "difficulty" which arose with regard to the voters who objected to bribery and those who were in favour of it before a candidate could be chosen. He believed that the imposition of a fine on a borough for corruption would tend to lessen the evil.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL pointed out that the proposed Amendment would make the issue of a Commission imperative when a single case of bribery had been committed, although the Judge might be of opinion that bribery had not extensively prevailed. He thought it would be a hardship to the inhabitants of the county or borough to issue a Commission in cases where the Judge was of opinion there were only one or two cases of bribery.

MR. AYRTON observed that a Commission would issue under the clause as it stood only on the Address of both Houses of Parliament. He thought a Commission should issue unless the Judge should certify that no further acts of bribery had occurred beyond those he had already inquired into.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY reminded his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) that the Judge was, under a previous clause, bound to report in writing to the Speaker whether there was reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed.

MR. BOUVERIE contended that it should be imperative to issue a Commission where corrupt practices had extensively prevailed; and therefore it was necessary to consider by whom the proceedings were to be carried out after the Judge had decided that corrupt practices had prevailed. He remembered a case which had come before an Election Committee, of which the hon. Member for Montrose (Mr. Baxter) was Chairman. The Committee reporte that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed; but, as the Chairman declined to move an Address, no inquiry had taken place from that day to this.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: If that is the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, he should say "No" to the clause, and bring up a new clause himself.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he thought that the meaning of the words "extensive bribery" ought to be defined. Did they mean corruption to the extent of 5 or 10 per cent of the constituency?

MR. M. CHAMBERS maintained that on receipt of a Report from the Judge that bribery and corruption prevailed, a Commission should issue forthwith.

MR. LOWTHER said, he was surprised at the mistake into which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Russell Gurney) had fallen when he said it would be the duty of the Judge to inquire whether corruption had been prevalent. All that would devolve on the Judge would be to take such evidence as would decide the question of the seat.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL observed that, in such a case at present, a Commission issued for the purpose of legislation, on the Address of the two Houses, to enable them to know whether the place should be disfranchised. A shorthand writer would attend the inquiry before the Judges, and his Report would be sent to the House, so that they would have the means of knowing everything that occurred.

MR. AYRTON: By whom will the Address be moved?

MR. DISRAELI said, he would answer the hon. and learned Member by asking who moved the Address in the House of Lords at present?

MR. AYRTON said, they were not legislating for the House of Lords; they were legislating for the House of Commons, and it was sufficient for him to have to do with the House of Commons. At present, the Chairman of the Election Committees who made the Report was a Member of the House, and could be brought to the table, but it surely was not intended that the Judge should be ordered to attend at the Bar, and explain what took place on the inquiry. After the Judge sent the certificate with regard to the prevalence of corrupt practices to Mr. Speaker, upon whom would devolve the duty of moving the Address? Unless they knew who was to move for the Commission in that House it would be better that the Commission should go as a matter of course.

MR. SANDFORD said, that if the Amendment were carried a stop would be put to corrupt practices, as the inhabitants would exert themselves to prevent such practices being carried on.

Question put, "That those words be there added"

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 72; Noes 126: Majority 54.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, that as he had an important Amendment to propose, and there was not time for the discussion, he would beg to move that the Committee report Progress.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he wished for some more explicit understanding as to the moving of these Addresses. He should otherwise feel it necessary to raise the question again. Was the duty to fall on the Government, or would it devolve upon any hon. Member who chose to wade through the short-hand notes? Unless he had a distinct understanding on that point he should move the rejection of the clause with the view to bringing up a fresh one.

MR. DISRAELI: If the right hon. Gentleman is desirous of preserving the privileges of this House, why does he grudge hon. Members the privilege of moving these Addresses?

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH objected to the performance of the duty being left to the inclination of any private Member.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

WORKHOUSE DIETARIES IN IRELAND.

RESOLUTION.

MR. BLAKE rose to call attention to the deficiency of Workhouse dietaries in Ireland, and to move That, in the opinion of this House, the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland should establish a minimum scale of dietary for the Paupers in the Union Workhouses not less than that now in existence in the Irish County Gaols, and which was recommended by the Commission appointed to report on the County

Prison Dietaries, "as necessary for the preservation of the health of the prisoners." A year ago he brought under the notice of the noble Earl the Chief Secretary for Ireland the deficiency of the gaol dietaries in Ireland. The noble Earl gave an assurance that the subject would be inquired into, and soon after a Commission was issued for the purpose consisting of three gentlemen most eminent in their profession. They recommended that the dietary should be increased by a supper of six ounces of bread and half a pint of milk. The county prison dietary now consisted of 28 ounces of solid food a day, or 196 ounces per week. He would take the Waterford Union as an illustration of the workhouse dietary, as it was quite as good there as almost anywhere else. The able men had about 170 ounces of solid food in the week, or 26 ounces less than the prisoners confined for terms beyond a month, so that the latter got more in seven days than the paupers got in eight days. In Clonmel and other unions the condition of the pauper was even worse. Some unions gave a supper; but, although that was an improvement, still, with very few exceptions, there was no actual increase in the quantity of food, as the supper was usually made up of reductions from the breakfast and dinner. When three competent gentlemen had laid down a certain amount of food as essential to keep county prisoners in health, the same rule ought to be applied to the paupers. Except for the seclusion the condition of the prisoner was better than that of the workhouse pauper. He had a better bed, a nicer sleeping apartment, a pleasant temperature kept up, and not harder work to do, on the whole, than the pauper. As the Gaol Commissioners had recommended in the event of the same hard labour being introduced in the Irish county prisons as existed in England, that meat should be added to the dietary, it was as impolitic as it was unjust to place the person compelled, as was often the case, to enter a workhouse for no fault of his own, in a worse position as regarded the necessaries of life than the prisoner expiating a crime; indeed, it offered a direct incentive to the violation of the law. Besides, as a matter of economy, it was better for the ratepayers to maintain the able-bodied pauper in a state of health that would enable him to gain a livelihood outside. A Return, ordered at the instance of Mr. Cogan, showed some curious facts with regard to workhouse dietaries. There were 164 unions. In 91, there were only 2 meals; in 73, there were 3 meals given. Forty excluded the old and infirm from the third meal. Three unions excluded women only from the third meal, and three more refused a supper to infants. The exclusion of the old and infirm was most inhuman; far better instead of killing them by inches would it be to do as was done in India with old people—put them on a raft and send them off to sea. Humanity, independent of everything else, required that the State should see that those whom it undertook to protect should have their health and strength maintained at a fair standard. From the success which attended his appeal to the Chief Secretary on behalf of prisoners, he had every hope that with his characteristic humanity he would take measures to have the poor people obliged to resort to the sad alternative of entering a poorhouse placed in at least as good a position as those who did not merit the same sympathy.

MR. O'BEIRNE seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland should establish a minimum scale of dietary for the Paupers in the Union Workhouses not less than that now in existence in the Irish County Gaols, and which was recommended by the Commission appointed to report on the County Prison Dietaries, 'as necessary for the preservation of the health of the prisoners,'" —(*Mr. Blake,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE EARL OF MAYO said, that the question raised by the hon. Member was one of considerable importance; but he thought the Motion was based on a misapprehension as to the scale of diet recommended by the Commissioners who inquired last year into the question of the dietary in county gaols. They recommended four classes of diet, proportioned to terms of imprisonment, for those who were respectively imprisoned one week, one month, three months, and more than three months; and the reason was that those undergoing the longer terms of imprisonment evidently required the more generous diet, particularly if their imprisonment was accompanied with hard labour. The scale for one-week prisoners was precisely the same as the minimum workhouse scale. The hon. Member did not say with what particular class of gaol diet he wished workhouse diet to be assimilated, but it was to be presumed he would say the one-month scale, which was somewhat more generous than workhouse diet and was accompanied by some advantages, three meals a day being allowed. In no single instance did the Commissioners, who inquired minutely into the diet of many workhouses, say that it was insufficient to maintain the health and strength of the paupers; but, in instituting a comparison between workhouse and gaol dietaries, they remark that whereas many of the paupers admitted into unions had been accustomed to a life of deprivation, many of the persons sent to prison had been used to liberal fare, and were, therefore, less capable of submitting to a very low diet; and they were inclined to the opinion that prisoners did require a higher scale of dietary than paupers. The average stay of the individual pauper in the Irish workhouse was seventy-one days, and that of the able-bodied pauper was much shorter, being a month or less, and on the principle of the Commissioners, the able-bodied paupers would have pretty nearly the same scale of diet as was recommended for the first-class prisoners who were confined for the shortest time. The question was a difficult one, and ought to be left to be decided very much by local circumstances and local knowledge, and it would not be wise in the Poor Law Commission to exercise their powers indiscriminately in forcing Guardians to increase the diet, particularly as it had been proved by the researches of Sir John Forbes in 1852, that the dietary in Irish workhouses, paradoxical as it might seem, was more nutritious and palatable than that in the English workhouses in consequence of the greater quantity of milk allowed. If an attempt was made to enforce a certain scale on the Guardians, the price and quality of the provisions would still be under their control. At present the greatest care was taken that everything should be of the best quality. The efforts of the Commissioners to induce Guardians in some cases to give a more liberal diet had generally been successful. The first point pressed upon the Guardians by the Commissioners was that they should allow three meals a day, instead of two. The next recommendation of the Commissioners, which had been adopted in a great many cases, was that a small portion of meat should be put into the vegetable soup for the purpose of rendering it more palatable. Another recommendation was that in the case of aged and infirm persons bread and tea should be substituted for "stirabout" and milk. It had been also recommended that a considerable addition should be made to the meat portion of the dietary: but, looking at the state of the country, he thought the reasons against adopting this recommendation were perfectly conclusive. In the first place the present dietary in Ireland was much more nutritious and wholesome, containing a greater quantity of animal food, than the English dietary. It should be remembered, moreover, that the great object of those who had the management of these institutions was to put the inmates in a position to obtain their livelihood by industry; but if in regard to young persons a scale of dietary were established superior to the ordinary diet of the country, no inducement would be offered to such persons to earn their livelihood by industry. There were good reasons, therefore, for the course which the Poor Law Commissioners had thought proper to adopt. It would be found from the Returns that the mortality in the Irish workhouses was very low; and under all the circumstances, although it might be desirable to make minor alterations in the scale of dietary, it would be unwise to make any considerable addition to the meat portion of the dietary.

Mr. BLAKE said, he would withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

CONSULAR COURTS IN TURKEY AND EGYPT.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. LAYARD: Sir, if the subject to which I desire to draw the attention of the House were not one of very considerable importance, I should not have ventured to bring it forward at this late period of the Session. It is important because it concerns the interests of a large number of British subjects residing in the East, because it has a direct bearing upon the extensive commercial relations now existing between England and the Turkish Empire, and because it affects the character and reputation not only of this country, but of other European nations. The House may probably be aware that Nubar Pasha, the principal Minister of his Highness the Viceroy of Egypt, has recently visited England, in order to obtain from Her Majesty's Government some modification of the state of things which now exists in Egypt connected with the administration of justice under Consular jurisdiction, and the relations between British subjects and the subjects of the Viceroy. Nubar Pasha has also visited France for the same purpose. As the whole object of our treaty relations with Turkey, and of the rights and privileges claimed under them, has been greatly misunderstood and misrepresented both in this country and in the East, I will endeavour to explain to the House how the matter really stands. England entered into her first treaty with Turkey as early as the year 1578. This treaty was followed by others in 1606, 1648 and 1675. They were termed, in the diplomatic language of the time, "capitulations." All these treaties were confirmed by the general treaty of peace at the termination of the war with Turkey in 1809. The capitulations consist of a large number of articles; but there are only three or four of them which bear directly on the present question, and I will quote them. The 15th Article states—

> "That in all litigations occurring between the English or subjects of England, and any other person, the Judge shall not proceed to hear the cause without the presence of an interpreter or one of his deputies."

The 16th Article—

> "That if there happens any suit or difference or dispute among the English themselves, the decision thereof shall be left to their own Ambassador or Consul, according to their custom, without the Judge or other Governors, our slaves, intermeddling therein."

The 24th Article declares—

> "That if an Englishman or other subject of that nation shall be involved in any lawsuit, or other affair connected with law, the Judge shall not hear or decide thereon until the Ambassador, Consul, or interpreter shall be present; and all suits exceeding the value of 4,000 aspers shall be heard at the Sublime Porte."

The 42nd Article that—

> "In cases of manslaughter or other crime, the Governors shall not proceed in the cause until the Ambassador or Consul shall be present."

It must be borne in mind that there are articles in the capitulations entered into between Turkey and other nations giving still more extended privileges to the subjects of those nations; and that, as our capitulations contain what is called "the most favoured nation clause," we have a right to insist on the same privileges which have been accorded to other countries. When the capitulations were entered into our relations with Turkey were very different from what they are at the present time. The commerce between the two countries was carried on by a privileged company, enjoying rights somewhat similar to those which were then possessed by the East India Company. This company, which was called the Levant Company, was abolished in the year 1825. The commerce of France with Turkey was carried on by a similar company, having a monopoly. The seat of that company was at Marseilles, and it was not abolished until 1835. Formerly, no British or French subject could trade with Turkey who was not a member of one of the privileged companies. Every member was compelled to deposit caution money, or to give security for his good behaviour, and was entirely under the control of the Consul, who was paid by the company itself, and who administered the law according to the articles of the various capitulations. The merchants resided in distinct establishments called "factories," which were usually surrounded by walls, enclosing shops, churches, chapels, and all the requirements for a small colony. The administration of justice by the Consuls being thus confined to these small communities was originally a very small and insignificant matter. The Sultans of Turkey made no difficulty in conceding the rights and privileges in this respect which the treaties had conferred, for two reasons. In the first place, it was admitted that owing to the exceptional position of foreigners in the midst of a fanatical Mahommedan population they were entitled to exceptional protection from their own authorities; and secondly, because it has always been in accordance with the principles of the Turkish Government to allow non-Mahommedan sects to administer their own concerns without the intervention of the Turkish authorities, a principle which has been acted upon in the case of the Greeks, Armenians, Jews, and other sects inhabiting the Ottoman Empire. No one, however, can suppose for a moment that the great Sultans, the conquerors of a large portion of Europe and Africa, had any intention of renouncing the smallest portion of that authority over their own subjects which they must have considered the essential prerogative and right of a ruler. The House will observe that the articles which I have read apply solely to quarrels and lawsuits between foreigners resident in Turkey, and do not in any way affect Turkish subjects. The law appears to have been administered in a rude kind of way by our Consuls, and when complicated questions of commercial law arose, the principal merchants formed a body of assessors, who, with the Consul, settled the matter in dispute. The Consuls themselves had very slight relations with the outer world, and knew little or nothing of the people in the midst of which they lived. Indeed, I remember one of them, who had been in the service of the Levant Company for fifty years, and who was a much respected and intelligent officer, shortly before his death boasting that he could not speak a word of the nasty languages of the country. After the end of the great war, and the abolition of the Levant Company, our relations with Turkey and other parts of the East underwent a great change. Owing to the improved means of communication with the East, to the development of the vast resources of the Ottoman Empire, and the reforms which were taking place in its internal administration, a large number of foreigners were attracted to Turkey as traders, merchants, and residents. A totally new state of affairs now arose, as this foreign population, no longer confined to the "factories," scattered itself over the country. It was very doubtful whether, after the abolition of the Levant Company, our Consuls, appointed and paid by the Foreign Office, still enjoyed the favours and could exercise the jurisdiction over British subjects which had been previously claimed by the officers of the Company. In order to remove all doubts upon the subject, the Act, 6 & 7 *Vict.* c. 94, commonly called "the Foreign Jurisdiction Act," was passed in 1843. This Act conferred upon Her Majesty's Consuls in the East the powers formerly enjoyed by the officers of the Levant Company, and enabled them to exercise jurisdiction over British subjects residing within the Turkish Empire, according to the terms of the capitulations. Since that time the foreign population has risen in Constantinople to 50,000, and in the Turkish provinces to about 100,000, and in Egypt from 9,000 (in 1848) to 200,000. A very large addition was made to British subjects by the Ionians and Maltese, who swarmed to Turkey to obtain a livelihood. These formed probably the most dangerous part of the foreign population in the Turkish dominions. They defied both the Turkish and British authorities—committing murders, robberies, and every manner of crime with impunity. They claimed protection from the British Consuls, and exemption from the Turkish laws, under the capitulations, and our Consuls were quite unable to deal with them. In consequence, to a great extent, of the state of things which had arisen under British protection, life and property became very insecure in many parts of the East. At length, in order to place some check upon the evil, Consular Courts were established at Constantinople, Smyrna, and Alexandria, and were presided over by professional lawyers sent out from this country, instead of by the Consul. Now, in any observations I may make, I do not wish to cast any reflection on the persons who have presided over these Consular Courts. They have been, in most cases, men of high character, who have been brought up in England and have studied the law here; and I believe that, without exception, they have discharged their duties with satisfaction to the Foreign Office and to British subjects in the East. The remarks that I am about to make apply to the system, and not to either the Foreign Office or to the Courts. The example of England in establishing Consular Courts was followed by France. The first Judge sent by the Foreign Office to Constantinople was Sir E. Hornby, a gentleman of much experience and of high character. Regular Courts, such as are seen in Westminster Hall, were established, and all the horrors of the law were witnessed at Constantinople and Alexandria—even to barristers in wig and gown. In the other cities of Turkey and Egypt the Consul still remains the Judge, and administers the law to British subjects, assisted, in certain cases, by assessors taken from the principal British merchants. Not only do the Judges and Consuls deal with cases which come within the capitulations, but in consequence of various abuses which have sprung up in the course of time, they now take cognizance of matters and claim jurisdiction in cases which are not only not recognized by the treaties, but which are, in many instances, directly opposed to their spirit. This state of things has given rise to the most serious complaints on the part of the Turkish Government, which has seen foreigners gradually encroaching upon its rights, and exercising powers most dangerous to its authority, and to the peace and good order of the country. It has made urgent representations on the subject to the European Powers, pointing out not only the danger which must arise to Turkey, from the fact of there being Consular Courts and Consuls of some twenty different nations, exercising independent and conflicting jurisdiction within the Turkish Empire, but the serious inconvenience which such a state of things must entail upon foreigners themselves resident in Turkey. It has shown that murders, robberies, and other crimes are constantly committed with impunity, because, whilst the Turkish authorities have no power to deal with the offenders, these offenders, being subjects of foreign Powers, were either not punished at all, or only removed for a time, returning to Turkey to commit again the same crimes. Especially in the case of British subjects it was shown that the power of the Consul to punish and remove them from Turkey was so limited that they virtually escaped with impunity. This state of things had become so serious that it was considered necessary to bring it before the Congress held at Paris at the end of the war in 1856. Lord Clarendon was, I believe, the first to introduce the subject. He was followed by other Plenipotentiaries, who admitted the evils that had arisen from the exercise of a foreign jurisdiction in the East, unwarranted by the capitulations. Ali Pasha, the Turkish Plenipotentiary, strongly urged the necessity of dealing with the matter, and the following declaration was solemnly recorded in a Protocol:—

> "Ali Pasha attributes all the difficulties which fetter the commercial relations of Turkey and the action of the Ottoman Government to stipulations which are obsolete. He enters into details tending to establish that the privileges which Europeans have acquired by the capitulation are injurious to their own security and to the development of their transactions by limiting the interference of the local administration; that the jurisdiction by which foreign agents protect their countrymen constitutes a multiplicity of Governments within the Government, and, consequently, an insuperable obstacle to all improvements. Baron Bourqueney, and the other Plenipotentiaries with him, acknowledge that the capitulations apply to a situation to which the Treaty of Peace will necessarily tend to put an end, and that the privileges which they confer upon individuals circumscribe the authority of the Porte within limits to be regretted; that it is opportune to devise modifications calculated to bring all things into harmony. . . The Plenipotentiaries, then, unanimously recognize the necessity of revising the capitulations, and decide upon recording in the Protocol their wish that a deliberation should be opened at Constantinople for the purpose after the conclusion of peace."

There were several reasons which induced the Plenipotentiaries at the Conference of Paris to consent to this declaration as to the revision of the capitulations; the principal one being, that at that time Foreign Powers were anxious to obtain for their subjects the right of holding land in Turkey; and the Turkish Government could not consent to grant any such privilege to foreigners so long as they refused to submit to its laws. Now, the question of the right of foreigners to possess land in Turkey has been very much misunderstood. It is often asserted that no Christian can hold land in Turkey. That is a mistake. A Christian can do so if he is a subject of the Porte. In fact, the laws relating to real property are the same in Turkey as in this country. An alien cannot hold it. In consequence of the declaration contained in the Protocol which I have quoted, the Turkish Government, relying upon the promise there made that the capitulations should be modified, proceeded to take measures for the alteration of the law regarding the possession of land by foreigners. In the so-called "Hatti-Humayoun," or "Charter of rights," issued by the Sultan in 1856, it was declared, that—

> "It shall be lawful for foreigners to possess landed property in my dominions, conforming themselves to the laws and police regulations, and bearing the same charges as the Native inhabitants, and after arrangements have been come to with foreign Powers."

This declaration was made on the understanding that the promise entered into by the Plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Paris would be carried out; but, unfortunately, it has not been. England and France have been continually calling on the Turkish Government to grant to foreigners the right to hold land in Turkey. They have made it a grievance that such a concession has not been granted to their subjects; but as they have not fulfilled their part of the agreement, they can scarcely, with justice, condemn the Porte. I believe that negotiations on this subject are still going on. I do not know in what state they now are; but perhaps the noble Lord the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will have the kindness to give the House some information on that point.

I will now explain how justice is administered in Turkey when foreigners are concerned. When the crime, or the matter in dispute, is of a mixed character—that is to say, when a Turkish subject and a foreigner are parties to it—it must be tried in a Turkish Court; the capitulations merely giving jurisdiction to the foreign authorities when foreigners alone are concerned. Under the capitulations an interpreter, or some person connected with the Embassy, or Consulate, of the nation to which the foreigner in a suit belonged, has a right to attend to see that justice is properly administered. Of late years the Turkish Government has established a special Court, called the "Tidjaret," for the decision of commercial cases, at which merchants, as well as Native Judges, preside, and which deal with cases in regard to evidence in other matters very much after the fashion of European Courts. Native Judges preside over the Criminal Courts; but when foreigners are concerned, an interpreter from the Embassy of the country to which the foreigner belongs takes his seat by the Native Judge, and is consulted by him as to the verdict. I have had an opportunity of speaking to Mr. Simmons, who for many years has acted as one of the interpreters to the British Embassy at Constantinople, and to whom has been confided the duty of attending these tribunals. That gentleman assures me that during his very long experience—and I believe that Mr. Simmons' experience has been as great as that of any other European in Turkey—he has scarcely ever known a case of injustice. On the whole, justice has been very fairly administered, and it is very seldom that any complaints have been addressed to the British Embassy. So much for cases between Natives and foreigners; but in cases between foreigners it sometimes happens that very considerable confusion and delay arise. According to the old legal maxim, *Actio sequitur forum rei,* the person against whom a charge is made is brought into the Court of his own Consul. When several foreigners of different nationalities have to be proceeded against each has to be brought into his own Court, and, in cases of appeal, the appeals must be made to separate tribunals, one, perhaps, sitting at Trieste, another in London, another at Aix, in France, and another at New York. Under such a system it is evident that there must be in many cases an entire miscarriage of justice. We formerly sent criminals to Malta and the Ionian Islands to be tried, and often it was impossible to get a verdict against them. The result was that they returned to Turkey to repeat their offences. In order to justify the protection thus afforded to foreign criminals, the Turkish police are said to be frequently cruel and arbitrary in dealing with strangers; but it is scarcely to be wondered at that, exasperated at being constantly bearded in their own capital, and seeing crimes committed upon them with impunity, they should have been driven to deal somewhat severely with such criminals as they could lay their hands upon. At one time it was determined that after a British subject had been twice convicted of crime British protection should be withdrawn from him; but that innovation caused so many complaints, and gave rise to so many scandals, that the British authorities were obliged to withdraw it. I will mention a case, showing the operation of these Consular Courts, and the nature of the independent jurisdiction which they claim. A very eminent British naval officer employed by the Turkish Government, Admiral Slade, was raised to the rank of a Turkish Pasha, and for a long time was in command of the port of Constantinople, rendering important services to the Turkish Government. Acting within his strict rights, he one day removed some Maltese from a ship which they had, it was believed, piratically seized in the harbour. They at once brought an action against the Pasha in the English Consular Court, and as he naturally refused to appear, not recognizing its jurisdiction over him for acts performed in the discharge of his duty as a Turkish Admiral, judgment went against him by default. They were actually going to arrest him under a warrant issued by the Court, when the Pasha threatened to take some very summary proceedings if they attempted to do so. The case was then referred to this country, and having been examined by the Law Officers of the Crown, was felt to be so monstrous in its character that it was immediately given up. Such was the state of things in the Turkish cities that a man who was seen to commit a murder and had entered a foreigner's house could not be arrested unless the officers of justice were accompanied by the Consul, or representative of the Consul, of the nation to which the offender and the person in whose house he had taken refuge belonged. Thus, if a Greek were seen to commit a murder, by merely walking into the next house he might defy the authorities to arrest him, unless accompanied by the Greek Consul, for whom it might be necessary to send a distance of twenty miles. If a violent outrage were committed by a band of brigands, it might become necessary that the Consuls of the nations to which they respectively belonged must be summoned before one of the number could be touched. It followed from this state of the law that the most atrocious crimes were often committed with impunity. Many other abuses have arisen under the capitulations, which render attempts on the part of the Turkish Government to improve and reform their local administration almost impossible. I will mention one or two of them. Complaints are constantly made of the state of the harbour of Constantinople. It is alleged that, owing to the mismanagement and confusion that exist there, the interests of British merchants and of British commerce are seriously affected, and that British shipping is exposed to damage and loss, and the Turks are held responsible. Now, from what does this state of things arise? Is it solely on account of the misconduct or negligence of the Turkish authorities? Allow me to quote from the very interesting work of Admiral Slade upon Turkey, published last year. No one has more experience of Turkey than that distinguished officer, and, having himself held command of the port of Constantinople, he can speak with authority. He writes—

> "European vessels pay no port or anchorage dues in any provincial harbour of the Turkish Empire. At Constantinople, they pay, without reference to tonnage or length of sojourn, dues varying from one to two shillings per vessel, according to her flag. For example, the Great Eastern might lie in the Golden Horn for a year, and her anchorage due would be twelve piastres. Twelve piastres, once representing as many dollars, now represent two shillings. In 1864 the Porte, at the instance of its Admiralty, proposed to improve the harbour accommodation on consideration of a graduated moderate scale of anchorage dues, and, in expectation of assent, suitable buoys with mooring chains were brought from England. The European Legations declined the proposition. . . . The English have made their harbour master out of a servant in search of a place, out of a shipchandler in difficulties, out of a hydropathic doctor in want of patients, but never out of a sailor."

There is no control by the Turkish authorities over the captains of British vessels. In time of war a British ship, or a ship belonging to an enemy and hoisting the British flag, might place herself alongside a Turkish ship of war. She might be laden with gunpowder, and might be intended as a fire-ship. The commander of the Turkish man-of-war would not dare to interfere with her. Such a state of things would seem incredible unless we had the statement from Admiral Slade. He says, in the work which I have quoted—

> "The Turkish captains were restrained from exercising the right of keeping clear water around them—exercised by men-of-war in every part of the world, exercised afterwards freely by the allied fleets in Beikos Bay—by fear of misrepresentation. The naval reader will exclaim indignantly, 'Why did not Hassan Bey or Ali Bey weigh Captain Tomkins or Captain Lefevre's anchor, and let him drift to the devil, if he pleased?' I will tell him why. Captain Tomkins or Captain Lefevre would have made a report to his Consul, who would have forwarded it with elucidatory remarks to his Ambassador, who in his turn would have sent a dragoman to the Porte with a demand for pecuniary compensation to Captain Tomkins or to Captain Lefevre for the anxiety and ill-usage he had suffered by his own statement, and a request for the dismissal of Hassan Bey or Ali Bey from his ship for over-zeal."

With such a state of things existing in Constantinople, is it possible that the Turkish administration can be satisfactory? Foreign ships become the refuge of every villain; under the capitulations no Turkish officer has a right to board them; they claim complete immunity under a foreign flag. Admiral Slade wished to obtain some control over the harbour by making regulations affecting foreign boatmen. The British Government were quite willing that he should do so; but the French Government, rather than consent, issued an order prohibiting any French subjects from acting as boatmen in the Golden Horn. Again, under the capitulations, Consuls claim exemption from the payment of Custom House dues. The Consuls of this country are for the most part highly honourable men, and would not take advantage of this privilege. But I am afraid that there are Consuls of other nations who do not bear so high a character, and who are not so scrupulous. Moreover, most of the Consuls in the Levant are either merchants themselves or are closely connected with merchants. It may be easily conceived how such a privilege may be used to defraud the Turkish Customs to an enormous extent, and it is a well known fact that, in consequence of its existence, the Turkish revenue suffers most seriously. Under the capitulations foreigners again claim exemption from various taxes. A short time ago the Turkish Government placed a tax upon horses; but this was at once protested against by the Russian and French Embassies on the ground that it was a personal tax, from which they were exempted by the capitulations, and the Government were obliged to give it up, because they could not levy a tax upon their own subjects which foreigners had refused to pay. It was only after some years' discussion that foreigners were induced to pay the common house dues, and even now they object to pay the licence tax, to which a Turkish subject keeping a shop is liable.

The evils arising from this state of things do not end here. The exceptional position of foreigners under the capitulations gives rise to constant claims, many of them of the most unjust and outrageous nature, upon the Turkish Government. When a foreigner conceives that he has been interfered with, or that he has not received the protection he considers himself entitled to under the capitulations, he appeals to his Embassy, and the affair is at once made a diplomatic question. A claim for indemnity is put forward, and urged with all the weight, I will not say the violence, of foreign diplomacy. The Turkish Government appeals in vain to the sense of justice of the Power concerned, and asks for a fair judicial investigation. The Embassy considers its reputation at stake unless it can summarily enforce the claim of its protected subject, and the Porte is compelled to give way rather than have a disagreeable quarrel. These demands for indemnities involve some shameful frauds, and the manner in which the Turkish Government has been frequently treated in regard to them is altogether disgraceful. When I was attached to the Embassy at Constantinople, I often felt a sense of shame when directed to support claims of this nature, and blushed for the honour of my countrymen. Enormous sums of money have thus been extorted from the Turkish Government, and the embarrassment in which the Turkish finances are now placed may be partly traced to this cause. In the case of the British Government, I am convinced that there is a desire to deal honestly and justly with the Porte; but I am not so sure that this is the case with some other countries. In speaking of Egypt I shall have to return to this question of indemnities, and to point out a still greater abuse of the system. But, before leaving this part of the subject, let me ask how we can expect the Sultan to encourage the settlement of foreigners in his dominions, and the investment of European capital in enterprizes which might prove beneficial to his country, when every stranger who settles in Turkey is an additional source of trouble and danger to the Turkish Government, renders all well-ordered administration impossible, and only looks to the means whereby he can plunder the Turkish Treasury? But bad as the condition of things arising out of the capitulations is in Turkey, it is infinitely worse in Egypt. In Turkey the European Powers have confined themselves generally to the privileges granted to them by the capitulations, and only cases between foreigners in which no Native is concerned have been dealt with by the Consuls and Consular Courts. But in Egypt, owing to gradual encroachments made of late years upon the undoubted rights of the Viceroy, the pretensions of the European Powers are carried far beyond these; and they insist that all cases in which a foreigner is defendant, whether the accuser or plaintiff be a foreigner or Native Egyptian, should be tried in the Court of the Consul of the nation to which the foreigner belongs; thus transferring the jurisdiction of the Viceroy over his own subjects to a foreign tribunal. Monstrous as this claim is, still it might be expected that, following the legal maxim and their own practice in other cases, foreigners would submit to the Native tribunals, where a Native was the defendant. But even in such cases means are found to evade the express stipulations of the capitulations, and to frustrate the ends of justice. This can be, and is, done in one of two ways. Either the case is taken away from the jurisdiction of the Native Courts altogether, and placed in the hands of the Consul, who makes a diplomatic question of it, and demands a direct and summary settlement, not according to the law, or the decision of a competent Judge, but according to the view which he may himself take of it; or, availing himself of his right to have an interpreter from the Consulate present at the trial, the plaintiff takes care that that officer shall never be forthcoming; and the necessary formalities not having been complied with, he refuses to accept the decision of the Court if not favourable to him, or he prevents any decision from being given, and then addresses his complaint to his Consul. Thus almost every case in which a European and a Native are concerned is made a diplomatic question, and a claim not only for the amount which it is sure is put forward, but a large additional sum by way of indemnity is usually added. A short time ago some Italian claims, which had been increased to an enormous extent by demands for indemnities, were urged upon the Egyptian Government. Instead of allowing these claims to be fairly investigated before a legal tribunal, the Italian Consul, after failing to induce the Egyptian Government to recognize them, referred the matter to the Italian Government. Upon the faith of his representations two armour-clad vessels of war were sent to Alexandria to enforce the claims. When the Consul announced the arrival of these vessels to the Viceroy and read a peremptory demand for the payment of the claims upon him, I am informed that the Viceroy asked him, "Whether the Italian Government wished him to become a tributary to Italy, or whether this was the method adopted in Italy to settle legal questions?" The Consul had no answer to give. However, the Viceroy deemed it more prudent to settle the matter by paying what was demanded of him than to expose himself to the consequences of a bombardment or blockade of Alexandria. And yet everyone acquainted with the matter is convinced that the greater part of these Italian claims were absolutely fraudulent. I do not venture to say that they were so; but this I will state, that the manner in which they were enforced naturally leads to the inference that they were so, and that those who put them forward did not dare to submit them to the investigation of a proper tribunal. But suppose the Viceroy had refused to pay these indemnities, a number of vessels would probably have been seized, or the port would have been blockaded, and in the end he would have had to pay in addition a bill of many millions of francs for losses inflicted upon merchants, shipowners, and others of different nations. Of course, under such circumstances, the Viceroy thought it prudent to pay at once. Such cases show that it is necessary to remove questions of this kind from the region of diplomacy; for, under the existing system, they can lead to nothing but misunderstandings, and must constantly endanger the peace of Europe. It is especially, I contend, the interest of this country to put an end to such a state of things, and to assist the Egyptian Government in introducing a better system under which claims of this nature can be settled in a just and judicial manner. No less than sixteen Consuls of as many different nations are at present resident in Alexandria and Cairo, with Consular Courts wherein cases between foreigners and subjects of the Viceroy are heard. Even the Persian Consul claims this right to an independent jurisdiction. The position of foreigners in Egypt and the scandals to which it gives rise are so well summed up in an article in *The Times* that I cannot do better than read an extract from it—

> "To illustrate the confusion fomented, it is pointed out that there is scarcely a single department of the national Administration free from interference. Even a murderer, if he be a foreigner, cannot be arrested by the police unless they be accompanied by a Consular delegate; while every minor police regulation—such as the control of drivers of public vehicles, &c.—is set at naught; because, if a foreigner, the man knows he can appeal to his Consul, and if a Native he complains of the immunity allowed to his alien competitor. So with questions of ordinary taxation. Each Native trader is required to pay a licence duty; the foreigner refuses, and thus one is weighted against the other, and the worst animosities of race are created. In the same way all the most important industries of the country are impeded. For the welfare and development of commerce and agriculture a sound mortgage law is essential. No such law is possible in Egypt. If a fellah grants a mortgage to a European, he knows that in case of any question the decision will be made by the Consul of his creditor, and this not according to any uniform practice, but according to the mortgage law of the nation to which the creditor may happen to belong. Hence the agriculturist is driven to the Native money-lender, and usury becomes inevitable. Similar considerations influence the Viceroy in guarding against any steps that might tend to throw land into the hands of Europeans. . . . . The crowning evil still remains. In Egypt, as in all other Eastern countries, rulers and people are alike ignorant of the true principles of trade and finance. Hence the Viceroy becomes the prey of specious adventurers, and these adventurers, relying on their nationality, constantly lead him into the most injurious commitments, and then trust to the threats of their Consul either to enforce fulfilment or to obtain preposterous indemnities. Such cases can always be reserved as political weapons, and, of course, those Powers contrive to obtain the most whose representatives are the least scrupulous."

I could mention a number of cases to illustrate this statement to the House, but I will confine myself to one. Two foreigners of different nations come to Egypt with machinery for a watermill. They erect it upon a stream to which they have no right whatever, and which irrigates some neighbouring lands. The owners of the stream and lands appeal to the authorities. The owners of the mill can only be proceeded against in their own Consular Courts. After a long lawsuit it is decided that the foreigners had no right to erect the mill. They then put forward claims upon the Government for loss of money on account of having had to abandon their mill, the machinery of which they declare has been destroyed, and they succeed by diplomatic pressure in obtaining a large payment from the Viceroy by way of indemnity. I will read from an official Report to the Viceroy one or two cases in which names are mentioned, and which I should consequently not have ventured to bring before the House had they not been thus authenticated—

> "A Consulate-General of Brazil exists, although there is no Brazilian settled in Egypt. The Consul General, an Italian, has been obliged, in order to constitute for himself a nation, to take all the members of his family under the protection of his flag. His nephew, Abd-Allah-el-Athem, an attaché to the Consulate, became bankrupt. The disputes arising out of this bankruptcy have been adjudicated against the will of the creditors by the uncle of the bankrupt, who has overruled all exceptions to the bankrupt's transactions. The refusals of justice on the part of the Consul General of Greece have been so flagrant that one day, in full session of the French tribunal, on appeal in action brought by a Greek against a Frenchman, the president, M. Tricou, sent for the plaintiff and addressed him, verbatim, in these words—'Your suit is struck off the list. Go and tell your Consul that when he shall render justice to Frenchmen, I will myself render justice to his countrymen.'"

Now, I would ask the House whether it be possible for a subject of the Viceroy or for the Viceroy himself to obtain justice when such a state of things exists? Nubar Pasha, in an official note, has stated that an Egyptian who has let his house to a foreigner would in most cases, in the event of the tenant refusing to pay the rent, rather abandon the house altogether than seek redress in a Consular Court. Let the House consider the position of an unfortunate Native who has to bring an action for a just debt against an association of three or more persons of different nations. He would have to pursue each one in a separate Consular Court. In one Court he might obtain a verdict in his favour, in the others he might fail to obtain justice. If he appealed from the Consular Courts in Egypt he might have to go, according to the nationality of each defendant, to Aix, to New York, and to Rio Janeiro. It would be absurd to imagine that the unfortunate Native could hope to get justice in such a case, even if he ventured upon, or could bear the cost of, such appeals. A still more absurd case might be imagined, and might, indeed, occur, and has indeed been instanced by Nubar Pasha. Suppose a band of marauders, including Englishmen, Spaniards, Frenchmen, Italians, and Greeks, were to attack an Egyptian village, to sack it, and to murder its inhabitants. The Egyptian authorities would be utterly powerless to punish—perhaps even to arrest—the criminals. They would have to prosecute each individual in his own Consular Court, and it may be easily imagined how much justice they would be likely to get in some of those Courts. I need scarcely point out the monstrous character of such a state of things, which would not be tolerated for one moment in any other country of the world. Supposing, again, that a man were wounded and robbed in the street, he might, by the intervention of the Consul, succeed in arresting the robber; but he could not compel a single witness to attend who did not belong to the same nation as the robber, and, consequently, he would probably fail to obtain justice. It must be remembered that this question of Consular jurisdiction and the abuses to which it has given rise, may very seriously affect the position of this country in Egypt, as well as the independence of that country. Thousands of French subjects are now employed on the Suez Canal, and may ultimately form a kind of permanent colony in Egypt. They would all claim to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of their own Consular Courts. No action could be brought against them, no redress obtained, except by appeal to the French Consul. Under such circumstances, the pretended neutralization of the Suez Canal would be simply an absurdity. The Company, or any of its officers, might close the canal any day against a British or other ship, and redress could only be obtained by an appeal to a French Consular Court. I need not dwell longer upon this subject—the danger will be evident to the House—nor need I point out the very serious source of uneasiness to the Egyptian Government which arises from the presence of a large population of foreigners in Egypt not amenable to the laws and authorities of the country. The question of indemnities is one worthy of the consideration of this country, on more than one account. The Viceroy has been compelled to pay within the space of four years no less a sum than 72,000,000 francs, or nearly £3,000,000 sterling, as indemnities to foreigners, without including the vast sums which have been shamelessly wrung from him by the projectors of the Suez Canal. How much of that sum was fraudulently obtained I will not venture to inquire. The result has been that the finances of Egypt have been seriously embarrassed, and that the Viceroy has had great difficulty in finding the means of paying the annual interests upon the Egyptian loans, which are held for the most part in this country. The Viceroy is denounced for his cruelty towards the unhappy cultivators of the soil, from whom the last farthing is wrung, and who are borne down by the weight of taxes and imposts. I have no doubt that these unfortunate creatures are exposed to great hardships and distress; but it must not be forgotten that the European Powers, by supporting monstrous and fraudulent claims for indemnities, and by compelling the Viceroy to satisfy them without reference to their justice or injustice, are to a great extent responsible for the oppression which may exist, and which arises in a great measure from the necessity of finding the means of paying these claims. At one time Mehemet Ali Pasha was anxious to give encouragement to foreigners to settle in Egypt, and to give the country the advantage of European industry, intelligence, and capital. He could not then anticipate the result of his enlightened efforts. He had a right to expect fairer and juster treatment from the nations who boasted of their civilization. He gave foreigners the right to hold land in Egypt, but on the express condition that they should be subject to the Egyptian laws as regarded that land, and that they should pay the taxes and do all that Egyptian landholders would do. Conditions to that effect were inserted in the title-deeds of land sold to foreigners; but the foreign landowners now neither obeyed the laws nor paid the taxes, and in this they were uniformly supported by their Consuls. Nubar Pasha has laid all these facts before the French and English Governments, and the answer he has received from the noble Lord has been placed on the table of the House. All Nubar Pasha proposes as some remedy to this state of things is a return to the capitulations, and that instead of Consular Courts there should be established in Egypt Egyptian Courts, presided over partly by European and partly by Native Judges, to adjudicate on subjects in which Natives may be concerned. He does not wish to interfere in any way with the Consular Courts where foreigners alone are concerned; he only proposes one departure from the capitulations. It is this—According to the capitulations, an interpreter must always be present in Court in cases where foreigners are concerned, in order to see that justice is done. Nubar Pasha desires to do away with this condition, and, instead, he proposes to constitute the Egyptian Courts upon the most liberal principles. He proposes that they should be composed of three Native and three European Judges; and in the event of this being objected to, he is even willing to agree that the Europeans should form the majority. All that he stipulates for is that the President of the Court should be a subject of the Viceroy. Instead of the presence of the dragoman or interpreter, he proposes that the utmost publicity should be given to the proceedings of the Court, that counsel should attend, and that a superior Court of Appeal should be instituted, composed, if insisted upon, of a majority of European Judges, and that justice should be administered as it is in European countries. It must be remembered that at present the proceedings of the Turkish Courts are not public. Moreover, it is the intention of the Viceroy to train up a certain number of young Egyptians to the profession of the law, and to educate them for the administration of justice. If this scheme were carried out, instead of there being, as now, sixteen different jurisdictions to which the subjects of the Viceroy are liable, there would be but one, presided over by European and Native Judges. This seems to me to be a just, reasonable, and practical proposal; even the noble Lord admits that there is nothing whatever in it opposed to the spirit of the capitulations, or even to their letter. I might almost say that the Viceroy has not gone far enough; but even this very moderate and just proposal has excited a great outcry amongst the foreign residents in Egypt. The British and Maltese merchants, in an indignant memorial addressed to the noble Lord (Lord Stanley), which has been recently published in *The Times*, declare that—

> "The Government of the Viceroy has submitted to Her Majesty's Government a proposition to abolish the jurisdiction of the British Consular Law Courts in Egypt."

But this statement is entirely opposed to the truth. All that the Viceroy asks is that the jurisdiction of those Courts should be limited, according to the express terms of the capitulations, to cases in which foreigners alone are concerned, and that they be not permitted to interfere with his undoubted rights and prerogative of dealing with his own subjects. A letter, signed by a Mr. Bell, who appears to speak in the name of the British community in Egypt, has appeared in *The Times*, together with the memorial. Amongst the reasons which it gives why Her Majesty's Government should decline to accept the Viceroy's proposal, there is one which will best show the pretensions of foreigners established in Egypt, and how ridiculous and utterly untenable they are. Mr. Bell states, in justification of the action of the British Consular Court over the Viceroy and his subjects, that in one case the payment of bills accepted by the manager of the Viceroy's private estate, and protested, could only be obtained—

> "By a formal demand addressed to the British Consular Court, that the Viceroy, having failed to meet his engagements, should be immediately declared a bankrupt. A private intimation that this formal demand had been made for a declaration of bankruptcy was communicated to the Viceroy's agent, and he thereupon sent to the office of the holder of the bills the money to meet them."

Now, let the House imagine for one moment a foreign Court with independent jurisdiction established in this country declaring the Queen a bankrupt! Could such a state of things be conceived in any other country of the world but Egypt? Can it be a matter of surprise that the Viceroy should consider this foreign jurisdiction as injurious to his dignity and independence? It appears to me that the fact of such a proceeding as that described by Mr. Bell having taken place would alone justify the noble Lord (Lord Stanley) in accepting Nubar Pasha's proposal. I do not advocate the withdrawal of the protection of our Consuls altogether from British subjects in the East. I know that the time is not yet come for this step, although I trust that it is approaching; nor do I suggest that the noble Lord should consent to the proposal of the Egyptian Government without having first satisfied himself that justice shall be properly administered in the case of British subjects. Nubar Pasha, in his note to the Viceroy, which has been laid upon the table of the House, declares that the Egyptian Government is willing to give satisfactory security upon this point, and to meet foreign Governments more than half way. The noble Lord might even avail himself of this opportunity to obtain from the Turkish and Egyptian Governments a reform of the law with regard to the admission of Christian evidence in criminal cases. Already, in civil and commercial suits, this has been done; and it is now virtually accepted, I believe, even in criminal cases: but the noble Lord would be quite justified if he were to call upon the Egyptian Government to abolish the law which still exists upon this subject before submitting British subjects to the control of Egyptian Courts. It has, I know, been suggested to the Egyptian Government that before calling upon the European Powers to accept the proposal made by Nubar Pasha, the best plan would be for the Viceroy to establish mixed Courts, and to allow the world to see how they worked. He has been told, "Institute your Courts, choose your European and Native Judges. Have justice well and impartially administered, and you will see that foreigners will then avail themselves of them, and you will obtain what you require from foreign Governments without any difficulty." But the objections to such a course appear to me to be very grave, if not altogether insurmountable. There are four that present themselves at once. First, English and French subjects might be induced to avail themselves of the Egyptian Courts, but others would not, and an additional element of confusion would consequently arise, and in mixed cases miscarriage of justice would ensue, some defendants appealing to the Local Courts, and others to the Consular Courts; secondly, the Egyptian Government could not venture upon a trial of this kind, unless they received the fullest assurance that the decrees of the Court should be carried out and its jurisdiction enforced —otherwise the authority of the Viceroy would further suffer; thirdly, the Viceroy could not call upon his Mahommedan subjects to submit to the jurisdiction of a Court presided over by European Judges, whose authority was not recognized by Europeans themselves; and lastly, the subjects of the Viceroy would be placed in this most unfair and disadvantageous position, that whilst foreigners would be able to appeal from the decision of the Egyptian Courts to a Court of Appeal established in Egypt, the Native of Egypt, when pursuing a foreigner in his Consular Court, would have to appeal to a Court established in some distant foreign country. The proposal made by the Viceroy, is, I think, a fair and reasonable one. He is willing that Commissioners named by the principal European Powers should be appointed to proceed to Egypt to inquire into the whole subject of Consular jurisdiction in that country, and to report to their respective Governments upon it, with a view to the adoption of the scheme which he has put forward. The French Government has already appointed a Commission of Inquiry, which has made a Report. Although I have not seen that Report, I understand that it is in many respects favourable to the proposal of the Viceroy. But whilst the Viceroy is prepared to agree to the appointment of an International Commission, he very justly insists that before it commences its labours a certain basis for its proceedings shall be agreed upon by the European Powers, and that that basis shall be the capitulations. Usages and abuses have sprung up in Egypt which are entirely opposed to those treaties, and the Viceroy cannot admit their validity, and recognizes this as a point of departure in any future inquiry. It is, I believe, stated that the French Government have refused to accept this condition. But I cannot believe that a great and just nation like France would insist upon supporting that which is a manifest abuse and a flagrant wrong when dealing with a weak Power. I have heard that the Emperor himself is fully alive to the great abuses which have sprung up under the capitulations, to the injustice to which the Natives of Egypt are exposed in consequence, and to the danger of the present state of things to the authority of the Viceroy. He cannot but feel that whilst the European Powers hold the Viceroy responsible for the safety of the lives and property of their subjects residing in Egypt, they are depriving the Viceroy of the only means that he has of securing that safety. The noble Lord (Lord Stanley), in his despatch of the 18th October last, which has been laid upon the table of the House, has fully admitted the evils to which the present system of Consular jurisdiction in Egypt has given rise, and has shown that that system is entirely opposed to the letter and spirit of our treaties. With the views expressed in that despatch I cordially agree. But I trust that the noble Lord will do more than write a despatch, and that he is prepared to act with energy in the matter, without being deterred from doing that which is just and right by any outcry which may be raised against him amongst the subjects of this country established in Egypt, who are, of course, determined to prevent, if possible, the reform of abuses of which they are partly the authors, and of which they have long profited. Let those gentlemen be reminded that after all they have no more right to the exceptional protection which they claim in Egypt, than British residents who chose to settle for the sake of gain in any other country. We do not have Consular Courts in South America—and the taxpayers of this country may with reason ask, why they should be compelled to support expensive establishments in Turkey and Egypt merely to promote the trade and speculations of persons who chose to go to those countries. Nor will the noble Lord, I hope, be deterred from doing that which is right and just, by the unwillingness which other Powers, some of whom may have a direct interest in maintaining the present system, may show to go with him. I feel convinced that if England boldly adopts a just and liberal policy in this matter, and admits the undoubted rights of the Egyptian Government, other nations will be unable to take a different course. And if France, as I have reason to hope she is prepared to do, will unite with England in putting an end to the present disgraceful state of things, and in supporting the just and legitimate demands of the Viceroy, I am certain that a new system will be introduced into Egypt, and, indeed, ere long into the whole of the Turkish Empire, which will be equally advantageous to the interests of Europeans and Natives. I will quote one or two extracts from the noble Lord's despatch, which will prove that he has taken what I conceive to be a proper view of this important question, and that there only now remains for him to carry out the policy which he has laid down—

> "Her Majesty's Government cannot doubt that the system which now prevails in Egypt in regard to suits in which foreigners on the one hand and the Government and people of Egypt on the other, are concerned, is as injurious to the interests of all parties as it is certainly without warrant of any treaty engagement. Her Majesty's Government are perfectly willing, therefore, to lend their aid to the Egyptian Government in an attempt to establish a better system, and if the Egyptian Government succeed in obtaining the concurrence of other Powers for the same purpose, you may assure Nubar Pasha that the cordial co-operation of Great Britain will not be withheld from so salutary a work. They would hail with the utmost satisfaction such an improvement in the judicial system of the Ottoman Empire, and specifically of Egypt, which is so important a part of it, as would justify them in altogether renouncing any judicial action in that country, and leaving the disputes of their subjects, and the crimes which they may commit, to the exclusive jurisdiction of the local Government, as is the case in other countries. With such feelings, Her Majesty's Government are certainly not inclined to hold out for a jurisdiction to which they have no treaty right, which they submit to be an usurpation, though brought about by force of circumstances, and which is as injurious to British interests as it is derogatory

to the character and well-being of the Egyptian Administration."

Fortunately, the principal commercial communities of this country are prepared to give their support to the noble Lord in this matter. I had hoped to have seen in their places this evening my hon. Friend the Member for Manchester (Mr. Bazley) and other Gentlemen connected with our commercial interests, who formed part of a deputation to the noble Lord a few days ago on this subject. They would have supported me, I know, on this occasion, They naturally perceive that the present system of Consular jurisdiction in the East, and the pretensions of foreigners residing in the Turkish Empire and in Egypt, are so outrageous and unjust that they must tend to interrupt the good feeling which ought to exist between the European Powers and the Turkish and Egyptian Governments, and to discourage and prevent the development of those commercial relations which exist between England and the East, and which are already becoming of such vast importance to this country. These views are entertained at the same time by almost every organ of public opinion of authority in this country, and have been advocated with great ability and power by *The Times*, and other leading newspapers. In conclusion, I would again quote from the work of a gentleman who has had more experience than most persons with regard to the working of the capitulations, Sir Adolphus Slade. He says—

> "The necessity of framing capitulations in the 16th century for the protection of a few European traders was a disgrace to Turkey; the strict enforcement of them in the 19th century is a reproach to Europe. They were framed on behalf of limited associations, self-restrained by bye-laws, and self-responsible for the conduct of their servants and *employés ;* they are now enforced in favour of 50,000 Europeans of various nationalities and callings at Constantinople, and twice as many thousands or more domiciled in provincial cities, in pursuit, one and all, *per fas et nefas*, of one object—gain, and though divided by clashing interests, united by the common bond of rancour against the dominant race. Probed to their source, the occasional outbreaks in Turkey, called fanatical, would be seen to be the natural reaction against the overbearings and insolence of foreigners and protected natives. 'Would you abolish the capitulations?' asks the Levantine. Not altogether, so long as the separation of administrative and judicial functions in Turkey remains indistinct; but we would modify them in the interests of society by drawing a line between protection and impunity, between privilege and licence."

These are wise words, and I cannot do better than call the attention of the noble Lord earnestly to them. I trust that he will lose no time in taking some step which may put an end to the state of things they describe. The first thing, it appears to me to be done, is to come to an agreement with the French Government for the appointment of an International Commission, founded upon the basis suggested by the Egyptian Government, and empowered to inquire into the working of foreign Consular jurisdiction in the Turkish Empire and Egypt, and to ascertain what may be the rights and privileges which foreigners may have a right to claim under the capitulations. When the facts of the case are thus ascertained, it will be for England and France to act in a just and generous spirit towards Turkey and Egypt; to retain only those privileges which are absolutely necessary to the protection of their subjects in the East; to be prepared to remove that exceptional protection still further as those countries advance in the path of civilization and of reform; and to give assistance to the Turkish and Egyptian Governments in placing their internal administration, and especially that part of it which relates to law and justice, on a footing which may be equally beneficial to foreigners and to their own subjects.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he wished to point out that it was the weakness of the Egyptian Government, after the revolt of Ali Pasha, which led to the granting of the existing concessions to foreigners. He hoped the noble Lord the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would not treat this question as an Egyptian one merely, but would go to the root of the evil, and endeavour to carry out all the recommendations contained in the Protocol of Paris. At the time when the capitulations were entered into there was in Turkey a poll tax on Christians, and one object was to exempt foreign residents from this badge of servitude. Circumstances had wholly changed, and it was absurd that foreigners should be exempted from every impost except customs' dues. Foreign residents ought to be placed on an equal, but on no better footing, than Natives, and there was no reason whatever why they should not be required to pay their fair share of taxation. There could be no question that the Consular jurisdiction had given rise to great abuses on the part of the Consuls of third-rate Powers, and so reluctant were people to interfere that murder might be committed in Turkey by foreigners almost with impunity. Indeed he could mention one case in which a murder was witnessed by an English Consul and another Englishman. It was committed by an Italian, and the victim was a Greek; and though the English Consul interfered, and compelled the police to take the man up, the Italian Consul evidently thought he was going beyond his duty, and the end of the matter was that the man who committed the murder was allowed to get off to Genoa, and what became of him afterwards he could not tell. It was a wrong system that the Government of a country should not have jurisdiction over all its inhabitants, and there would be less inconvenience in the Egyptian Government having it now that Christian evidence was to all intents and purposes admitted. Mixed Courts having at our instance been established in Turkey, it was discrediting them in the eyes of the people if we did not allow our own subjects to be tried in them. He believed they were as impartial as the tribunals of Spain or Portugal. He trusted that there would be joint action by the European Powers as to these capitulations, with due regard to the right of the Turk in his own country.

LORD STANLEY: Sir, I have no wish, and I see no reason, to prolong this discussion, since there is no dispute as to facts, and I am bound to say that in by far the greater part of what has been stated by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Southwark (Mr. Layard) I am inclined to agree. And first let me dispose of one or two questions which have been raised incidentally. As to the question of the right of foreigners to hold land in Turkey, and the conditions on which they should be allowed to hold it, I may remark that that is a matter which has been for some time under discussion, and I think we have practically settled the terms on which land may be held. I have always felt that in principle the Turkish Government were quite justified in the reservations and conditions they laid down; but Her Majesty's Government had to consider how those conditions would practically work in some parts of the Empire where Europeans are not numerous, and where Consular assistance is not at hand. I believe, however, that question has now been arranged between the two Governments. With regard to the abuse of Consular jurisdiction, I cordially sympathize in what has been said by the hon. Gentleman. It is an anomaly, even if it be a necessary one, that we should remove British subjects from the territorial jurisdiction of the country; but I quite agree that it is an intolerable abuse if that protection is extended to a large number of persons who have no claim upon us, as, for instance, in those cases in which Natives of the Ionian Islands have claimed the privilege. Maltese, of course, have a right to protection as British subjects; but with regard to all those cases which used to be numerous in former years, when protection was extended to Natives who were dependants upon Europeans, I think the hon. Gentleman will bear me out in saying that this has been diminished of late years, and I do not think the abuse now exists to any considerable extent. At any rate, if a case is brought before me in which it does exist, I shall be ready to do all in my power to remedy it. With regard to the claim of Europeans to exemption from local taxes, I am not aware that it has ever been made the subject of complaint on the part of the Porte. I am bound to admit that, like many other things bearing upon our connection with the Turkish Empire, it is somewhat anomalous, and I can quite understand that arrangements which were perfectly natural and harmless when but a very small number of foreigners were settled in Turkey, are quite inappropriate to the circumstances of the present time. The main question is the question whether or not we can get rid of Consular jurisdiction as regards Egypt. Now, upon that point I have stated what are in principle the views of the British Government in a despatch from which the hon. Gentleman has quoted, and I therefore need not repeat them at any length. Ever since the Crimean War and the Treaty of Paris, not only the British Government, but I believe all the Great Powers of Europe have concurred in the feeling that the exercise of this Consular jurisdiction was an anomaly which it was desirable to remove. There is no doubt that jurisdiction extra territorial of that kind is in itself an evil. The only justification there can be for it is that it may be a necessity. But if it ceases to be a necessity, it ceases to be justifiable. The real question is not whether you desire to give up these rights, but whether you can find an effective substitute for them. You cannot give up these exceptional rights unless you are satisfied that you can substitute for them the jurisdiction of an independent and impartial tribunal, and the difficulty is how to find in a country like Egypt sufficient security for the establishment of such a tribunal.

Egypt, as we all know, is a country absolutely despotic, both in theory and in practice. I am not saying that Judges would on that account be necessarily servile, but I am afraid that it would be difficult to find men who in any case where their own Government was concerned would not think it their duty to take the part of the Government of their own country, and we all know that the Egyptian Government is very often concerned in the questions that arise. There is no part of the hon. Gentleman's speech with which I more thoroughly concur than with respect to the great abuse and inconvenience of resorting to diplomatic agency for the determination of private matters; but it is because I hold that opinion that I think it essential to have Courts you can rely upon, because it is a lesser evil to have a Court which is anomalous in principle, but which works tolerably in practice, than a Court which may be constituted according to European notions of what is right, but which does not practically give justice, and the result of the working of which would be that its decisions would be continually appealed from, so that diplomatic questions would constantly arise. There are difficulties in our way but I do not say that they cannot be overcome. With regard to an International Commission, I do not apprehend that there is at present between the leading Powers of Europe any considerable difference of opinion. I believe they are all of opinion that such a Commission should be established for the purpose of ascertaining how such Courts as we all desire in principle should be established. The only points of difference are upon questions which are comparatively matters of detail. With regard to the claim put foward by the Egyptian Government no longer to admit the capitulations and to ignore usages, that is a claim to which I should find it very difficult to give a positive answer either one way or the other, for there are usages and usages. A usage which has become an unwritten law must, I think, be practically regarded as part of the law of the country, but the same claim cannot be made for a custom that has sprung up within the last dozen years, and which has never been sanctioned or tolerated, but only submitted to through the weakness of the Government. I need say no more upon that, because there is very little in dispute between us. The one point upon which I should be inclined to question the view which the hon. Gentleman takes is his wish that whatever we do should be done, not for Egypt only, but for every part of the Turkish Empire. Now, as to that, I am open to conviction, but as at present advised I doubt the policy of that course. Turkey is a very wide Empire, and it contains provinces in various stages of civilization. We have far greater interests in Egypt than anywhere else in that Empire, and there is a greater appeal there to European feeling and a greater influence of European ideas than can be found in the remoter provinces of Turkey. After all, too, if you are to establish a system of territorial jurisdiction which is to work well, the best chance of getting it to work is to establish it experimentally, and then, if you find it work well in one part, you can extend it to another. At the same time, we must be very much guided on this question partly by the views of the Porte, partly by the view which the other Powers may take, and partly by such light as may be thrown upon it in the course of the investigation which is to be held. The question of principle, as I understand, which the hon. Gentleman wishes to raise is, "Do you regard the present Consular jurisdiction and the claim for Consular authority as desirable?" Now, I agree with him that it is not desirable. The hon. Gentleman further asks, "Do you wish to see a better system of jurisdiction substituted?" I certainly do, but if you ask me how that is to be done it is a matter of great difficulty. We have to consult the Porte, the Egyptian Government, and the other great Powers, and many questions of detail will arise as to which we do not altogether see our way. All we say is that time and deliberation will be required, and I can only assure the House that the Government will not lose sight of the subject, and that their anxious desire is so to deal with it as to bring about a state of things more satisfactory than the present.

Mr. CHEETHAM said, he wished to warn the noble Lord not to be led astray by the extraordinary statements which had proceeded from some of our countrymen in Egypt. He could readily understand that our countrymen there were so accustomed to special privileges that they were very unwilling to part with them. Egypt was now becoming so intimately bound to this country, and especially to Lancashire, by commercial relations, that he hoped the noble Lord would not allow that state of things with regard to our Consular Courts in Egypt which was so discreditable to us to remain in their present condition. It depended on the noble Lord very much whether the proposed new Courts would or would not be sanctioned by the other Governments.

MR. J. PEEL said, that he was at the head of the firm which had signed the document of which the hon. Member for Southwark had so much complained. They knew very well that there was no tribunal in Egypt which could judge fairly between the buyer, being the Pasha, and the seller, the British merchant. He believed he was the oldest British merchant engaged in the Egyptian trade, and he had never heard of the decisions of the British Consular tribunal being called in question by any Native whatsoever. Any one who knew anything of the transactions between the British and the Pasha would say that where justice was obtained it had been obtained by the Consular Courts. Though he would have no objection to see any system established which would do justice to other countries as well as our own, he would hesitate a long time before he would consent to have the transactions which passed between British merchants and the Pasha settled by an Egyptian tribunal,

MR. A. EGERTON said, that in a case where so many nationalities were concerned it was clear that nothing could be done without reference to them. The noble Lord had held out a hope that foreign nations would be willing to appoint a Commission to settle this question, but it would be more satisfactory to the mercantile community if they were assured that steps were being taken to have the matter immediately referred to this International Commission.

MR. AYRTON begged to enter his protest against Her Majesty's Government giving up British subjects to a Government which was utterly unconscious of purity of administration. [Mr. LAYARD: No!] The hon. Gentleman might say "No," but he maintained that the Government of Egypt was one into which corruption in every form entered. The idea of justice was foreign to such a Government, and to contemplate giving up British subjects in defiance of treaties to such a Power was most monstrous. If he could tell the House what was going on in Egypt, the hair of hon. Members would stand on end. [Mr. LAYARD: Oh!] Perhaps he had as authentic information and knew as much of what was going on in Egypt as the hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Layard), and he felt bound to say that nothing could exceed the corruption which prevailed there. This scheme had originated in the fact that there was one person connected with the Egyptian Administration who had had the advantage of an European education, who had a great deal of information and had made a fortune. That person had established himself in Western Europe and had created an opinion purely fictitious as to the character of the Egyptian Government. [Mr. LAYARD: Oh!] The hon. Member might shake his head, but the fact was that those who took an interest in the affairs of the Levant became either very violent Turks or very violent Greeks—they were either desperate Philo-Turks or Philhellenes. Now, he was neither a Philo-Turk nor a Philhellene, because he had received great courtesy both from Turk and Greek; but he was speaking only of the Egyptian Government, which he believed to be so bad that it was utterly impossible to entrust it with any power over the destinies of British subjects. He hoped, therefore, the noble Lord would never consent to the establishment of an Egyptian tribunal such as that which was advocated by the hon. Gentleman. In any scheme that might be adopted, he hoped the noble Lord would make it a *sine quâ non* that to every decree pronounced by the Court affecting the rights of British subjects, the consent of the British Consul should be required.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

RESOLUTION.

MR. FAWCETT, in rising to move a Resolution on this subject, said, that he had to apologize to the House for bringing forward so important a subject at so late an hour; but when an independent Member had been counted out by the tactics of his own party, hon. Members would agree with him that the fault was not his. When he brought forward the Motion last year to place Catholics and Presbyterians on an equality with members of the Established Church with respect to education, it fell to the lot of Mr. Speaker to decide its fate, and in giving his decision the right hon. Gentleman said that the principle of the Motion was so important that the House ought to have another opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it. Since that time the subject had made unexpected progress. The question of religious equality in Ireland had made during the present Session a progress as sudden as it had been gratifying and extraordinary. The question had been simplified since last year, because the antagonistic scheme of the Government to grant a charter to a Roman Catholic University had been unanimously condemned by the House and the country. It had been shown that it was impossible to satisfy the Catholics by giving them a charter for a separate University; because the scheme was not more distinctly mischievous it was rejected with contempt by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. They demanded a University which should be exclusively managed by ecclesiastics, and in which Bishops should have a positive veto on the appointment of all officers, and the power of deciding what books should be read. Such demands the House never would concede; and the scheme which he proposed was the only one which would place Presbyterians and Roman Catholics in a position of equality. The country had decided not to grant State endowments to establish sectarian education. There was no chance of an endowment being granted for either a Presbyterian or a Roman Catholic College. If so, there was only one way in which Presbyterians and Roman Catholics could be placed in a position of equality with members of the Established Church, and that was by fairly and impartially throwing open to all the existing University endowments. The creation for either Roman Catholics or Presbyterians of an institution like Trinity College, on which £1,500,000 had been expended, was pecuniarily impossible; and, even if it were possible, money would not purchase associations like those connected with Trinity College. The Presbyterian or Roman Catholic who entered Trinity College might take the same honours and degrees as a Churchman, but he could not compete for a Fellowship with its distinction and income. As long as such a state of things remained the Presbyterian and Catholic inhabitants of Ireland would suffer under grave disability. Endowments were the outgrowth of historical circumstances which were not likely to recur, including the exercise of religious munificence and zeal and the confiscation of property by despotic monarchs. The irresistible conclusion was that the only way of producing equality was to admit people of all religions to existing endowments. An independent College for Roman Catholics and another for Presbyterians would result only in mischief, from the perpetuation of religious rancour and discord, which must be removed before Ireland could prosper. It was a mistake to suppose the Roman Catholic hierarchy represented the laity; and this was shown incidentally by an article in the *Westminster Gazette*, which, speaking of the increasing number of Catholics who were going to Oxford and Cambridge, said—

> "This liberalism is as contagious as scarlet fever. If the Catholic laity continue to send their sons to these places, where they receive a mixed education, in fifty years time where will be the friends of an exclusive system of Catholic education?"

It was remarkable that at present the number of Catholics receiving education at the Queen's Colleges and Trinity College compared with the number of Protestants was nearly in the same proportion as the number of Catholics to Protestants in the lay professions in Ireland. Dr. Lloyd had propounded, with the most enlightened views, a scheme differing from his own. He proposed that Trinity College should be left exclusively in the hands of the Established Church, and that there should be denominational Colleges in connection with the Dublin University for the education of Catholics and Presbyterians. This scheme, said Dr. Lloyd, without destroying the denominational character of Trinity College, would secure many of the advantages of mixed education. But there were two main, and in his opinion insuperable, objections to such a scheme—first, the pecuniary difficulty of providing endowments for the proposed Roman Catholic and Presbyterian Colleges; and, secondly, because the great glory of Trinity College —the educational liberalism which had admitted Roman Catholics and Presbyterians to degrees long before degrees were given to Dissenters in the English Universities—would thereby be entirely destroyed. By establishing Roman Catholic and Presbyterian Colleges at the Dublin University you would put an end to the present mixed education there. Now great advantages had resulted to Ireland by bringing together at Trinity College men of different faiths, who had learnt to respect each other's conscientious opinions. At Oxford and Cambridge men of different opinions held foundation scholarships; and among the Fellows High-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen lived in harmony, sinking their religious differences in the prosecution of a common educational work. The same result would follow at Trinity College if his plan were adopted. But then it was said that if men of different religious bodies were admitted into the governing bodies that would introduce religious discord. He would only say that was not borne out by experience. It might be true that discord reigned among the members of the National Education Board, because they were sent there to represent three different religious denominations; but among those who were brought together by the bond of literary or scientific eminence religious discord was unknown. He was convinced that if his scheme were carried out in practice it would go far to remove religious prejudices. It was said that it would be impossible to promote the study of theology if they had mixed education. In reply to that, he would say why should there not be in the same College professors of different systems of theology as in Germany and, to some extent, in France? He had high Catholic authority for saying that in no European country was Catholic theology better taught than in Prussia. That the exclusive system had a depressing effect was pretty clear from the fact that, while Trinity College had produced unrivalled mathematicians and more than one great philosopher, it had, in three centuries, scarcely produced a single illustrious theologian. A few years ago there were living in the College three of the greatest mathematicians in the world, but in the theological department the case was altogether different. You could not, in fact, expect theology to thrive if you bound it in narrow fetters. Sectarianism had a benumbing influence, and probably many a splendid intellect in Ireland was now wasting its powers in fanning the flames of religious discord. He believed he had shown that the scheme which he proposed was the only practical one by which Catholics and Presbyterians could be placed on an equality in regard to University education with members of the Established Church. He would be the last man in the House to say anything against the great principles of Liberalism. He wished his fellow-subjects to enjoy the same religious freedom which he enjoyed himself. He did not wish to force on others any system of religion to which they objected. What he wished was that the Roman Catholics of Dublin, Oxford, and Cambridge Universities should enjoy the same advantages which he, as a Churchman, enjoyed; and he felt that he enjoyed an unfair benefit when he, as a Churchman, had a share of great national endowments, while others, because they differed from him in religious opinion, were excluded. If the youth of Ireland were brought up together, they would inevitably learn a lesson which they would never forget—namely, that a man was not to be shunned because of his religious belief, but that honour and respect were due to all who displayed intellectual eminence or moral worth.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, Catholics, Presbyterians, and other inhabitants of Ireland, will not be placed in a position of equality, in reference to University education in that country, with those who are members of the Established Church, until all religious disabilities are removed from the fellowships, scholarships, and other honours and emoluments of Trinity College, Dublin,"—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA, on rising to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice, said, he should not have taken exception to the question raised by the hon. Member, had it not appeared to him that the Motion, if accepted generally by Irish Catholic Members, was calculated to mislead the judgment of the House in respect to the real requirements of the Catholic people of Ireland in the matter of University education. He would state shortly what those requirements were. They might be all summed up in one proposition — namely, that there should be established in Ireland with the sanction and under the protection of the State an University as free from the interference of the State as the University of Dublin now was, and with equally satisfactory protection for the religious faith of its Catholic students as that now enjoyed by Trinity College for the protection of its Protestant students. He maintained that nothing short of this proposition would or ought to satisfy the Catholics of Ireland, and he regarded it as important that the House should not be led to believe that the liberality of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) in opening up Trinity College and admitting Catholics to its honours and emoluments would or ought to satisfy the just claims of Irish Catholics. He took the present course, therefore, because he believed the opening of Trinity College, instead of being a solution of the difficulty or a removal of the obstacles to a satisfactory settlement, was simply adding another and a very serious impediment to those against which the Catholics of Ireland had already to contend. If justice were done to the Catholics of Ireland in the matter of a Catholic University, he saw no reason why Trinity College should not continue to be, as it has been since its foundation, the chief educational establishment of the Protestant inhabitants of Ireland. At the same time, however, he claimed equal protection and equal sanction for the establishment of a Catholic University; but he declined to mix up that question, which was one of principle, with an assault on the constitution of Trinity College. The establishment of a Catholic University was a national requirement, but he regarded the attempt to make Trinity College a Catholic as well as a Protestant institution a very tempting, but at the same time a very dangerous, expedient. The proposition, although made, he was bound to admit, in a spirit of justice and fair play was, nevertheless, in his opinion, one of those devices whereby modern Liberalism sought to eliminate all religion whatever, whether Catholic or Protestant, from the institutions of the State. And of all such devices he regarded the plan of "Godless Colleges" as the most dangerous. To him it appeared strange that in an assembly like the House of Commons there should exist any large section prepared to ignore the danger of educating the youth of Ireland in institutions where religion had no place. For his own part, holding steadfastly as he did for the rights of Catholics in respect to University education, he should regard it as less dangerous to faith and morals to send his children to Trinity College to be educated there, while it continued an avowed Protestant institution, than to send them to a College where Christianity was ignored. He was aware that such opinions as he held where characterized in certain quarters as retrograde and re-actionary; but he would not be deterred by phrases of this sort, nor ashamed of the principles he held, because they were opposed to those of the so-called party of progress. There is one question involved which is at the base of this controversy. Was Christianity essential to the welfare of the State, and of the individuals of whom the State is made up? He answered that question in the affirmative, and those who agreed in that answer must agree also in the corollary that it was the duty of the State to protect and foster the Christianity of its people. He could not doubt that the sense and conscience of the great majority on both sides the House would also affirm this proposition, and he could scarcely believe that human pride had blinded the people of this country so that in any large proportion they would deny it. He admitted, indeed, that the abstract principles of morality, honour, and patriotism might exist independently of religion; art, literature, and science might exist irrespective of religion, but he denied that all these things could ever suffice without the chastening influences of religion to preserve society from corruption and decay. He should have been glad to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice if the rules of the House permitted him to do so, because for the reasons he had stated he could not concur in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Brighton.

Mr. SYNAN said, he sincerely regretted that he could not support either the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) nor the Amendment of the hon. Member for Youghal (Sir Joseph M'Kenna). While he was willing to give both his hon. Friends full credit for the best intentions, he did not think that either of their propositions was a solution of the University question in Ireland. He differed from each of his hon. Friends, however, for very different and almost opposite reasons. He could not agree with the application of the endowments of Trinity College proposed by the hon. Member for Brighton; and he could not accept the proposition of the hon. Member for Youghal, that those endowments should be left as they are. After what had lately taken place in that House he did not think his hon. Friend could be so over sanguine or so deficient in political sagacity as to hope that Parliament would ever endow a separate University for Roman Catholics to the same extent as Trinity College, or to any extent at all. He therefore looked upon that proposition of his hon. Friend as an oratorical flourish at the eve of an election. To refuse, therefore, to deal with the enormous endowments of Trinity College for national University education in Ireland is to deprive the Roman Catholics of that country of all endowments for that purpose from public sources. There are three questions involved in the present Motion. First. The amount of the endowments of Trinity College. Second: Whether they are more than sufficient for the superior education of the Episcopalians of Ireland; and Third: What is to be the principle upon which they are to be applied? The Amendment states, or implies, that they are to be left as they are, and the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton goes to have them applied in one College upon the mixed system. In other words, his hon. Friend wished to transform Trinity College into a gigantic Queen's College. He found by returns before him that the endowments of Trinity College amounted to £64,000 a year—namely, from rent and renewal fines, £34,000, and from fees, interest, &c., £30,000. But he also found by the Report of the Commission into that College that, if properly administered from the commencement, they would be now over £90,000 a year. Was that enormous endowment to be left for the University education of 690,000 Episcopalians, while four-fifths of the Irish people are left without any superior education? The number of students in Trinity College was 1,200, of which only 300 were resident; the number of Professors was 35—namely, 7 seniors and 28 junior Fellows. Now, he asked, were 1,200 students and 35 Professors to have a present income of £64,000 a year and a future income of probably £90,000 a year? But in the University of Berlin the number of students was 2,500, of Professors 28, of extraordinary Professors 33, and of private Docentum 29—in all 90. The amount of endowments was £29,518, made up of a State grant of £28,842, and fees and real and funded property, £676. There were out of this a great many exhibitions for poor students varying from £12 to £60 a year, and the salaries of the principal Professors varied from £340 to £400, and with fees amounted in some cases to £1,000 to £1,500; so that this University out of less than half the income supported twice the number of students and three times the number of Professors that Trinity College did. But would this Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton effect the object of giving University education to the Roman Catholics of Ireland? In his opinion it was founded not only upon an ignorance of the opinions and feelings of the Irish people, but upon an ignorance of the actual facts recorded in the returns and records of that House. Out of the whole Roman Catholic population of Ireland the students in the Queen's Colleges and Trinity College belonging to the Catholic faith were a small minority; the Roman Catholics of Ireland protested against the separation of religion from education, and as a protest against the mixed system, they had established a Roman Catholic University at a cost of £120,000. Was it probable that the Roman Catholics of Ireland would resort to a mixed College in Dublin when they refused to enter a mixed College in Cork and Galway at their doors? What were the grants for the Queen's University and Colleges? University; £2,462; Belfast College, £7,000; Cork College, £7,000; Galway, £7,000. In all £25,265, equal to the endowment of the University of Berlin. What had the Roman Catholics got under this large endowment? Belfast was an exclusively Presbyterian College. Cork, with almost an exclusively Roman Catholic population, had only 30 per cent of Roman Catholic students, and Galway the same proportion. What stronger evidence could they have that the Roman Catholics would not have the mixed system? *Cui bono*, therefore, establish a system that would not be accepted, and would be only a gigantic Queen's University? But his hon. Friend charged the Irish Bishops with rejecting the Government proposal of a separate University with scorn and contumely. Now, he had read the correspondence on that subject with care, and he thought if his hon. Friend did the same he would come to the conclusion that the Irish Bishops never said or did anything to warrant that charge. They simply were not brought up in the same school of diplomacy as Her Majesty's Ministers, and were consequently out-manœuvred. They were the victims of political exigency and of mistaken confidence. Turning to the third part of the question, what ought to be the principle and scheme to be applied to these endowments of Trinity College? In the first place, what was the original idea in the minds of the founders of this University, and had Trinity College realized that idea? So far back as the reign of Henry VI. there was an idea of founding an Irish University in Dublin. The wars of the period prevented its execution. Then came the Reformation, and Elizabeth founded this College; but from the words of her charter, as well as those of James and Charles, it was intended that Trinity College should be only one of several Halls or Colleges. He admitted that the immediate idea of Elizabeth was to use this College as an instrument of Protestantizing the Irish people. Now, had it succeeded in its mission? Was it not admitted that it had failed in that mission as much as the Irish Established Church, of which it formed a part. But Trinity College was also in a great part an ecclesiastical College, and celibacy was enforced until the Royal Letter of 1850. So far, therefore, the cases of Trinity College and Maynooth were parallel. And as they had passed a Resolution to disendow Maynooth, was Trinity College to be maintained as an ecclesiastical College? Was that the way to pacify and enlighten Ireland? There was only one way of dealing with this question, and that was to carry out the ideas of the founders and the objects of the charters, and to apply the endowments of Trinity College to form a National University with denominational Colleges, of which Trinity College should be one. The Queen's Colleges will represent the mixed system, and the Irish people could avail themselves of University education according to their respective opinions, tastes, and sentiments. Two objections were, however, made to this plan—First, that the examining body would be independent of the teaching body, and would also be of separate religions; and the second, as to books to be read. Now, as to the first, instead of an objection it was a recommendation that the examining body should be independent of the teaching body. As to religion, there surely could be no objection to have Dr. Russell on the same examining board with the Provost of Trinity College. And as to books, the objection could only apply to moral philosophy; and as to that each student could use the books he was recommended in his own College. There was therefore no force in these objections. There were two courses open to them. First, a separate University with a separate charter, or one Irish University with several denominational Colleges. The former was the favourite plan of Her Majesty's Government, trumpeted all over Ireland by their supporters, but lately hastily abandoned in that House. It was the great "card"—considered by some the "trump card"—but played out very recently, or rather thrown away without any serious attempt to play it at all. The first plan being therefore abandoned by the Government, and opposed by this side of the House, the second was the only practical and rational course. It appeared to him the only solution of the Irish University question under present circumstances. He hoped that the friends of the mixed system would give up their exclusive and procrustean philosophy, and not stand in the way of this practicable and just solution. Did any Irish Member think, after what he had lately seen, that a Parliamentary endowment was possible for a separate Roman Catholic University? It had been abruptly abandoned by his own party, and had been met by what he might call a howl of disapprobation from that side of the House. Under these circumstances it appeared to him the duty of every Irish Member who wished for Roman Catholic University education to demand a University with denominational Colleges; and for that purpose the endowments of Trinity College were sufficient, and to that purpose they ought to be applied.

Mr. DISRAELI said, he wished to make an appeal to the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) with regard to the peculiar position of the discussion which that hon. Gentleman had originated. The hon. Member had had an opportunity of placing his views on that subject before the House, and also of eliciting the views entertained by hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House in opposition to his own; and as it was understood that the hon. Member did not wish to go to a division, it did not seem as if they were likely to make much progress with the question in hand; while it should be remembered that they had a heavy Paper of Business still before them, and that the period of the Session was advanced. He would suggest, therefore, that, in order to facilitate the course of Public Business, the hon. Member for Brighton should withdraw his Motion, on the understanding that the hon. Member for Youghal (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) should also withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. FAWCETT expressed his readiness to accede to the request made to him by the Prime Minister.

Sir FREDERICK HEYGATE said, he would be the last person to interfere with the convenience of the House; but he wished to express his regret that, after the statement of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett), he and others on that side who held views contrary to those of that hon. Gentleman, and views, moreover, which might not be altogether in accordance with those of Her Majesty's Government, had had no opportunity of expressing their sentiments on that question.

MR. LEFROY said, he shared the feeling entertained by the last speaker.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY—ROYAL GUN FACTORY.

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE.

MAJOR ANSON said, he had on the Paper for that evening a Motion for a Committee to inquire into the truth of the charges he had made on Monday night against the above establishment. He had put that Motion on the Paper in consequence of the remarks made by the Secretary of State for War in answer to his speech. Since then he had had a consultation with the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair, and found that his Motion was not strictly in Order. He was therefore obliged to withdraw it; but he was anxious to have the truth of his statements investigated, and he would be happy to adopt any suggestion which the Secretary of State for War might make for that purpose.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON wished to say that, in consequence of what passed the other evening, he had communicated with the officers of the War Office, and with Colonel Campbell, the head of the Royal Gun Factory, at Woolwich, who were affected by the statements of the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield (Major Anson). Those officers were all gentlemen of as high station, honour, and character as that hon. and gallant Member himself, and they felt very much hurt by the statements which the hon. and gallant Member had made, casting serious imputations upon them; and they all desired that there should be some inquiry into the subject. The hon. and gallant Member would admit that it was due to those officers that his statements should be investigated or withdrawn; and under those circumstances the best course would, he thought, be that the hon. and gallant Member should draw up the charges which he was prepared to make against the Royal Gun Factory at Woolwich, and then they would be in a position to refer them to a Select Committee of the House for investigation. He (Sir John Pakington) would suggest that the Committee of Inquiry should consist of only five Members, to be appointed by the Committee of Selection, and should sit *de die in diem,* to investigate the charges which the hon. and gallant Member might be prepared to specify.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn;* Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

PENSION TO SIR ROBERT NAPIER.

RESOLUTION.

Message from Her Majesty *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Queen's Message read.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, after the discussion in this House, and considering the state of public feeling on this subject, it is unnecessary for me to expatiate on the services of Sir Robert Napier. Great and distinguished as those services in Abyssinia have been, they are only portions of a career in which for a long period of years he has proved his loyalty to his Sovereign and his devotion to his country. I have the satisfaction of informing the House that Her Majesty has been pleased to confer the high distinction of a peerage upon Sir Robert Napier, by the style and title of Lord Napier of Magdala; and it is with a view to sustain the honour of that great distinction that Her Majesty has now appealed to the House of Commons to assist her in the consummation she wishes. It is a part of the admirable combination of forces in our constitutional system that the Sovereign and the nation unite necessarily when there is a complete recognition of public services; and if the Committee will pass the Resolution which I am about to move, we shall prove that in this country those who render such services may depend upon a gracious Sovereign and a grateful people. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by proposing—

"That the annual sum of Two Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to be settled upon Lieutenant General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., and the next surviving Heir Male of his Body, for the term of their natural lives."

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That the annual sum of Two Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to be settled upon Lieutenant General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., and the next surviving Heir Male of his Body, for the term of their natural lives.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday* next.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Reason for disagreeing to one of the Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY moved that the House do not insist on the Amendment made by them, from which the House of Lords had expressed their disagreement.

Mr. M'LAREN said that, in the present state of Public Business, and owing to the necessity of facilitating the registration for the purposes of the approaching General Election as much as possible, he should not, acting on the advice of a distinguished Member of his own side of the House, offer any opposition to the proposal.

Resolved, That this House doth not insist upon the Amendment made by this House to the Amendment made by their Lordships, to which The Lords have disagreed.

DANUBE WORKS LOAN BILL.

Resolution *reported :*

Bill to enable Her Majesty the Queen to carry into effect a convention made between Her Majesty and other Powers relative to a Loan for the Completion of Works for the Improvement of the Navigation of the Danube," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dodson, Lord Stanley, and Mr. Sclater-Booth.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 227.]

MILITIA PAY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Dodson, Bill to defray the Charge of the Pay, Clothing, and contingent and other Expenses of the Disembodied Militia in Great Britain and Ireland ; to grant Allowances in certain cases to Subaltern Officers, Adjutants, Paymasters, Quartermasters, Surgeons, Assistant Surgeons, and Surgeons Mates of the Militia ; and to authorise the employment of the Non-commissioned Officers, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dodson, Sir John Pakington, and Mr. Sclater-Booth.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time.

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) SUPPLEMENTAL (NO. 3) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Sclater-Booth, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Sclater Booth and The Earl of Mayo.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 229.]

SAINT MARY SOMERSET'S CHURCH, LONDON, BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Bentinck, Bill to prevent the removal of the Tower of the Church of St. Mary Somerset, in the City of London, and for vesting the said Tower and the site thereof in the Corporation of the said City, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Alderman Lawrence.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 228.]

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Saturday, July 11, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Larceny and Embezzlement* (245).

Their Lordships met ; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at Twelve o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 13, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—New Zealand Assembly's Powers* (247); Court of Session (Scotland)* (246).

Second Reading—Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal (204) ; Ecclesiastical Commissioners (221) ; Metropolitan Police Funds* (230) ; Fairs (Metropolis)* (223) ; Burials (Ireland) (212) ; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2)* (207) ; Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* (175) ; Local Government Supplemental (No. 3)* (194) ; Hudson's Bay Company (244) ; District Church Tithes Act Amendment* (236).

Committee — Railway Companies* (226) ; West Indies (135-249) ; Curragh of Kildare* (195).

Report—Lee River Conservancy* (140) ; Railway Companies* (226) ; Curragh of Kildare* (195).

Third Reading—Reformatory Schools (Ireland) (122) ; Compulsory Church Rates Abolition (211) ; Registration* (218) ; Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings* (227-228), and *passed.*

Royal Assent—Voters in Disfranchised Boroughs [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 41] ; Municipal Rate (Edinburgh) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 42] ; Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) Act Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 43] ; Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 44] ; Consecration of Churchyards Act (1867) Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 47] ; Sea Fisheries [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 45] ; Vagrant Act Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 52] ; Judgments Extension [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 54] ; Fairs [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 51] ; Representation of the People (Ireland)

[31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 49]; Courts of Law Fees, &c. (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 55]; Boundary [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 46]; Representation of the People (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 48]; Petroleum Act Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 56]; Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts (Lanarkshire) Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 50]; New Zealand (Legislative Council) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 57]; Medway Regulation Act Continuance [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 53]; Inclosure (No. 2) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 82]; Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 83]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 84]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 85]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 86].

PRIVATE BILLS—RAILWAY BILLS—INCREASE OF RATES.—RESOLUTION.

LORD TAUNTON, in rising to move a Resolution that no Railway Bill proposing to increase existing Rates for Passengers or Goods shall be read a Second Time until a special Report from the Board of Trade shall have been laid before the House, said, he had supported an Amendment moved by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Clanricarde) the other night to strike out of the London and Brighton Railway Bill a clause permitting the Company to increase its fares. The noble Lord the Chairman of Committees (Lord Redesdale) had for many years so persistently set his face against any attempt on the part of railway companies to obtain power to raise their fares that they had almost refrained from making such an attempt; but in a most important instance their Lordships had broken down the barrier so usefully raised by the noble Lord, who had since told their Lordships that his hands would now be paralyzed, and that he would no longer be able to oppose Bills of this kind. This was a most serious change. There could be no question that extensive amalgamation resulting in an increase of fares and charges would not only bear hard upon passengers, but would have a very injurious influence upon commerce. He would not say that under no conceivable circumstances should the fares of a railway company be modified or increased; but every precaution ought to be taken that proposals of this kind should not be agreed to without the utmost deliberation. It was in an especial manner the duty of the Legislature to protect the public, because when railway companies came before Parliament with Bills of this description no individual opponent of the Bill could afford to pay counsel and go to the expense of opposing the Bill in Parliament; but while the interest of each individual who travelled over the line was very small, the community as a whole had a very great interest in the matter; because an increase of rates and fares in railway communication was attended with most injurious consequences. Their Lordships should consider themselves in the position of counsel to the public. It was said that such an increase was necessary to protect the interests of the shareholders. If the shareholders had mismanaged their affairs he was sorry for them; but he could not admit that this would justify an application to Parliament to restore their finances at the expense of the public. There might be cases of short lines of railway in which it might be necessary or expedient to raise the fares; but when the great lines came to be tampered with, the public injury inflicted would be most serious. It was said that in many cases the advance of fares had become necessary to clear off the expenses which the companies had incurred in defending their rights; but he did not see any reason why the public should be called on to pay the expenses created by what was in too many cases unnecessary and bootless litigation. He had communicated with various authorities on the question, and he found that there existed a very general feeling that, after their Lordships' vote the other night it was absolutely necessary that some safeguard should be devised for the protection of the public. He did not know any Public Department which could more properly discharge this duty than the Board of Trade, whose function it was to watch over the trade and commerce of the country. The best thing would be for the Board of Trade to undertake, in every case where railway companies came to Parliament for power to increase their rates and fares, to make inquiry into all the circumstances of the case in order to direct and enlighten the judgment of their Lordships and of the other House of Parliament.

Moved to resolve, That no Railway Bill that proposes to increase the Rates now payable on the Conveyance of Goods or Passengers shall be read a Second time until a special Report from the Board of Trade on the Subject shall have been laid upon the Table of the House.—(*The Lord Taunton.*)

LORD CAMOYS said, he believed that there was no better method than the present of arriving at a correct conclusion with regard to railway Bills, for the Select

Committee heard evidence and counsel on both sides. If the Board of Trade reported in the way proposed by the noble Lord, the House might have to choose between the conflicting decisions of the Board and the Committee. The proposition was, moreover, too late, the House having accepted the decision of the Committee in the case of the London and Brighton Company's Bill. It was impossible to lay down a "hard and fast" line as to fares, for it would be unjust to the public to select the highest existing rates and impose them on all lines; and it would be unjust to the companies to select the lowest fares and make them universal, while to take the average would probably combine the disadvantages of both plans. The increased fares on the Brighton line were not so high as the rates originally charged before a competing line was projected, and the Committee had given universal satisfaction by insisting on so moderate a scale of fares in the Brighton and South Eastern Amalgamation Bill that the companies preferred abandoning the measure altogether.

LORD REDESDALE said, he regarded the decision of the Committee in the case of the Brighton line as a very unwise one, and regretted that the Amendment moved on the third reading of the Bill was not pressed. He thought less weight would have been given to that decision had it been known that it was carried by only a bare majority: two of the Committee differing from it, though they did not divide against it, and consequently felt precluded from taking part in the discussion on the third reading. He objected to this proposal as an admission that the raising of fares might be proper in some cases. Now, he should like a decision against raising fares in any way. Every company took property and made the line on the promise of affording certain accommodation at certain prices, and people built houses along the line on the presumption that those fares would be adhered to. There was therefore a contract between the public and the company; and if the fares were reduced in consideration of some concession from the Legislature, those reduced fares also formed a contract to which the public had a right to hold the company. Let companies be cautious what they asked for originally, and let them be cautious what reduction they might subsequently offer; but he would have them bear in mind that what was once done was done for ever, and that Parliament would not permit any increase As to the Brighton Company, it was true that the reduced fares were originally proposed on account of a competing line; but their counsel stated at the time that, whether that line was sanctioned or not, they were equally prepared to reduce their fares, believing that such reductions would prove remunerative. With regard to the Board of Trade, he was sorry to say he felt no confidence in its competency to report on railways. It was a large body, and comprising many subordinate officers who conducted a large number of inquiries; and, painful as such a view might be to his noble Friend behind him (the Duke of Richmond), experience had led him (Lord Redesdale) to believe that the railway interest possessed a great influence over them. Moreover, if the Board reported in favour of increased fares, that increase would have the support of the Government in both Houses. If their Lordships were unprepared to lay down the rule that increased fares were altogether inadmissible, but wished to refer proposals of this kind to some Committee, or other body, he would suggest that the Standing Orders Committee should every Session appoint three of their number—say the Chairman and two other Members—and that those three Members should report to the House upon such proposals. There would be no danger of conflict between their decision and that of the Select Committee, since the question of increased fares would not be referred to the latter at all. There would thus be a uniform decision by a small and responsible body.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, the noble Lord who had just sat down (Lord Redesdale) appeared to lay down two rules with regard to railways—first, that whatever railway companies asked for must be wrong; and, secondly, that whoever expressed an opinion in favour of railway companies must be acting under corrupt influences. [Lord REDESDALE: No!] The noble Lord had applied the latter maxim to the officials of the Board of Trade, than whom, he believed, there was no purer portion of Her Majesty's subjects. Now, he ventured to protest against the doctrine which the noble Lord had asked the House to adopt, namely, that railway companies ought never to be allowed to increase their rates. Extreme severity was a mistake, not only from the railway companies' point of view, but also from that of the public, and very much of the evils into which railway companies had fallen and of the sufferings the public had undergone had arisen from that extreme anxiety which the noble Lord himself had had so large a share in enforcing. There was one reason why their Lordships should not accept the doctrine of the noble Lord, which was that the value of money was from time to time subject to great variations; and there was nothing which affected it so much as large discoveries of the precious metals. Another consideration was, that so long as even small dividends come to the proprietors, directors—who, with other elastic bodies always moved in the direction of the least resistance—would try to meet the complaints of the public by making the railway as comfortable as possible; but the moment the dividend became so small that the complaints of the shareholders became more violent than those of the public, every possible economy was practised, and the comfort of the public became quite a secondary consideration. He had ventured to call their Lordships' attention to this question of the dynamics of railway Boards in order to show that no legislation which Parliament might adopt would prevent those Boards from consulting their own interests against those of the public, and therefore there was the greatest possible inducement to adopt a generous treatment of railway companies as a matter of policy in regard to the public. He was one of those who held a strong opinion that it was a great mistake to allow those great lines of communication to get into the hands of private companies; but, having done so, Parliament must not crush out the private interests which they had thus encouraged. He had no objection to the proposal of the noble Lord opposite (Lord Taunton); but he hoped the House would never consent to be led away by the arguments which had been used by the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees (Lord Redesdale).

Earl GRANVILLE said, this was a question which they could afford to discuss in a cold latitude, and it appeared to be quite possible to do so in a spirit neither of partiality nor hostility to the railway companies. He agreed with the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) that their Lordships could not adopt the principle laid down by the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees, that it was impossible at any time to grant a rise in railway fares. He held that the proposal of his noble Friend (Lord Taunton) would act as a security that a power of that kind would not be carelessly granted. Such a power was desirable, not only on account of the variations in the value of money, but also on account of the variations in the rate of wages, and a thousand other circumstances which must make a great difference in determining matters of that sort. Suppose that a company showed that they could not continue to work a line at the rate of fares they were charging and no one would buy it, the result would be that the railway would be closed unless the fares were raised, and the public might be put to the most serious inconvenience. He protested against the implied charge that the Board of Trade could not be trusted to supply facts and data on which Parliament could proceed. He had the greatest confidence in the noble Duke the President of the Board of Trade (the Duke of Richmond), and he believed the Board would act impartially and judicially in a question of this sort.

The Duke of CLEVELAND said, that the question raised by his noble Friend behind him had a very important bearing upon the public interests. He quite agreed with the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) that it was not desirable to lay down a "hard and fast line" such as that recommended by the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees. Great injury might be done to the public from such a course, particularly in the case of a short line which it might be desirable to carry on, but which might be shut up because it had become entirely unremunerative. Therefore a power to increase the fares to a slight degree might be very beneficial. It would be most unjust not to take into consideration the difficulties in which railway companies were sometimes placed. They must take care that they did not prevent new railways being established, which might be the case if they were to lay down a "hard and fast line."

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE said, he felt very strongly that it would be most unadvisable to lay down a "hard and fast line;" but he did not think that fares should be raised except in very exceptional cases. That fares should not be raised without good reason was a matter which affected the railway companies as much as the public. In a case which was before their Lordships the other day the company offered no reason whatever for raising the fares except that they had expended a great deal of money. They did not pretend that it would be of any advantage to the public, the shareholders, or any party whatever; they simply said that they had spent money and they wanted to have the fares raised. He wished to have the public protected, and who was so proper to protect them as the Minister of trade and commerce of the country? No doubt the public and also the shareholders had suffered because the Government had not sufficient control over the management of railways. The Government only had a certain amount of control over the accounts, with which they ought not to have meddled as much as they had done. The present Motion was, in his opinion, a most valuable one, and he sincerely trusted that the Government would not oppose it, but would take upon themselves that responsibility which they ought to assume in the interests of the public.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND said, he must enter his protest against the language used by his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees (Lord Redesdale) with regard to the Department over which he had the honour to preside. He was extremely sorry to hear remarks of such a kind coming from his noble Friend, because, proceeding from such a quarter, they were calculated to carry with them considerable weight. He was afraid his noble Friend was not justified in making those remarks, which, in point of fact, amounted to charges of dishonesty on the part of the officials of the Board of Trade. Unless his noble Friend was prepared to prove that the officials of that Department had been actuated by dishonest motives he was not justified in making such a charge; and he might remark that if the charge were distinctly brought forward in their Lordships' House he should be prepared to meet it with a distinct and unqualified contradiction. As to the subject immediately under consideration, he would not discuss it, because it had already fully occupied the attention of their Lordships' House, and had also been fully debated in the House on a former occasion on the Motion introduced by the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Clanricarde). The noble Lord opposite (Lord Camoys) did not appear to have correctly apprehended the object of the Motion, for he understood the noble Lord to say it would be unfair to allow the decision of the House to be over-ridden by the decision of the Board of Trade. Now, he believed that the Motion raised no question as to the Board of Trade deciding the matter. The object of the Motion was merely that in cases where a railway company proposed to ask Parliament for power to increase its fares a special Report from the Board of Trade should be laid upon the table, in order that their Lordships' attention might be duly directed to the subject. He saw no objection whatever to such a proposition, and on the part of the Government he had great pleasure in acceding to the Motion of the noble Lord.

LORD HOUGHTON said, he thought it an anomaly that the management of a railway was not affected by the ordinary law of supply and demand with regard to the charges it made and the remuneration it received, although it was, to a certain extent, a monopoly. If a "hard and fast line" were applied to railway fares it certainly could not be applied to railway management, for unremunerative fares would always result in insufficient attendance, dangerous materials, and bad management generally. To assume that a railway would not be affected by a change in the value of money or a rise in the price of iron, and that the fares ought to be uniform, notwithstanding such mutations, was, in his opinion, a totally incorrect application of a well-known commercial principle. Indeed, it was almost impossible to conceive that any rate of fares could be both remunerative to the company and just to the public if they were continued unchanged for a long period of time. In his belief the advantage gained by the public would be in proportion to the freedom and pliancy given to the system of railway charges, and the possibility of railway remuneration. In conclusion, he would point out that the whole question of excursion trains depended upon the raising and lowering of fares.

EARL FORTESCUE said, he must protest against the doctrine of the noble Lord who had just sat down (Lord Houghton) that the trade and commerce of the country should be kept in a perpetual state of uncertainty, which would be the consequence of the pliability and variability which his noble Friend had so highly extolled. It should be remembered that a great part of the expenses to be defrayed by railways consisted of the interest on the capital which had been expended upon their original construction; and wages, materials, and working expenses did not constitute so large a portion of the outlay as had been represented. He wished to impress upon their Lordships that the interests of the public were not represented before

Railway Committees, nor before Private Bill Committees generally, and the case of the public was not stated before such Committees. In some instances the interests of opponents might be identified with those of the public, but in many cases it did not suit opponents, who were generally another company, in the case of railway Bills to consult the interests of the public. To support this position he quoted the Report of a Committee of 1847, who said that the chief imperfections of the present system arose from the fact that no provision was made for furnishing Committees with complete and trustworthy information as to local wants; and that when a Bill was not opposed the Committee were wholly dependent for information on the interested representations of the promoters, while expense deterred all persons from opposing unless their interests were directly affected. The public were as much interested in being represented by counsel before a Committee as prisoners were in being defended by counsel. Exactly the same arguments used to be urged against the defence of prisoners that were now urged against the representation of the public, and he could only hope that in the course of time the public would succeed, as prisoners had done, in obtaining professional representation. He considered that the Motion would be of the utmost value, and he thanked the noble Duke at the head of the Board of Trade for acceding to it.

LORD REDESDALE: My Lords, I wish to offer a few words of explanation in consequence of what fell from the noble Duke the President of the Board of Trade. I made no charge of corruption against the officials of the Board of Trade, but I did say that from the intercourse which they have with clever persons belonging to the railway companies, and the railway influence brought to bear upon them, something such as I have referred to is sure to be the consequence. I have seen evidence of it on many occasions. I can even now cite a case which is just occurring. Your Lordships will remember that on the 30th of June there was a division in this House upon a provision in the South Eastern Railway Bill with regard to the division of the ordinary capital into deferred and preferred stock. I objected to that provision, and your Lordships rejected it by a majority of 44 to 35. Mr. Watkin, the Chairman of that Railway, then came to me and represented the importance of carrying this provision, and said that such a provision ought to be proposed as a public matter, not affecting one company, but applicable to all. He further stated that there was a Railway Bill at that time before the House, and that the provision might be proposed in that Bill and discussed as a public question. Now, I find that he has been to the Board of Trade, and that this very provision is to be proposed in the Commons by the Vice President of the Board of Trade in Committee upon the Railway Bill referred to. That is what I have complained of, and it is well worthy of consideration. The Bill will return to this House at a late period of the Session, and, in all probability, the imprudence of the Vice President will impose upon your Lordships the necessity of reversing a decision of the other House. Why should it not have been left to Mr. Watkin to propose the Amendment when it had in substance been rejected by your Lordships?

LORD TAUNTON said, as their Lordships seemed disposed to accept the Resolution, which it would be necessary to embody in a Standing Order, perhaps the Chairman of Committees would undertake the responsibility of giving effect to the wishes of the House.

Motion *agreed to.*

REVENUE OFFICERS DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL—(No. 204.)

(*The Lord Abinger.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD ABINGER said, that he had just presented to their Lordships no less that ninety-eight Petitions in its favour. These were chiefly from officers of the Customs, Revenue, and Postal Services in all parts of the country. To one Petition from the General Post Office 1,200 signatures were attached; and the Petitions from the London districts and from the Post Office *employés* of Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Glasgow, Leeds, and Bristol, gave a total of 3,189 signatures. There were also Petitions from the Mayor and Corporation of Wexford; the Provost, Magistrates, and Councillors of Leith; the Town Commissioners of Galway; the Inhabitants of Brechin and of Lichfield; and the Town Council of Nairn. It seldom happened that so small a Bill involved the interests of so large a number of persons. The Bill consisted of only one clause; but the number of persons the Bill affected was 36,000—26,000 in the Post Office, 5,500 in the Customs, and 5,000 in the Inland Revenue; and these public servants felt, after the large amount of enfranchisement conferred by the last Reform Bill, that a stigma would be cast upon them if they were classed with the residuum and the few respectable people who were out of the pale of the franchise. In 1782, when the disability was imposed, it was a wise and judicious measure, and it was passed with the approval of the public and of the Services because the Government unscrupulously used its influence with the officers of the different Departments. A great change occurred in 1832; and now the electoral roll had been so much enlarged that the votes of revenue officers, even if they were at the disposal of Government, could not have any appreciable influence on the elections. The admission of a large number of respectable persons to the list of voters would nevertheless strengthen the hands of almost any Administration. The Commissioners of Customs had drawn up a document in reference to this question, in which they adduced what he regarded as very illogical reasons against allowing revenue officers to vote. They alleged that to do so would be to introduce political agitation in a Department which was now free from it. Now, it had also been asserted in the House of Commons that the revenue officers themselves felt no anxiety on the subject; and, in support of that assertion, reference had been made to the fact that only a comparatively small number of Petitions had been presented in favour of the Bill, but a full and sufficient answer had been given to that allegation. An enormous number of Petitions had been presented to their Lordships' House in favour of the measure. He himself had presented no fewer than 130 from various parts of the country. If the Bill were not passed there would be a constant repetition of these demands. Again, it was alleged in the Minute of the Commissioners of Customs that great inconvenience would result to the public service from the leave of absence which would have to be given to the revenue officers in order to enable them to attend at elections. Having regard to the fact that elections were not very frequent occurrences, he did not think he need go into any argument in refutation of that statement. It was said, further, that if revenue officers had votes this circumstance might lead to political combinations on their part in order to obtain an increase of salary; but he could not at all agree to that assumption. In the House of Commons there was a large number of military officers, and there was a good sprinkling of them in their Lordships' House also; but he had yet to learn that in either House those gallant officers had agitated for an increase of pay to themselves or the soldiers under their command. It was true that there had been an increase in the pay of the soldiers, but that increase was an effect of the law of supply and demand. The Board of Excise objected to the Bill, but their Report was still weaker in its arguments and less deserving of attention than the Report from the Customs. It urged that the possession of the franchise would inconvenience the officers themselves, and render them liable to be placed in unpleasant positions; but that argument did not go for much when it was found that they desired the franchise. And their Lordships would bear in mind that the Bill was supported by the heads of the Departments. Fifteen out of the seventeen heads of the Excise Department were in favour of its passing. The Bill was not one creating a right, but one removing disabilities which had been imposed upon a portion of Her Majesty's subjects. It did not touch those Acts which prohibited public servants from unduly influencing others in the exercise of the franchise.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Abinger.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I venture to ask your Lordships' very anxious consideration for a few minutes, both to the principle of this Bill and to the position in which the measure now stands. My Lords, the noble Lord who moved the second reading said no more than what was accurate when he said that this Bill was one of extreme importance. It is of extreme importance, on the one hand, because it involves the political franchise of a large number of our fellow-subjects. It is important, on the other hand, because it is supposed by authorities whose opinion deserves the greatest consideration that this measure, if passed into law, would affect the collection of the public Revenue. I freely admit the proposition of the noble Lord who moved the second reading (Lord Abinger) that the burden entirely lies on those who oppose the admission to the franchise of the class of whom he has spoken to establish some reason why the franchise should be refused to these persons. At first sight they have got every qualification which, I think, should incline us to extend the franchise to them. They are selected, in the first instance, by a process which, at one time, found considerable favour as the basis of the franchise,—namely, the process of competitive examination. With regard to their continuance in the public service and to their promotion, it is not too much to say that both depend on their intelligence and good conduct. In addition to that they are generally persons of whom we may truly say they represent the heads of families. They of all others are interested in the well-being of the country, because on the well-being of the country the hope of their livelihood and the hope of their promotion must depend. Further than that, the noble Lord is entitled to this admission, that there is certainly in this country no general rule applicable to the Civil Service disqualifying the members of it from the exercise of the franchise. You at present entrust the franchise to that large class of civil servants who are under the control of the Treasury, who are connected with the Departments of the Secretaries of State, who are under the superintendence of the Admiralty and of the War Department; and the only three Departments the servants of which are now deprived of the franchise are the Post Office, the Customs, and the Inland Revenue. There is especially a very large class of persons in the employment of one of the Departments to which I have referred who are at present in possession of the franchise—I mean the numerous body who are engaged in the Royal Dockyards. Let me remind your Lordships—for the history of this question must be kept in view—of the course which Parliament took in regard to the persons employed in the dockyards. The Reform Bill introduced in 1859 contained, for the first time, I think, a clause proposing to withhold the franchise from the workmen in the dockyards. That Bill did not become law; but in 1866, when another measure of Reform was brought in by the late Government, a similar clause was inserted withholding the franchise from the dockyard workmen. In the last Session, when the Bill which has now become law was introduced into Parliament, the Government of the day recommended it as a very large measure of enfranchisement, and as one the peculiar characteristic of which would be that it would not in any way be a disfranchising Bill; and they accordingly abstained from making the proposition that had been made on former occasions for disfranchising the dockyard workmen. Now, the Acts of Parliament which disabled the civil servants of the Post Office, the Inland Revenue, and the Customs from voting were passed, the one of them in the last century and the other two in the beginning of the present century. According to their Preambles the ground of those measures was, as the noble Lord has stated, a desire on the part of the Legislature to keep in check and to control the power of the Crown, which it was then supposed might be exercised in a manner dangerous to the freedom of election by the opportunity which the Crown had of placing in those three great branches of the public service persons who, if entitled to the franchise, might be disposed to use it in favour of the Government of the day by whom they had been promoted. The circumstances of the present time are in two respects extremely different. In the first place, the constitution of Parliament has been very materially altered, first by the Act of 1832, and then by laws which have since then been passed. Moreover, there has been introduced into those three branches of the service a system altogether unknown at the period when the earlier Acts were passed, and which has made an important modification in those Departments. I refer to the reform in the Inland Revenue and the Customs, according to which no appointments, except first appointments, are made by the Executive Government; and even the first appointments can hardly be said to proceed from the Executive Government, which, in substance, only nominates a limited number of candidates, who compete together by examination. Therefore, in those Departments the reason for the older legislation has disappeared. But, on the other hand, it must be observed that the permanent heads of the Customs and Inland Revenue at all times in recent years, when the proposition has been made to confer the franchise on the servants in their employment, testified the most decided repugnance to any legislation in that direction. Your Lordships will, I think, agree with what has been stated by every Government which in modern days has held Office in this country —namely, the great confidence which the country has in those gentlemen who are the permanent heads of those Departments; the great reliance which is placed in their ability, their experience, and their entire devotion to the public service; and any opinion which falls from them must be entitled to the greatest weight both with your Lordships and the other House of Parliament. Now, when the Reform Bill of last year was passing through the House of Commons a proposition was there made to insert a clause having the effect of the present measure. That clause was opposed by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Disraeli) on the ground to which I have referred—namely, that the permanent heads of the Customs and Inland Revenue really entertained a strong opinion that, however it might have originally happened that the franchise was refused to the Civil Service, in its operation the exclusion had been found so beneficial that it ought to be maintained, and that injury would accrue to the service if the exclusion were terminated. The same view was taken by the immediate predecessor of my right hon. Friend, Mr. Gladstone, who also opposed the clause, and on the same ground; and the result was that it was not pressed to a division. Since the Bill now before your Lordships was introduced into the other House, two Reports, made by the permanent heads of the Customs and Inland Revenue, were communicated to Parliament, and are now before your Lordships. Those Reports express a very strong disapproval of a measure for enfranchising the members of those branches of the Civil Service. Those Reports having been made, Her Majesty's Government in the House of Commons felt it their duty to place them and the substance of them in the strongest way before the other House of Parliament, and the Government were of opinion—whatever might otherwise have been their disposition to enlarge as much as they safely could do the basis of the franchise—that it was their duty, as representing in the House of Commons those who, as permanent heads of Departments, could not be heard there, not only to state their reasons, but to support them by their votes in that House. Consequently, my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to whose Department the matter more properly belonged, urged with the utmost force he could use the reasons given by the permanent heads of the Customs and Inland Revenue against the measure. My right hon. Friend was supported in that view by Mr. Gladstone, who was himself so long Chancellor of the Exchequer, although I rather think that Gentleman did not record his vote on the subject. The question thus raised was certainly one peculiarly for the House of Commons, because the view taken by the heads of those Departments was that the consequence of this measure of enfranchisement might be dangerous to the collection of the public Revenue. The Government thought that was a question which the House of Commons, as the guardians of the public Revenue, must take upon themselves to decide. The result of the discussion and division in the other House was that the Bill was carried by a considerable majority. No doubt the House in which that division occurred was not a large one at the time; but it has been said, I believe, with some accuracy, that that was much owing to the circumstance that, the Chancellor and the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer taking the view they did, many Members who would have been anxious to support the Bill felt constrained to absent themselves from the division. After this decision, over-ruling the strongly-expressed opinions of the permanent heads of those Departments, the Government have been obliged to consider the course which they would recommend your Lordships to adopt. They might have asked your Lordships to reject this Bill; and if they were of opinion that the reasons given by the permanent heads of those Departments were reasons which upon examination ought to receive the degree of weight which those gentlemen themselves attach to them, the Government would not hesitate to ask your Lordships to reject the measure, though such a step might seem a strong one to those who desire to see it pass into law. I think, however, it will be found that it will be your Lordships' opinion, as it is that of Her Majesty's Government, that those reasons, although I agree that they are very strongly and broadly expressed, are not strong enough, after the decision arrived at in the other House of Parliament, to lead you to throw out the Bill. Any objection I may make I shall offer with the most profound respect for the heads of the Departments, who are, I am sure, actuated by the highest and purest motives. In substance the reasons of the Commissioners of Customs may be very shortly stated; but before I state them I will mention the numbers of the different Departments who are affected by this proposal. We have no reasons from the Post Office; and those which we have are from the Customs and Inland Revenue. The total number of persons in the three Departments of the Civil Service is upwards of 36,216. Of these there are in the Post Office 25,652; in the Customs, 5,115; and Inland Revenue, 5,049. The reasons stated on the part of the Customs authorities are four. The first reason is that if the persons employed in this Department are to be allowed to vote it will be necessary to give them leave of absence, and this would cause inconvenience to the Service. I do not think this ought to influence your Lordships much. An election, after all, rarely occurs, and as these persons will all be occupation voters the polling places will be near their residences. We know that in some of the largest establishments in the country, where the men enjoy the franchise, means are found to enable them to go to the polling-booths in the dinner hour, and there is not the slightest practical difficulty in the way of their obtaining the limited amount of time necessary to enable them to record their votes. The Commissioners next state that the possession of the franchise might affect the promotion of inferior officers by their superiors, but as I understand the matter this difficulty could not arise. The superior officers have not the right of promotion. They may recommend officers for promotion, but it is the Board themselves who alone possess the power of promotion. The third reason is that it might subject the officers to solicitations for their votes which might place them in equivocal and difficult positions. I am at a loss to perceive the force of this objection. The fourth and last reason is the gravest one, if it has any foundation — that these persons might form combinations to secure for themselves an increase of salary. This might be very well in theory, but there is not much weight in this suggestion. How far would your Lordships carry out this principle? It is scarcely possible, looking at the composition of the other House of Parliament, and the vast body of electors, to say that any such consideration as this should lead to the disfranchisement of any class of Her Majesty's subjects. It might be said that members of the military and naval services might combine to raise the pay of those services, but that is no reason for refusing them a vote. By interests which are very strong in the Commons great combinations might be formed for the benefit of those interests, and yet you do not disfranchise any body of men on this account. The railway interest is very influential; the publicans are a very influential body; so, also, are the solicitors, who have combined to get the certificate duty removed. I might suggest half a score instances of that kind, but you do not lay down the position that because combinations might be formed that would be a reason for disfranchising those interests. The Inland Revenue Department have stated their reasons against the Bill, and they are two in number. These are expressed with so much point in their Report that I will read them to your Lordships; but before I do so I will advert to an opinion they give which goes a long way towards bringing us to the conclusion that we may safely support this Bill. They state that—

> "It is generally supposed that the principal, if not the only, reason for maintaining the existing law is a dread of the influence of the Government of the day being brought to bear upon a large body of voters who hold their offices during pleasure."

This, the Commissioners state, they regard as a consideration of minor importance. We thus get rid of that apprehension which was the foundation of the legislation which we are now asked to repeal. Their objections apply to the out-door officers. They take an imaginary case of an officer of excise canvassing for A. B., while C. D., the opposing candidate—or even one of C. D.'s most prominent supporters—is a distiller or maltster. They say—

> "If an excise officer so situated should find it his duty about the time of the election to procure a search warrant to ransack C. D.'s house, or to put his distillery under seizure, and bring an information against him for penalties, no one can doubt that he would subject himself to the greatest suspicion of using the power conferred on him as a revenue officer to serve a political party, and the mischief of such an imputation would be nearly the same whether it were true or false."

I have read this because it states in forcible language an objection felt by the Commissioners, to which the fullest consideration should be given. But the possibility or impossibility of the officer giving a vote has nothing to do with this objection, which takes it for granted that the excise officer has got strong political opinions of his own, and that there is a danger of his carrying out those opinions in such a way as to allow it to shape his course in the collection of the Revenue. But he can do that quite as well if he has not a vote as if he has. I go further than that, and say that there is an additional reason for using his power in an illegitimate manner if you deny him the proper outlet, and refuse him what everyone else has—the opportunity of recording the expression of his political opinion. If you give him a vote he has then nothing to complain of; but if there is one thing that would tempt a man of strong political opinions to act in a sinister and improper manner, it is to refuse him a vote. But the Commisioners do not tell us that such a case has ever occurred. If these officers possess the power of injuring other people even without votes, when they have strong political opinions of their own, they will be more likely to use this power in order to favour one side or the other when they are denied the franchise than when they are able to exercise it. The Commissioners go on to say—

> "The power of removal is one of the most valuable parts of our disciplinary system. If an officer is believed to be on terms of too great intimacy with a trader under his survey—if he has fallen into the company of bad associates—if he appears to be deficient in the acuteness and energy requisite for dealing with some fraudulent trader—or if he has identified himself with any particular religious sect or parochial party, so as to be obnoxious to other sects and parties in the locality, his removal to another district is a ready and effectual check to the mischief which would otherwise ensue. But when the officer becomes a voter, when he is perhaps one of the managers for a political party in a small borough, what will not be our difficulty in sending him away, perhaps on the eve of an election, and what will not be the suspicions of party motives to which the Board and the superior officers who recommend his removal will be subjected?"

Now, that question deserved consideration and weight; but is it sufficient to justify the exclusion from the franchise of a class of persons otherwise well qualified for it? I think not, and for this reason—the Commissioners admit that, at present, if any one of their officers has become identified with some particular party in parochial or local politics, so as to prejudice the public service, they endeavour to cure the evil by removing him to another place. Now, I apprehend the same power would remain in their hands, and being a body wholly unconnected with the Government, against whom no suspicion has ever been suggested that they exercise their powers for any political purpose, public opinion would support them if they found it necessary to deal with any officer mixed up in general politics in the same way as they have done hitherto with regard to local politics. As to Members of Parliament being subjected to solicitation, I think the Commissioners have already taken steps to prevent such a thing, for when myself a Member of the other House, being ignorant of what the rule of the Service was, I wrote to them with reference to a person who I thought had been dealt hardly with, and I received in reply a printed form stating that by the rules of the Service no Member of Parliament was allowed to communicate with the Commissioners with regard to any person in their employment, and that if a Member so communicated they would not stop to inquire whether he had been put in motion by the civil servant, but would assume that the civil servant had put him in motion, and would punish the civil servant accordingly. That, I dare say, is a very proper rule, and it quite disposes of the objection as to interference with Members of Parliament. These, my Lords, are the reasons why Her Majesty's Government, having taken the opinion of the House of Commons—the guardians of the public Revenue—do not think they ought to ask your Lordships to interfere with the progress of this Bill. I trust and believe that on its becoming law the large number of persons whom it will admit to the franchise will show by the way in which they exercise it that they are worthy the confidence reposed in them by Parliament. The Bill proposes to deal with the Acts 22 *Geo.* III., c. 41, 43 *Geo.* III., c. 25. I will only add, for the consideration of the noble Lord in charge of the Bill, that the 9th section of the Act 7 & 8 *Geo.* IV., which it also proposes to repeal, not only prohibits civil servants from voting, but imposes a penalty on any member of the Civil Service who directly or indirectly persuades any other person to vote. Now, I think it would be well to retain that proviso and forbid these persons from becoming solicitors of votes, which might raise a suspicion that they were using the influence of their position for political ends. The general scope of the Bill does not require the repeal of that part of the section. With this reservation I cheerfully assent to the second reading.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, your Lordships must be very grateful to the noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor) for the agreeable and pleasing way in which he has explained the change of opinion on the part of Her Majesty's Government with regard to this question. I entirely agree with him as to the abstract claims of men of such position and character as these civil servants to the enjoyment of the franchise. The only question is whether in other ways such a measure would be injurious to the public service. I cannot help thinking that the course taken by the Government in the other House was rather hard upon the civil servants, for, after laying on the table the very decided reports of the permanent heads of Departments, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, placing, as the noble and learned Lord tells us, his own opinion in abeyance in deference to those Reports, made one of the strongest speeches I ever remember reading against the claims of those gentlemen. I really think that some of the arguments which the noble and learned Lord has so forcibly advanced against the Reports, and with many of which I entirely agree, should have been weighed by the Members of the Government in the other House before they gave their opposition to the Bill. I came down to-night not feeling so strongly as many the objections to giving this class the franchise, but feeling that in a matter of such delicacy in connection with the public Revenue — a question in which the other House is not exclusively interested —I should give the benefit of any doubt which existed in my mind in favour of the opinion of three successive Chancellors of the Exchequer, who ought to be persons most competent to give an opinion on the matter. I now find that Her Majesty's Government, on further consideration, do not think harm will arise to the collection of Revenue from this Bill, and in the sanguine hope that the heads of Departments will prove mistaken, and with unmixed pleasure that so intelligent and respectable a class should be admitted to the franchise, I most cheerfully support the second reading.

EARL FORTESCUE said, he objected to the retention of that part of the section referred to by the noble and learned Lord. He thought these officials should not be debarred from giving the reasons which influenced them. To retain the proviso would be a trap to catch the unwary, and would be a slur on a very deserving class.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR explained that he had not suggested that civil servants should be debarred from giving reasons for their votes, but simply from soliciting the votes of other persons

LORD ABINGER said, that the object of repealing the entire section was to place excise officers, to whom alone it applied, in the same position as other services. That section made the penalty with regard to the excise £500, whereas with regard to other services it was only £100. The matter could be settled in Committee.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

The QUEEN's Answer to the Address of Thursday last [July 9], *reported,* as follows:—

> "I thank you sincerely for your loyal and dutiful Address on the Birth of a Princess, my Granddaughter, and I derive great Gratification from the renewed Assurance of the Interest you feel in the domestic Happiness of Myself and My Family."

MARRIAGE LAWS COMMISSION.

QUESTION.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE inquired, When the Report of the Marriage Laws Commission may be expected; and whether Her Majesty's Ministers intend to propose to Parliament any Legislation upon that Subject, so far as Ireland is concerned, in the next Session?

LORD CHELMSFORD said, that as he had the honour of being the Chairman of the Commission, he might be permitted to answer part of the Question put by the noble Marquess. As there had been both Scotch and Irish Members on the Commission, it was almost impossible from time to time to collect a proper meeting; but he was happy to say that they had now agreed upon their Report, which in a day or two would be signed by the different Commissioners, and he hoped it would be presented to both Houses of Parliament before the Prorogation. As to whether the Goverment would undertake to legislate next year on the question he could say nothing.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, he could not undertake to give a promise on the subject.

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS BILL.—(No. 221.)

(*The Lord President.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that it involved no new principle. The Bill proposed certain arrangements by which the estates of chapters would be transferred to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for a certain time for the purpose of being restored to the chapters after various changes with respect to the leasehold tenure of their property had been effected. Many years ago, as their Lordships would remember, an Act of Parliament was passed which gave the Ecclesiastical Commissioners a considerable interest in the estates both of deans and chapters and Bishops. The effect of that Act was to arrange the appointment to a certain number of canonries, and to vest the proceeds of those canonries in the hands of the Commissioners, thus forming funds comprised under the name of the Common Fund of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The mode in which payment was made with that fund was by making certain charges upon the funds of the chapters, the chapters having the administration of the whole of the estates, and paying a certain sum into the hands of the Commissioners. In the process of years that was found not to be the best way of carrying out the arrangements. There were many disadvantages in the Commissioners having merely a charge on the estates in the management of which they had little or no interest, and at the same time there were inconveniencies connected with the leasehold tenure of the property which it was very desirable to terminate. He believed the Church leasehold property was considered to be one of the worst kinds of property, or at least one of a very objectionable nature. The various interests of the lessees and the reversionaries were not identical, and consequently the property suffered. The consequence was that for a length of time it had been found convenient that arrangements should be made between chapters on the one side and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners on the other for transferring to the Commissioners the estates, in order that the Commissioners, by means of the funds at their disposal, might be able to arrange the leasehold interest on a proper footing, to buy up reversionary interests, and at the same time to pay themselves the debt which the chapters owed them, guaranteeing to the chapters the income which Parliament had fixed as their future income, and, after the changes which it was thought desirable had been effected in the property, to hand back to the chapters estates freed from that objectionable leasehold tenure which it had been the intention and endeavour of Parliament for a long period of years, and by many Acts, to put an end to. In consequence of the convictions which the necessities of the case had brought to light those arrangements had for a series of years been in progress. He believed the first arrangement was made with the Chapter of York in 1852, and from that to the present time various surrenders of property, amounting to eighteen, had been made by different chapters for effecting those voluntary arrangements, and obtaining a subsequent transfer of their property to them in an improved condition. That principle had been thoroughly sanctioned by Parliament. In 1860 a Bill was passed rendering it obligatory that all the property of all the Bishops upon the avoidance of the sees should be transferred in the way he had described to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the Commissioners at the same time undertaking to put the Bishops in re-possession of property sufficient to yield the income allowed by Parliament. Few, if any, doubts arose for some time to shake the belief that a competent authority existed for such arrangements; but in the course of last year doubts were raised as to the authority which the Acts in question conveyed, and in the case of the transference from the two chapters of Norwich and Westminster, which were under consideration by the Commissioners and the chapters, communications were received at the Privy Council Office which made him feel that it was his duty to submit the question in a formal shape to the Law Officers of the Crown. The Law Officers reported that they did not consider the authority of the Acts sufficient to enable the Commissioners to effect the transfers in the usual manner, and a decision of the Judicial Committee recorded to that effect stopped the transfers in contemplation. The effect of that was not only to prevent the transfers then under consideration, but to throw doubt upon the authority by which, in the case of the eighteen chapters, the former transfers had been made. In order to remedy any inconveniences that might have arisen, Parliament passed an Act during the present Session which gave validity to those transactions. But it was evident that unless Parliament gave more distinct powers the process hitherto so salutary must be brought to a stand-still. This Bill, therefore, had been brought in for the purpose of enabling the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to carry on arrangements with other chapters which were desirous of entering into them. The provisions of the Bill were of a simple character; they enabled transfers to be made of the property of deans and chapters, the latter to receive a money payment, and provided that a certain sum should be set apart for cathedral repairs. Farms were to be let without fines at the best annual rent that could be obtained. These were the main provisions of the Bill. There was nothing compulsory in the powers it sought to confer; it simply enacted that voluntary arrangements were to be permitted between the chapter on one side and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners on the other. Whatever arrangements lessees might have made previous to the transfer of property, these arrangements the Commissioners would be able to carry out if they saw fit, and, if they did not, they would be bound, if the lessees required them, to purchase the outstanding terms of the leases.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

BURIALS (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 212.)

(*The Earl of Kimberley.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, he would briefly explain its provisions and those of the present law. The latter depended upon an Act carried by Mr., afterwards Lord, Plunket, and it provided that, in the event of the burial of a person not a member of the Established Church in one of its graveyards, his relatives might ask permission of the clergyman to have the service read by a priest or Dissenting minister, and if the clergyman refused such permission he should give his reasons in writing to the applicants, and send a copy to the Bishop of the diocese, who should send it to the Lord Lieutenant. The author of the Bill said that his intention was that it should be regarded as a mandate, and that while he thought it possible that some wrong-headed clergyman might refuse his permission, he believed the Act would be found a remedy for the evils complained of. Unfortunately that had not been found to be the case; there had been several instances of refusal; and they were not confined to Roman Catholics, but had occurred in several instances to Presbyterians and Wesleyans. He was told that the feeling of the Presbyterians and of the Wesleyans in relation to the necessity for a Bill like the present was even stronger than that of the Roman Catholics. The Bill was short and simple, and provided that, instead of permission being asked, the clergyman should have no right to refuse the request, when made, for a priest or minister to read the burial service. Many of the Irish population were now buried without any service being read at their graves—buried like dogs, as Lord Plunket said in 1824. Yet the feeling in Ireland in regard to the sanctity of burial was greater than it was in most countries, and to outrage this feeling could have anything but a conciliatory effect upon the people. In the greater part of Ireland there were no separate graveyards for those who did not belong to the Established Church, and therefore a large part of the population were buried in the churchyard without having a service read over them. The priests of the Roman Catholic Church had a natural dislike to asking the clergyman for permission to read the Roman Catholic service; and Presbyterians and Wesleyans, although they did not share that dislike, had preferred requests which had unfortunately been refused. This was a state of things which it was desirable to put an end to, and he therefore hoped their Lordships would assent to the second reading of the Bill. The Primate of Ireland had given notice of a Motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee; and he could not help regarding that Motion as an attempt to get rid of the Bill, which was resorted to under some apprehension as to the result of direct opposition, seeing that it proposed to relieve not only Roman Catholics but Protestant Dissenters. The Bill was so short and simple that any Amendments could easily be discussed in Committee of the Whole House; and he should therefore feel it to be his duty to oppose the Motion for referring it to a Select Committee

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly.

Then it was *moved,* That the Bill be *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH said, he felt it to be his duty to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. He did this, not to oppose the principle of the Bill, but in the hope that its deficiencies might be supplied, and that some Amendments might be made in parts of the Bill that were objectionable. The subject was a large and extensive one; it involved arrangements as to the burial in the same churchyard of persons of four or five different religions. This was a matter of very considerable delicacy, too much so to be dealt with in a single clause. The noble Earl had stated the present law correctly, with one exception; he had forgotten to say that the clergyman, when applied to for his consent, must give it in writing, and state the time for the burial. On the face of it the object was to prevent the interruption of divine service. The churchyard was the freehold of the incumbent, whose position was fully recognized in Lord Plunket's Bill; but this Bill treated him as a nullity, a defect he hoped to remedy in the Select Committee. The fixing of the hour gave mutual notice of the time of the funeral, but the Bill provided for no such arrangement, and the consequence might be the simultaneous arrival at the churchyard of two or more funerals of persons of different religious persuasions, and the clergyman might have to wait in his own churchyard until lengthy addresses had been delivered by those previously in possession. It was not necessary that the clergyman should be entirely disregarded in this way. The absence of any provision fixing the time was a practical inconvenience, for those constituting a funeral *cortége* could not know that they would clash with another, and a funeral party from a remote part of a parish might have to wait at the churchyard for an hour, on a wet day, owing to the omission of a desirable arrangement. Under the proposed arrangement there would be nothing but confusion and collisions. Then, it should be borne in mind that the sexton had care of the churchyard, but there was no provision in the Bill that he should receive notice of intended funerals, and the consequence would frequently be that when the sexton was not present with the key the churchyard would be broken into. At present the sexton took no fees, and was only entitled to a small salary, which was settled by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; but if he had additional labours imposed upon him he ought in fairness to receive additional remuneration. Then, again, the clergyman's jurisdiction over the tombs and monuments ought to be maintained, and it would be the duty of the Select Committee to take into consideration the circumstance that in Ireland there were eight different kinds of churchyards. For instance, there were the public and poorhouse burial grounds, Roman Catholic cemeteries, places of sepulture surrounding Dissenting chapels, those around the old monasteries, those on sites where Protestant churches formerly stood, and in which both Roman Catholics and Protestants had the right of sepulture; burial-grounds surrounding existing Protestant churches, and burial grounds near churches recently erected. With regard to the last, he might remark that since the Union a great number of churches had been built in Ireland. Indeed, he believed that no fewer than 550 had been erected since 1806. These were, for the most part, surrounded by small churchyards which were only suited for the interment of the Protestants in the district, and which would soon be overcrowded if the right to be interred there were claimed by the Roman Catholics. In his opinion, these burial grounds ought to continue to be appropriated to the uses for which they were originally intended. There would, indeed, be no objection to allow Dissenters to be interred there, but if Roman Catholics were admitted overcrowding would be the inevitable result. There was a strong reason why this Bill should not be passed at the present time. It was pretty generally understood that an attempt would be made next year to disestablish and disendow the Established Church in Ireland, and to reduce it to the position of a sect. Well, if that were done, it was only fair that the Church should enjoy the benefit of its new position. If, as was possible, the Bill did not pass this Session, it might be brought forward again next year, with the addition of such safeguards as would render it acceptable to the members of the Church in Ireland.

An Amendment *moved* to leave out from ("Bill") to the end of the Motion, and insert ("be referred to a Select Committee.")—(*The Archbishop of Armagh.*)

EARL GRANVILLE said, that although the most rev. Prelate had declared his assent to the principle of the Bill, he had, in fact, argued against the only principle it contained, and at the end of his speech had stated explicitly that the measure ought not to be passed. As to the various Amendments suggested by the most rev. Prelate, there was not one of them which required in the slightest degree the intervention of a Select Committee. Every one of the proposed Amendments might be satisfactorily dealt with, and in a very short space of time, in Committee of the Whole House. The most rev. Prelate had spoken of different classes of churchyards in Ireland; but, as the present Bill had reference to one class only, the objection had no force. As to the objection raised with respect to certain churchyards of very limited size, he wished to point out that the Bill in no way affected the right of burial, but simply provided that in churchyards where, by the present law, Catholics and Dissenters had a right to be buried, the burial services might be read by the clergymen of their respective denominations. On the whole, he thought their Lordships would come to the conclusion that the most rev. Prelate had not advanced sufficient reasons for the appointment of a Select Committee.

THE MARQUESS OF WESTMEATH said, he thought the present was a very unfit time for bringing forward a measure of this kind, which would, in all probability lead to unseemly collisions in churchyards.

LORD LYTTELTON said, he could not see that there was the slightest ground for referring the Bill to a Select Committee, and he hoped the most rev. Prelate would not press his Motion.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, he could not concur with his noble Friend (Lord Lyttelton) that no case had been made out for referring the Bill to a Select Committee, but at the same time he felt that the adoption of such a course at this late period of the Session would have the appearance of an attempt to burke the Bill. He was sure, however, that that was not the object of the most rev. Prelate. The Bill, it must be admitted, was very faulty in its details, and he, for one, should be extremely sorry to support it in its present shape. Greater safeguards ought, for instance, to be provided in order to prevent those collisions which he was afraid were more likely to occur in the sister country than in England. This was a part of the subject which his noble Friend who had charge of the Bill (the Earl of Kimberley) did not appear to have sufficiently considered. Under all the circumstances, perhaps the best course would be for the most rev. Prelate to give his attention to the matter during the next two or three days, and at a future stage of the Bill to bring forward such Amendments as he might deem necessary. The House would be quite competent to decide upon those Amendments, and also upon any which his noble Friend opposite (the Earl of Kimberley) might think fit to bring forward.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, he wished to express his readiness to confer in the most friendly spirit with the most rev. Prelate on the subject of any Amendments which he might deem it necessary to move.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH said, he would adopt the suggestion of his noble Friend the Lord Privy Seal.

Amendment (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn:* Then the original Motion was *agreed to:* and Bill *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

COMPULSORY CHURCH RATES ABOLITION BILL—(No. 211.)

(*The Earl Russell.*)

THIRD READING.

Bill read 3^a (according to Order), with the Amendments.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON said, he had given Notice of an Amendment by way of addition to Clause 6; but in consequence of some suggestions made to him by the noble Earl lately at the head of the Government he had made certain modifications in that Amendment. His Amendment, as he should now propose it, provided that the inhabitants of any ecclesiastical district constituted out of a portion of an ancient parish should not be entitled to vote in that parish in matters relating to church rates; but might, subject to the other provisions in this Bill, assemble and make a rate for their own ecclesiastical district. The right rev. Prelate concluded by moving his Amendment.

THE EARL OF DERBY said, he had apprehended that the Amendment as framed originally would have prevented persons from voting in respect of church rates for the payment of which they were liable. For twenty years after separation from the ancient parish the inhabitants of an ecclesiastical district continued to be liable for a proportion of the rates imposed for the maintenance of the fabric of the mother church. To relieve them of that obligation would be to throw a new tax on the ancient parish. It was not easy to gather the exact effect of an Amendment from hearing it read; but if the clause, as now worded, would only go the length of depriving persons of the right of voting in respect of rates for no part of which they would be liable, he could have no objection to it.

Amendment *agreed to;* Further Amendmends made.

Then it was *moved,* That the Bill do pass.

THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL said, he did not at this time oppose the passing of the Bill, as such a course would be now alike fruitless and unusual; but he did feel it to be his duty formally and deliberately to enter his protest against it. He would ask their permission to state briefly why he must firmly say "Not-content" when the proper time arrives. He would not thus trouble their Lordships, if he were not conscious that he was now expressing the sentiments of several other Members of the right rev. Bench, and if he had not reason to believe that in his protest the voices of others more influential were really joined with his own. He protested in the first place against the scope and principle of the Bill. He protested against thus giving up a portion of the heritage of the Church and of the just liabilities of the land to clamour, and that too to a clamour that year by year was becoming less reasonable and less justified by the facts of the case. A principle had been almost gratuitously surrendered, and they were brought face to face with the true beginning of the end. He protested then against the general substance and tenor of the Bill. He protested further and in the second place against the Bill, when compared with the Bill that came up from the Commons. In that Bill there were at any rate some few safeguards; there were provisions that tended to put the Church in a better and safer position than she could occupy when the present measure should become law. Of two measures the worst had been chosen.

The Earl of Derby

Lastly he would make bold to say that simple and unconditional abolition of church rates was to be preferred to the present measure. If injustice were to be done, better far that it should be clear and patent rather than masked under what many may be led to speak of as adjustment and compromise. If church rates were unconditionally abolished, the church would fall back upon herself and her own real strength. She would rely not on scaffolding, but on free hearts and free offerings, and she would not rely in vain. He thanked their Lordships for the consideration with which they had listened, and reiterated temperate but firmly his protest.

LORD LYTTELTON said, he should have been glad to have an opportunity of saying a few words on the general question of church rates, but could not think of presuming to do so at that moment. But when many of their Lordships hoped rather than expected that that Bill would enable them to hear no more of that question for a long time to come, he must express his entire conviction that the whole agitation against church rates and the proposal for their total abolition were as totally unfounded in justice as any movement that ever occurred in this country, except upon a ground that would go a great deal further, and that would extend even to the abolition of the Established Church. The repeal of church rates had been advocated on considerations of expediency, with a view to conciliate the Dissenters; but he doubted whether it would have that result. He had very slight hope indeed that this Bill would lead to any good, yet, as it had been agreed to by both sides, he could not offer any opposition to it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he disagreed both with the noble Lord (Lord Lyttelton) and the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London) as regarded the comparative disadvantage of that Bill as it stood and a measure for the complete abolition of church rates. He thought that measure very much better than one for the complete abolition of church rates; and he had a sanguine hope that in many parishes in the country it would work very satisfactorily. If there was a parish in the country which thought it had got a better machinery of its own than that provided by the Bill, it would be perfectly at liberty to employ that machinery; and that he deemed a merit in the Bill.

On Question? Resolved in the *Affirmative;* Bill *passed* accordingly, and sent to the Commons.

WEST INDIES BILL—(No. 135).

(The Duke of Buckingham.)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

LORD LYTTELTON moved an Amendment relating to the remuneration of the coadjutor Bishop of Kingston in Jamaica.

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM said, the Bill had been prepared with the intention of saving all vested rights; but it could not on that footing have met the particular case to which the noble Lord's Amendment referred. All the work of the Bishop of Jamaica had been done by the coadjutor Bishop of Kingston, who received a certain portion of the funds applicable to the bishopric of Jamaica. It seemed equitable that while he discharged the duties the coadjutor Bishop should receive some remuneration; and, therefore, he could not think of opposing the Amendment. The last two lines of the Amendment, however, went rather too far. The noble Duke moved a proviso that while the coadjutor Bishop was in the receipt of his salary no payment should be made from the Consolidated Fund in respect to his archdeaconry.

After a few words from Lord CRANWORTH,

Amendment *agreed to.*

Further Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 249.)

HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY BILL.

(The Duke of Buckingham.)

(NO. 244.) SECOND READING.

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that an Act was passed two years ago to annex the Hudson's Bay territory to the Canadian Dominion. It was, however, found that that Act did not give all the necessary powers. The present Bill enacted that power should be given to the Crown to accept the surrender of the lands and rights enjoyed by the Hudson's Bay Company under their charter, and it gave power on the other hand to the Company to make such a surrender. There was a proviso that in the event of the surrender of the Company's rights being agreed to, yet that the surrender should not take effect unless within one month the Canadian Parliament passed an Address embodying the terms of the agreement, and unless the Imperial Government by an Order in Council within one month agreed to the transfer of the said powers and rights to the Canadian Parliament.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at Nine o'clock,
till To-morrow, Half-past
Ten o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 13, 1868.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—Malt Tax [No. 420]; County Financial Arrangements [No. 421].

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—NAVY ESTIMATES.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolutions in Committee*—Sir Robert Napier's Annuity.

Ordered—Sir Robert Napier's Annuity; Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation.*

First Reading—Sir Robert Napier's Annuity* [230]; Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation* [231]; Admiralty Suits* [234].

Second Reading—Army Chaplains* [225]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland)* [210]; Militia Pay*; Danube Works Loan* [227]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3)* [229].

Committee—Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [149]; Inland Revenue* [207]—R.P.; Vaccination (Ireland)* [217]; Municipal Elections (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [211].

Report—Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [149]; Vaccination (Ireland)* [217]; Municipal Elections (Scotland) (*re-comm.*)* [211].

Considered as amended—Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* [222].

Third Reading—Court of Session (Scotland)* [214]; New Zealand Assembly's Powers* [216].

VAGRANCY.—QUESTION.

MR. FLOYER said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Whether, in pursuance of the intimation given in the last Annual Report of the Poor Law Board, it is intended to issue any further regulations for the administration of relief to Vagrants?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said, the Poor Law Board made considerable inquiries and collected a good deal of information as to the state of vagrancy; and he hoped before long, as the result of those inquiries, the Poor Law Board would be enabled to issue an Order providing uniformity with regard to the diet, lodging, and work of vagrants.

SURVEY OF INDIA.—QUESTION.

Mr. AKROYD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Why the survey of the direct route from Rangoon to Kianhung, on the South Western frontier of China, has not been completed, and on what grounds the preference has been given to the survey of the route by Bhamo to Talifu (Assam and Calcutta) in the North West of China?

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, in reply, that the grounds upon which the survey of the route between Rangoon and Kianhung had been suspended were stated in the Papers already presented to the House. The survey had been carried on as far as the limits of the British territory; but upon the representation of the Governor General of India that it might involve political complications if it were carried through the independent States, he (Sir Stafford Northcote) had issued an Order directing the survey to be suspended. In regard to the survey of the route by way of Bhamo to Talifu, that had nothing to do with the survey of Rangoon. It was authorized by the Governor General without asking the permission of the Secretary of State; because, as he (Sir Stafford Northcote) imagined, there were no similar political difficulties to be apprehended.

ALLEGED CRUELTIES IN NEW ZEALAND.—QUESTION.

Mr. GORST said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to the following passage in a despatch of the Governor of New Zealand, laid before Parliament on the 5th May, 1868:—

> "I have heard no allegation of other acts of cruelty in New Zealand, except in the case of the attack made on the native mission village of Rangiaohia by the European Forces under General Cameron one Sunday morning (the 21st February, 1864). I heard with sorrow those reports; but, for the reasons I have before stated, I could not tell whether they were true or not," &c.

What were the acts of cruelty at Rangiaohia referred to by the Governor; and, whether the matter has ever been inquired into either by the civil or military authorities?

Mr. ADDERLEY said, in reply, that the despatch referred to by the hon. Member was dated 1866, in which the Governor of New Zealand (Sir George Grey) described certain conduct of the troops towards the Natives in 1864. By reference to that despatch it appeared that it referred to a certain local force—Rangers—who set fire to a village, the Natives being at the time in arms and firing on the troops. The Governor at the time passed no censure on them, although two years later he described their acts as acts of cruelty. The Secretary of State had expressed general approbation of the conduct of the troops. Under these circumstances, and considering that four years had elapsed, he did not think there was any good cause for further inquiry into the case.

INDIA—RAJA OF KUPURTHULLA.
QUESTION.

Lord WILLIAM HAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether it is the case that the decision of Lord Canning, with respect to the will of the Raja of Kupurthulla, has been reversed by the Governor General, and that six months only, dating from the 1st of May, have been allowed to His Highness for the purpose of appealing; and, if so, whether he has any objection to extend that period to one year?

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, in reply, said, he had received no direct communication from the Governor General of India on the subject; but he saw in the Report of the proceedings that a decision was come to by the Governor General on the 8th February last in respect to the will in question, and that the present Raja had been called upon to give effect to the will of his father. In consequence some communications had taken place between the Raja and the Governor General in April last, when the latter stated that he would allow the decision to be suspended for a period of six months from the 1st of May in order to enable the Raja to carry his appeal to England. No such appeal had as yet arrived. If there should not be time to consider it within the period named, which he (Sir Stafford Northcote) thought very possible, he would take care to have the time extended so as to afford ample time for the consideration of what was a very complicated question.

CONCENTRATION OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. GREGORY said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether notices will be served on the owners of houses between Bridge Street and Montagu House, in order that no time may be lost in case the plan of Sir Charles Trevelyan for the future arrangement of the Public Departments should be preferred to that of the First Commissioner?

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, in reply, that the Question of the hon. Gentleman seemed to be based on a misapprehension. There was no plan before the House of the First Commissioner. The Treasury Commission appointed to inquire into the Concentration of the Public Departments had considered the subject, and presented a Report, and to that the signature of the First Commissioner had been appended. The Report was the Report of the Commission. Notices would be given to the holders of property for carrying out the plan so far as adopted.

Mr. GREGORY said, he wished to know, Whether anything would be done in the matter beyond serving the notices?

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, no other step would or could be taken in the matter. The usual notices would be served in the ordinary way, and a Bill would be introduced early next Session with reference to the subject.

PARLIAMENT—PALACE OF WESTMINSTER.—QUESTION.

Mr. COWPER said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he has received a Chemical Report on the results of trials of processes for the induration of decaying stone in the walls of the Palace of Westminster, and whether he will communicate such trial to the House?

Lord JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, no chemical report on the results of trials of processes for the induration of decaying stone in the walls of the Palace of Westminster has yet been received. When it is received it will be communicated to the House.

ARMY—STORING OF AMMUNITION.
QUESTION.

Mr. HAYTER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether his omission to give any reply to the Motion respecting the placing in store of Ammunition now carried by the Non-commissioned Officers and Privates of the Army is to be interpreted as an acquiescence in the propriety of adopting such return to the original practice in the Army; and, if not, whether he is prepared to accept the responsibility of offering facilities to men, when either insane or intoxicated, for committing outrages in barracks similar to those which have already been attended with fatal results on several previous occasions?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had to apologize to the hon. Member for not giving an Answer on Monday night last, when the subject was brought before the House by him, pursuant to Notice; but his (Sir John Pakington's) attention had been engrossed by the Motion and speech of the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield (Major Anson). He could by no means accept the sort of argument by which the hon. Member concluded his question. Had he answered the hon. Gentleman's Question the other evening he could only have repeated what he had before stated—namely, that he should be throwing great discredit and a slur upon the whole British Army, were he to be induced, in consequence of one or two isolated acts of violence, to deprive the whole of the non-commissioned officers and privates of the ammunition with which they had hitherto been entrusted.

ARMY—HALE'S WAR ROCKETS.
QUESTION.

Mr. OTWAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has received a Letter dated the 21st of November, 1867, from Mr. Hale, the Inventor of the War Rockets adopted in Her Majesty's service, in which, among certain other charges, he accuses the Superintendent of the Royal Laboratory at Woolwich of having made alterations in the Rockets, which render them less efficient and more costly; and requesting the right hon. Gentleman to give him (Mr. Hale) an opportunity of substantiating these charges in the presence of the Superintendent of the Royal Laboratory; and, whether any

Reply has been given to this communication?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, the War Office had received a Letter from Mr. Hale, dated the 21st of November, 1867, which corresponded generally with the first part of the Question of the hon. Member, but which contained no request for an opportunity to be afforded him for substantiating the charges he had made against the Superintendent of the Royal Laboratory at Woolwich. What Mr. Hale said in the letter was that if he (Sir John Pakington) thought proper to call upon him, to substantiate his allegations, he was quite willing to do so. Mr. Hale had received the sum of £8,000 as compensation, and upon condition that the Crown should possess all rights over his invention; and in consideration of that payment, the Officer at the head of the Laboratory at Woolwich conceived he had a right to make such improvements in these rockets as would render them more serviceable. He (Sir John Pakington) had not heard that those alterations had rendered the rockets more costly and less efficient, and he did not believe it.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

NAVY—IRON-CLAD FLEET.

OBSERVATIONS.

CAPTAIN MACKINNON said, the great object he had in view in rising was to show the House various deficiencies and defects in several ships built by the present Controller. He would divide the subject into three heads:—First, an example of want of classification; secondly, improper and unscientific distribution of weight in certain vessels; thirdly, defects in fighting qualities, for attack and defence, of *Invincible* and her class. To prove clearly the causes of these deficiencies and defects he must allude to the difficulties that surrounded the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty when he took Office. At that time a new fleet was being created, of iron-clad ships, the designing of which was in the hands of men who, ignoring the experience of the past, had attempted to produce a new Navy on principles at variance with science and experience, and who had been conspicuous for the tenacity with which they had adhered to unsound principles of naval architecture. The Controller of the Navy, in evidence before the Turret Committee of 1865, said—"I have a very serious objection to the moveable turret system at all in a sea going ship." The Chief Constructor, before the same Committee, spoke "of the objections taken by himself to the practicability of constructing satisfactory sea-going turret-ships." Thus the Controller's Department was doubtful as to the practicability of constructing satisfactory sea-going turret-ships. But that satisfactory sea-going turret-ships might be produced was very clearly shown by models of a complete classified fleet of iron-clad sea-going turret-ships to be seen at the South Kensington Museum. To show what the country obtained from the Controller's Department, and what might be produced, he would give the comparative elements of the *Inconstant*, now building at Pembroke, and one of the turret-ships of Admiral Halsted's proposed system for future turret navies—the *Vidette*. The *Inconstant* was ordered on the plea that fast iron-clads of a reasonable size could not be produced. The design of the *Vidette* was an answer to this plea. She was armoured from end to end with a shot resistance equal to 9-inch plates, extending 3 feet above and 5 feet below the water line. The resistance of the turret was equal to 11 inches of armour. The *Inconstant's* sides were entirely unprotected. A single shot or shell would sink her. The *Vidette's* tonnage was 4,089, the *Inconstant's* 4,073; the complement of men for the former was 300, for the latter 600; the maximum speed for each was 15 knots; in the turret-ship there was stowage room for 1,000 tons of coal, in the broadside-vessel for 600 tons; draught of water aft—turret, 23 feet; broadside — 24 feet 6 inches; length of turret-ship, 337 feet 6 inches, of broadside, 333 feet; weight of metal thrown — turret, 1,050 lb.; broadside, 1,478 lb. The late Chief Constructor of the Navy, Mr. T. Watts, the designer of the *Achilles*, writing on this subject, said—

> "The results of the calculations on the *Vidette* are most satisfactory. You have in her a full-armoured turret-ship, differing but little in tonnage, length, and breadth from the *Inconstant*, a ship being built by the Admiralty, but not proposed to be armoured at all. And as regards speed, armament, and coal stowage, the *Vidette*, it can hardly be said, suffers in comparison. Under these circumstances, it can hardly be a

question which ship is best suited for the Navy in the present day, and more especially for the purpose for which the *Inconstant* class of vessel is being built—that is, protection of our commerce. Under these circumstances, why not offer to submit the design of the *Vidette* to the Admiralty, with a request that they will be pleased to build a ship with it?"

It was proposed to put 12-ton guns in the *Inconstant's* broadsides, which would be useless except in smooth water, as Admiral Warden reported that it was never desirable to cast loose even 6½-ton guns in a seaway. He was at a loss to know of what use the *Inconstant* would be if she could not fight her heavy guns in a seaway; and how it was that this country could not have sea-going turret-ships, when we were assured—on the authority of Mr. Watts, the late Chief Constructor and designer of the *Achilles*—that it could be done. He now had to notice the contradiction of his former statement by the Secretary to the Admiralty, and he would quote the following extract from the Report of Admiral Warden, which had only appeared within the past few days :—

> "Here, again, we have the *Achilles*, one of the first iron-clads built, distancing, in a run of 100 miles, occupying eight hours, some of the latest constructed ships—containing generally the most recent improvements, condenser, &c.—in a very remarkable manner. . . . It is to be borne in mind that while the engines of the *Achilles* develope only 5,700-horse power to drive 6,000 tons, those of the *Bellerophon, Lord Warden*, and *Lord Clyde* develope about 6,000 to drive 4,000 tons. It is a result, I think, calculated to give rise to very serious reflections."

It appeared from Admiral Warden's Report that the *Achilles* in the eight hours' trial, did 102½ miles, and the *Bellerophon* 89¼, the average speed of the *Achilles* being a little under thirteen knots an hour, and of the *Bellerophon* a fraction more than eleven knots an hour. He had three charges to make against the noble Lord the Secretary of the Admiralty. The first was that the noble Lord had improperly charged him on a former occasion with having made an exaggerated statement about these ships; the second was, certain observations said by the noble Lord to have been made by a gallant Admiral with reference to the iron fleet, which the gallant Admiral had fully denied; and, thirdly, indiscretion on the part of the noble Lord in publishing in that House a private letter he had received from Admiral Ryder from the squadron. Captain Coles had publicly stated that the reasons why the turret system was not adopted was because the Controller's Department determined not to adopt anything which did not originate with themselves. Certain matters had come to his knowledge which confirmed the belief that this was the case with Mr. Henwood's economic scheme for converting our wooden line-of-battle ships into sea-going *Monitors.* It could be proved that the reports of the Controller's Department on these plans were totally incorrect. This country, indeed, was in a dangerous condition as regarded its maritime defences. We were building ships, costing about £500,000, obsolete and useless for the increased and increasing size of modern artillery. The Board of Admiralty, it appeared, were guided solely by the opinions of the Controller's Department, who were committed to strong opinions against the practicability of building sea-going turret-ships. He could not help thinking that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty was in the position of Sinbad the sailor, who in doing a good-natured action got the Old Man of the Sea on his neck and shoulders who made him obey his orders. Sinbad was relieved by plucking grapes and squeezing them into calabashes, which, when fermented into wine, made the old man drunk and fall off Sinbad's shoulders; and his (Captain Mackinnon's) mission was metaphorically to supply the calabashes of wine to relieve Sinbad the sailor from the horrible *incubus* that was ruining our navy. In the Report of the Channel fleet for 1867, the Controller, speaking of the *Minotaur*, attributed her occasional heavy pitching to the weight of the armour at her bow, and to cure the heavy pitching of this ship he added more weight—namely, a forecastle weighing sixty to seventy tons, and considered that this heavy forecastle added to the extremity of the ship since she was designed was very valuable. One would have thought that adding more weight to the bow would have aggravated the evil complained of, rather than have lessened it; and he believed that a cadet passing his first examination for midshipman would be turned back by his examiners if he showed himself so ignorant of the effect produced by adding weight to the extremity of a vessel with fine lines. He would now turn to the serious defects of the *Invincible* class, six of which were proposed to be built. The ends of the central battery were protected only by four and five inch armour against a raking fire, and when engaged bow on they could, within an arc of sixty degrees, only bring one 300-pounder gun to bear against a converging fire of four 600-pounders of the competitive design by Messrs. Laird. The main deck outside the battery was only plated with iron 5-16ths of an inch thick, so that a single shot from a turret-ship with seven degrees of depression would easily penetrate the deck and pass through her boilers and sink her. This defect was pointed out by the Controller and Chief Constructor in their evidence on Captain Coles's turret-ship in 1865. The Controller said—

> "A shot may come in at the top of the armour on one side, and go right through and strike the armour on the opposite side; and we have every reason to believe, from experiments made, that it would drive the armour-plate off and might destroy the ship."

This proved the very defective character of vessels of the *Invincible* class. He therefore called on the Admiralty and on the House, in the name of the sailors of England, to stop this culpable folly, this dangerous blundering. It had been well said by a high authority that in some cases a blunder was worse than a crime, and the blunders in the case in point, jeopardizing as they did the lives of our sailors, the honour of our navy, and the safety of the country, amounted to an enormity which the definition "criminal" failed to describe. If persisted in they would lead to the disgrace of the navy of England and the humiliation of this great nation.

NAVY—IRON-CLAD FLEET.

RESOLUTION.

MR. SEELY, in rising to move That a Scientific Inquiry be instituted to take into consideration the leading characteristics that should be adopted in the future Construction of the Vessels of the Navy, said he did not ask the House to pronounce an opinion upon this question, but merely that they should inquire into the subject. During the last few years a great controversy had been going on with respect to the principles upon which our vessels should be constructed. It was an indisputable fact that £3,500,000 had been spent during the last five years on broadside iron-clads, and about £500,000 on turret-ships; and more was still to be spent, although the Admiralty by asking private builders to furnish designs for broadside-ships, admitted that it was still a doubtful question on what principle ships of war should be constructed. The right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for War (Sir John Pakington) in his speech on the Navy Estimates, in March, 1865, said that the turret principle was a great invention, and that Captain Coles was entitled to the gratitude of his country; and that the experiment ought to be tried in the best possible manner; and the present First Lord (Mr. Corry), whose absence through illness would doubtless be admirably supplied by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Henry Lennox), said in 1866, that in the present state of uncertainty as to the principles on which our ships of war should be built he did not think they ought to embark largely in the construction of ships during that year. The amount asked for by the Government for iron-clads this year was £700,000, of which £135,000 was to be devoted to turret-ships, and £565,000 to broadsides. But why such haste to build ships of doubtful utility, when we had resolved on non-intervention, and were in no fear of attack? Why, then, not take breathing-time? He asked the Admiralty to pause before spending vast sums of money on ships which after all might prove utter failures. The United States were selling their ships of war, and had not commenced building any more. But if they were resolved to build, let them at least build ships respecting which there was no controversy. He referred to the vessels for coast defence. It would be far better to spend in protecting our coasts and harbours than in increasing the number of our cruizing vessels. About seven years ago the Defence Commission advocated vessels for coast defence rather than large cruizing ships of the broadside class. The Admiralty had declared they were bound to build experimental sea-going vessels, but the defects of those they had in hand were well known, and had not been exaggerated by the hon. and gallant Member for Rye (Captain Mackinnon). They were undoubtedly weakly armed against guns of the present day, and it was a question whether fleet vessels should not be preferred, at least while uncertainty prevailed, to armour-plated ships. Sponsons, he contended, would cause rolling, and were unnecessary, because the Chief Constructor had admitted that an end-on fire could be obtained another way. No doubt the sponsons would be soon dispensed with. The hon. and gallant Member had remarked upon the *Invincible* class of vessels, and had described how a plunging shot would penetrate their boilers. On this point he would read the evidence of the Controller before the Turret-ship Committee in 1866. The Controller said—

> "In the *Bellerophon*, and in all our ships we are now constructing, we stop the armour short of the extremities of the ship, and, in order to prevent a raking fire destroying you, we put armour-plated bulkheads across the ship. I think, if that is the box principle, it is the best principle which can be acted upon."

But it was rather singular that in 1865 the Controller objected to Captain Coles's design in competition with the *Pallas*, "on account," said the Controller, "of the unplated ends of the ship being a source of danger, and incapacitating her from being really a man-of-war." More than four years ago an American Admiral, Reporting Secretary, American Navy, said—

> "The efficiency or intrinsic worth of an iron-clad intended for the ocean or for coast purposes is to be estimated according to her strength throughout every part of her hull, &c."

Now, it was a fact that the firm at present building one vessel of the *Invincible* class had condemned the principle as strongly as it could be condemned. How, then, was their construction justified? The First Lord of the Admiralty had said that experienced naval officers were opposed to the turret principle for sea-going vessels. Would the noble Lord condescend to say who those experienced naval officers were? The hon. Baronet the Member for Stamford (Sir John Hay) who sat next to the noble Lord the Secretary for the Admiralty, was, he believed, in favour of the turret principle. Admiral Austin, Admiral Elder, and Captain Burnet were all in favour of that principle, and so might Admirals Yelverton and Warden be said to be, judging from their Report. He remembered also among its supporters the late Mr. Cobden, as well as the hon. Member for Tavistock (Mr. Samuda), the Messrs. Napper, and some of the most eminent shipbuilders in the country. And what was it that the Admiralty had to oppose to such a weight of authority. Why, the simple assertion that they would not try the experiment, and the experience of some naval officers with whose names the House was unacquainted. Public opinion, in short, approved the turret principle, and against it was arrayed merely the authority of the Constructive Department of the Admiralty. Under these circumstances, the House had a right to examine into what had been done by that Department, and to pass in review the vessels which they had built. The present Chief Constructor proposed, in 1862-3, to build shorter and smaller vessels than those which were being constructed when he came into Office. There were three such vessels constructed. The first was the *Research*, the designs for which, as well as for that of the sister ship, the *Enterprize*, were submitted to the late Constructor-in-Chief, Mr. Watts, who reported against them; notwithstanding which the Admiralty determined to build them, and in consequence three of the officers resigned their positions. The *Research*, having been built, was condemned by Admiral Dacres. Surely, then, the House could hardly fail to be of opinion that Mr. Watts was justified in reporting against the design. In 1866 the vessel had been much improved, but even then it was reported that she was not safe to go to sea in. How far, then, he should like to know, did the *Research* carry out the promise of the present Chief Constructor that he would build short, small ships equal in all the good qualities required in sea-going vessels to those which were being constructed? Then, as to the *Pallas*, she was designed without an upper deck, and without a plough-bow, and was meant to be of extreme speed; but Admiral Yelverton, in his Report of 1866, stated that she had only obtained a full speed of 11·9 knots, her speed being placed by Admiral Warden in 1867 at 11·55 knots. He would next say a few words with regard to the *Bellerophon*, which the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty had a few nights before described as the best ship in the navy. If that were so, it was somewhat singular, he thought, that no other ship like her had been built. She was designed with no upper deck. An upper deck had been added to her, and not only had that been done at considerable expense, but he was informed that she now drew, when fully laden, 13 inches more water than was first designed. The *Achilles* could take in coals sufficient to propel her at full speed for 1,960 knots; the *Bellerophon* for only 778 knots. The noble Lord, however, had laid some stress upon the fact that upon her six hours' trial she had attained a speed of fourteen knots, but it should be borne in mind that she had been tried under circumstances very favourable for a vessel of her form. She had the tide with her the whole way. The next class of vessels to which he directed the attention of the House was what was called the corvette or *Amazon* class, which were said to have been built for speed, but did not realize what was anticipated from them. They were partly rams. Nine of them were designed by the Chief Constructor, and one came in collision with another vessel and both went down, though fortunately, no lives were lost. The next ship to which he would call attention was the *Achilles,* which was built with what were termed recess ports, which were condemned by Brazilian officers as a source of danger. The *Achilles* was designed before the present Constructor came into office, but she was altered by that officer from three masts to four masts. She was subsequently restored to three masts, and Admiral Warden, in his Report of 1867, stated that the *Achilles* beat the *Minotaur,* and that he attributed her superiority to being altered from four masts to three. He was informed that to alter these ships to their original state would cost £15,000 for each vessel. Three heavy armour gunboats were designed by the Chief Constructor—the *Vixen,* the *Viper,* and the *Waterwitch.* The hon. Member for Rye (Captain Mackinnon) had furnished him with reports with regard to the first. Captain Brett, in reporting of her first voyage, said she worked heavily, and her rolling from stem to stern, was such as to place her in the greatest peril. He had no hesitation in saying the ship was a mistake. She was positively unsafe to handle on the high sea ; and at present she was noted as unseaworthy. The sister ship, the *Vixen,* when ordered to make her first voyage from Portsmouth to Plymouth, proved equally unseaworthy. These three ships, which were complete failures, cost the country upwards of £200,000. When the Admiralty were asked to build turret-ships, all they answered was that they would not try experiments, but must rely on their Constructive Department. That was a sound rule under ordinary circumstances, but there were special cases in which it would be wise to depart from it. As for the statement that the Admiralty would not indulge in experiments, what had all these vessels been from first to last but a series of experiments, various alterations having been made in them at different times? Upper decks had been added, plough-bows filled up, recessed ports removed, and sponsons added — probably in their turn to follow the recessed ports. The large amount of money expended in shipbuilding had lamentably failed in producing satisfactory results. The Controller of the Navy had stated that the day of battle must be the proof of the true merits of the ships. Now Admiral Warden's opinion was to the effect that the practice of the broadside-ships had been wild in the extreme ; there was not the slightest probability of hitting an enemy's ship except by accident. Would a turret-ship of equal size have acquitted herself better? There were several considerations, in the Admiral's opinion, that led him to answer that question in the affirmative. Admiral Yelverton, in his Report of the Channel squadron, said on one occasion during a cruize the armour-clad vessels were unable to fire their guns, and that the turret system of arming a ship had been tried on that occasion. A single turret-ship would have done the Channel fleet serious injury. Indeed, she might have taken them in detail and sunk or captured every one of them unless the mode of defence suggested by the noble Lord of cutting and running had been adopted. Admiral Robinson said that two heavy guns of a turret-ship with their all-round fire formed a most powerful weapon of offence ; and although he added that that could only be secured in the *Monitor* class of ships, that remained to be proved. It might be the opinion of the Controller and of the Chief Constructor of the Navy. But they had this fact, that a turret-ship placed broadside with an ordinary armour-plated vessel would sink her in a very short time. Therefore, the only question was whether a turret cruizing ship could be built. In favour of its possibility they had the opinion of Captain Sherard Osborne, of Mr. Samuda, and of the Messrs. Napper the builders, and they had also the express authority of the late Chief Constructor of the Navy, Mr. Watts. There was a mass of authority in favour of the turret principle. He hoped that, in answer to these facts, the noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox) would give something more than mere generalities. He might be told hon. Members were not fit to deal with technical questions, which they did not understand practically. The Board of Admiralty said they themselves were not competent to deal with such questions, and must refer them to the Constructive Department. But the Constructive Department had made serious blunders, and the opinions of the Controller and Constructor should not weigh against the mass of evidence to which he had referred. Besides though it might be true that the House was not fit to deal with technical questions yet there were certain points of this case where even common sense was of some use. The noble Lord would not deny that a ship-of-war ought to be able to fire her guns; and common sense told them that guns carried in the centre could be fired more evenly than guns carried on the broadside. Another principle was that guns ought to hit; and common sense told them that the guns were more likely to hit when the ship that carried them did not roll than when she did. Another principle was that a ship ought to present as small a target as possible; and common sense told them that a turret-ship would present a smaller target than a broadside. Then it was desirable to plate a ship as heavily as possible in order to keep out the shells; and common sense told them that the side of a ship six feet out of the water could be more heavily plated than the side of one that was twelve feet out of the water. It was most desirable that the men fighting the guns should be protected; and it was plain that the men could be better protected in a turret than in a broadside-ship. A broadside-ship was constantly in the face of the enemy, whereas the turret-ship, being always on the move, only presented her porthole to the enemy in time to fire the shot. There was another advantage, which had been mentioned by Admiral Gordon. It was admitted that they could build a turret-ship at far less cost with the same power. It was, therefore, extremely desirable to inquire into this question. The answer to all this was that the Admiralty did not like the inquiry, and we should have confidence in them. Now, the Board of Admiralty consisted undoubtedly of very clever men. The First Lord was a very clever man; the Second Lord was very clever; individually all the members of the Board were extremely clever; but the question was how the six clever units acted as a Board. Had they displayed such judgment and forethought that strong reliance must be placed in them for the future? He had a right to refer to the past doings of the Admiralty. They had gone on building sailing ships when steam-ships were required. They began to build steam vessels when it was known we must have our ships armoured. The Admiralty persisted for a long time in spending money in building unarmoured ships, and within the last few years they had been attempting to dispose of them. Some of those obsolete ships which had been built within the last ten or fifteen years, in defiance of the warnings given, cost from, first to last, perhaps, £150,000, and they were sold for less than £10,000. He did not want a similar folly to be again perpetrated. Turret-ships would be the ships of the future. Therefore he asked the House for inquiry on this subject, which was a most important one. He trusted that the Admiralty would consent to this question being inquired into by some tribunal composed of men who possessed the greatest knowledge upon the subject, and in whom the House and the country would place entire confidence. He begged to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

MR. SAMUDA seconded the Motion. He thought that the question ought to be made the subject of a scientific inquiry. He wished to guard against it being supposed that he desired in any way to obstruct the proceedings of the Admiralty, or to find fault with the course they had adopted; but it appeared to him that this great subject was one of the highest national importance, and ought to be regarded from a point of view far beyond that which was likely to be taken of it within the precincts of a mere Department of the State. When a great policy had been inaugurated, he could well understand that a Department of the State might efficiently carry it out; but it was unlikely that such a policy could be initiated by a Government Department. The State, by appointing a Commission of Inquiry, could obtain the assistance of men of the greatest ability, experience, and knowledge in the kingdom, who would freely give evidence upon the question about to be inquired into; whereas if the inquiry were placed in the hands of a Department, it would be sure to languish, because if the highest authority upon the question were converted into an official, he would soon become unfitted for taking a broad view of it. It was clear that little or no progress had been made with regard to this question of armour-clad vessels since it had first come before the Admiralty, and therefore it was of great importance that fresh minds and fresh modes of thought should be brought to bear upon the subject. He regretted the absence of the First Lord of the Admiralty on this occasion; but he would remind the noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox), who would probably reply, that his right hon. Friend (Mr. Corry), when Secretary to the Admiralty in 1846, attempted to develop the screw fleet, he found the greatest difficulty in carrying out his plans in consequence of the opposition of the officials of his own Department; and it was owing to his right hon. Friend's foresight and perseverance that they obtained that screw fleet several years before they would have obtained it in the ordinary way. He might add, with regard to the turret system, that the highest authority on naval architecture the world had seen during the present century—the late Mr. Oliver Lang—had given it as his strong opinion that that system which the Admiralty had rejected was in every respect better than the broadside system which they had adopted. But the Admiralty were still pursuing the same course, though they showed their dissatisfaction with their system by continually changing their types of vessels, until they had now eight different types of armour-clad vessels, of 2,000 tons and upwards, which had been introduced since the time of the re-organization of that Department—a period of about eight years. Besides this there were several different descriptions of unarmoured vessels. He thought that this fact alone went far to prove the necessity that existed for a full scientific inquiry being instituted into the subject, because if the Admiralty had been satisfied with their work they would have adhered to it. The Controller of the Navy was an officer of very high standing as a naval officer, and he had expressed a deliberate opinion that the head of a vessel should be protected especially from plunging shot, but not a single vessel that had been built possessed that peculiar description of defence. Nothing, in his opinion, could be a more fatal mistake than to put a central armed and protected box into a vessel and to leave the remaining two-thirds of the vessel unprotected. It was evident that the Admiralty did not see their way to securing the two essentials of speed and complete protection at the same time. But he contended that the speed of the vessel could be maintained to a great extent even though it was completely armour-plated at the ends as well as at the sides. He urged this upon the Government, because they were in danger of allowing a foregone conclusion to override the fact. He believed that all they desired could be accomplished without increasing the size of a vessel beyond what was desirable. He believed that if the House would only boldly strike out a policy for itself, we should have vessels which could keep out any shell that had ever yet been fired. The Admiralty appeared to doubt this, because they had been told by the artillerists that shell would go through any armour that had ever yet been produced. But that was not the fact, because in no case hitherto—and he had carefully watched the experiments that had been made—had any shell gone through 6-inch armour and then acted as shell. It was perfectly true that shells had gone through that thickness of armour, but they had gone through as shot, making a round hole, and they had broken in the passage, and had in no case gone through in their entirety and burst subsequently as a shell ought to burst, from the effects of the powder carried within them, scattering death and destruction all around. The result of such an inquiry as that advocated by the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely) would, he believed, be perfectly successful, and do much towards putting an end to the vacillating policy by which, in the absence of sound and broad principles, the Admiralty had hitherto been guided.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a scientific inquiry be instituted, to take into consideration the leading characteristics that should be adopted in the future construction of the vessels of the Navy,"—(*Mr. Seely,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. GOLDNEY said, he must deprecate the practice of bringing forward desultory Motions—he did not mean to include the present under that title—on going into Supply, when those Motions could be as well and more advantageously discussed in Committee, without delaying the progress of Business and protracting the Session. The present Motion, for instance, would naturally enough have arisen when Vote 10 came to be taken. Since he had entered that House the Naval Estimates had been doubled, the Army Estimates trebled, and the Civil Service Estimates quadrupled, and the House could get no satisfaction on the subject beyond general statements. When so much yet remained to be done, he thought hon. Members might well restrict themselves to Motions which could not be made in Committee, in order that the House might have an opportunity of getting to the real Business before it. The result of the present practice was that large sums of money were voted after midnight in very small Houses, and amid pretty general slumber. Hon. Members were continually professing to their constituents a desire to effect a reduction in the public expenditure of this country; but it was impossible for those who, like himself, were not skilled in all the details connected with the Service to move reductions, when the Motions which would show such reductions were advisable were made without any practical connection with particular Votes.

MR. GRAVES said, he thought the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely) was to be congratulated on having secured so favourable an opportunity for a Motion of so much importance. No doubt this question might have been considered when the Vote to which it had reference came before them, but he must remark that the result of the course advocated by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down would probably have been to prevent this discussion coming on before midnight. He regretted that the hon. Member for Lincoln had not stated whether the Inquiry which he advocated was to take the place of the Estimates which were to be voted that night, or whether it was to be instituted after those Estimates had been passed. With regard to the Motion itself, no one admitted more thoroughly than he did the existence of the defects in the navy to which the hon. Gentleman had alluded. But he had always believed that the Admiralty lacked practical rather than scientific knowledge. He feared, therefore, that the Inquiry recommended by the hon. Gentleman would have the effect, if limited to a "Scientific Inquiry," of making confusion worse confounded; because the Admiralty could not but regard the appointment of a Commission for that purpose as evincing a want of confidence in its own Constructive Department. The result, he feared, would be seriously to weaken a responsibility which rather required strengthening. Now, from time to time, Motions were made for the purpose of showing that the expenditure of our public money did not lead to results which were satisfactory. The vessel which had been so prominently alluded to, the *Bellerophon,* was a vessel of no mean character. She was unusually handy at sea, but here unfortunately ended her superiority. He judged from the Reports that she was more unsteady in heavy weather than many vessels of her class, but in moderate weather she exhibited greater comparative steadiness. Since her first trial she had materially declined both in speed and power, though it was but fair to say that she had on a late occasion yielded results equal to those attained on her trial. The *Hercules* be believed to be an improvement on the *Bellerophon.* The *Monarch,* her sister vessel, was a turret, but a spoilt turret, and could not be said fairly to represent the class, because she had a wall side which would catch every shot and shell that the merest tyro might fire at her. She had, in fact, all the disadvantages of a broadside. He had examined the construction of the *Invincible* class, and had come to the conclusion that it was the duty of the House when in Committee on the Vote for shipbuilding to prevent any more vessels of that class from being constructed. He believed no inquiry was wanted respecting them. As they rolled ten to fifteen degrees, the enemy's shot must strike their decks, which were only defended by iron plates five-eighths of an inch thick. He would much prefer turret-vessels to them. The amount of doubt in the minds of the Admiralty on the subject was shown by the diversity of model and design at present in favour. Eight different classes had been mentioned; he wished he could have described them as eight successes; but the fact was that, while the country was feeling its way respecting turret-vessels, the Admiralty was wildly experimenting and building ships on principles not based on experience but upon hypothesis. *Monarchs, Plovers,* and *Invincibles* had all been laid down without experiment. But the *Captain,* a turret-ship built under the force of opinion in the House, would prove a formidable addition to the navy. There were fanciful views at the Admiralty which should be ignored, in view of the more practical course taken by other countries. When he examined the *Captain* he saw three vessels of the turret class beside her being constructed for the Dutch Navy, and the captains of those vessels expressed themselves in very unfavourable terms of the way in which we rejected the turret principle for smaller ships. The *Invincible* class had a double screw, but it was not known whether a double screw would answer with 20-feet draught. Officers of the Dutch Navy had told him that they had a vessel of 2,000 tons and 18-feet draught, but although they could get 12 knots out of her with steam they could only get 2½ under a stiff breeze. Then, if one screw were injured, the ship would only turn one way, and this in itself was sufficient to condemn the principle. In regard to the *Penelope*, he had heard from a distinguished officer that her defects were so great that he had been asked to report upon them immediately to the Admiralty. Surely that was a reason why they should not go on building others of that class. The hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely) had asked why we were building ships at all. The answer, however, to that question, was very simple—we did so because other nations were doing it; and one country in particular, not far distant from our shores, had more iron-clads afloat or in course of construction than we had. Another point which was in danger of being lost sight of was the lamentable deficiency in means of coaling. Our iron-clads could not carry sufficient fuel to steam to Halifax. There was not one which could carry more than would suffice for four days' steaming at full speed. 200 tons of coal on board would be of immense value to a ship under some circumstances—of more value even than armour. It was questionable whether we were not trying to combine too much in one vessel; and he much doubted whether 12-inch armour was compatible with speed. He concluded from Returns which had been supplied him from a source calculated to inspire confidence, that the vessels of the French Navy beat ours in maintaining speed. If then the Committee moved for were appointed he hoped some really practical men would be nominated to serve on it—such men, for instance, as the chief engineers of the Cunard line, the Royal Mail, the Inman, and other lines—that the doubt as to whether the engines of the navy were inferior to those of the ordinary steam-packet might be set at rest. But the whole question of Admiralty organization should be put upon its trial; and he submitted whether it would not be wise to set up some permanent Committee of the ablest men at command to be constantly in consultation, and to stand between the Board and its Constructive Departments. He hoped that next year the question would be taken up in such a manner that some practical good would result.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, inquiry had been attended with the most beneficial results in other Departments, and there was reason to believe that in that of naval construction its results would be equally satisfactory. He thought the hands of the Admiralty would be strengthened rather than

otherwise by an inquiry which would elicit the opinions of scientific and practical men. He differed entirely from his hon. Friend the Member for Tavistock (Mr. Samuda) on the subject of penetration of iron plates by shell. He believed that on a recent occasion plates of eight inches thick had been penetrated by shells, which burst inside. He wished to know, he might add, why the Letter of Admiral Warden, dated the 3rd of December last, was not presented with the Papers which had been laid on the table of the House on the 5th of March, and had only been delivered to Members last week?

Mr. M'LAREN said, that the Admiralty seemed always in the position of the mole underground, blind to what was passing around them. They built one class of ships after another that were immediately found not to be wanted. They ought not, in his opinion, to be intrusted with this irresponsible power. Remarkable circumstances had been brought out by the Committee now sitting, of which he had the honour to be a member. It appeared that ships built at an expense of £150,000 had in a few years been sold for £10,000. A condition of sale was that the copper sheathing and copper bolts and iron should be brought back to the Admiralty, and purchased at a price which was often found to be very much larger than the whole amount produced by the sale of the ship, so that they actually made a present of the ship to the purchaser and gave him a sum of money besides. He (Mr. M'Laren) had asked one of the witnesses before the Committee respecting a ship thus sold at Bermuda, and obtained an answer to the effect that it would have been more profitable, commercially speaking, to have burnt the ship on the beach, for the metals would have remained, and cost nothing; though as there were no tides at Bermuda, this might have been a difficult operation. And though all other establishments in the world could keep their stores from being stolen, it appeared that the Admiralty could not. It was asked if the Admiralty did not pay about £22,000 a year for police watching the dockyards, which was admitted; but still they were afraid of the thieves.

Mr. LIDDELL; I rise to Order. Is it usual, Sir, to comment in this House on the proceedings of a Select Committee before that Committee has reported?

Mr. SPEAKER: If a Committee has not reported it is out of Order to comment in this House upon the evidence taken before it.

MR. M'LAREN said, under those circumstances, he would content himself with saying that all he had heard showed that the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely) did a very wise thing to move for this Inquiry. He should cordially support the hon. Member's Motion.

MR. LAIRD said, that the question was whether they were to continue building broadside-ships, or go on with the construction of turret-vessels. He had long since come to the conclusion that it was a mistake to build broadside-ships, and his opinion was more than verified by the Reports of Admiral Warden and Admiral Yelverton in reference to the Channel Fleet. Turret-ships had proved successful as sea-going vessels, and as the Admiralty possessed sufficient means for judging which was the best turret-ship to build, he saw no utility in the appointment of a Royal Commission of Inquiry, which might take a long time to arrive at a decision. He would rather that the House should pronounce a decided opinion that the construction of broadside-ships, which had proved to be of no value whatever in a gale of wind, should be abandoned for the purpose of providing the country with some turret-ships.

MR. CANDLISH said, he hoped the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty would not resist the Motion of his hon. Friend, which was conceived in no spirit of hostility to the Board of Admiralty. The Board could not be supposed to be possessed of all knowledge as to the best principles of construction for our ships-of-war. There might be outside the Admiralty much ability and scientific knowledge, which a country like England ought to avail itself of.

MR. LIDDELL said, he must beg, as a Member of the Select Committee, to express views quite in opposition to those of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren). It would appear from the remarks of the hon. Member that his impression from what occurred before the Committee was, that the Board of Admiralty was a Department absolutely unfitted to be entrusted with responsibility. [Mr. M'LAREN: Not quite so far as that.] The impression made upon his (Mr. Liddell's) mind by the inquiry of the Committee was that they had in the office of the Controller of the Navy a most conscientious man, thoroughly capable of performing the duties of that position, as alive as any naval reformer in that House to the requirements of the country, and as anxious as any public servant could be to correct errors of administration, and to provide England with the best possible navy. The Constructor of the Navy was also a man of great ability, with an experience of naval architecture possessed by few men in this country, and entitled thereby to the confidence of the public. With regard to the Motion before the House, he admitted there was a great deal of weight in some of the arguments adduced in favour of bringing to bear on discussions that might arise from time to time whatever talent existed outside the Admiralty; but there would be this great difficulty in opening their doors to a council of advice, that the Admiralty would be beset by inventors of every description pressing their schemes upon them. The Admiralty was responsible to the House for constructing the best ships, and he would remind the House that although they had not adopted any distinct plan with regard to any particular class of ships, they had been hurried forward in the construction of vessels by external pressure, by that desperate race of competition in defences which had been pressed upon them by the progress made by foreign nations. With regard to shipbuilding, England could not allow herself to be outstripped in that respect, and he suggested that the Foreign Office ought first to be put in motion to see if some attempt could not be made to induce foreign nations to come to an understanding to suspend this tremendously rapid progress of shipbuilding until something like a fixed principle of construction could be arrived at. So long as the present competition went on the Admiralty could not suspend shipbuilding in our yards. A vast amount of misapprehension existed both in the public mind and in that House with reference to turret-ships. Within the last few hours he had been informed by the highest authority that no thoroughly sea-going turret-ship had been constructed either in this or any other country to which reference had been made. Turret-ships were of inestimable value for harbour defence, and two sea-going vessels of this form were actually now in process of completion. Surely then it would be well to suspend our judgment until a fair trial of them had been made; but it was only fair that, as an independent Member of a Committee upstairs, when charges were made against Admiralty administration, he should state the impression which had been made in his mind in the investigation that was going on, and he hoped the House would not be too hasty in adopting the views of the hon. Member for Lincoln. Shipbuilding and the best models for fighting ships were very difficult questions, but England could not afford, and never ought to allow herself, to be left behind in the general race.

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, he thought that at this period of the debate it would be well that he should state the views which Government held on the subject of the proposal which had emanated from the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely), and also give some answer, as far as he was able, to the various objections which had been raised against the policy of the present and preceding Boards of Admiralty, and also against the classes of ships which they had built. He had to thank the hon. Member for Cashel (Mr. O'Beirne) for giving him an opportunity of explaining a matter connected with the printed Papers. The hon. and gallant Officer (Captain Mackinnon) had used epithets which he believed the sailors of the navy would be the first to discountenance and regret, considering that the charge of wilful suppression rested on the First Lord, on himself, and his hon. and gallant Colleagues. If it had not been for the hon. Member for Cashel he would have passed by in silence the uncourteous attack that had been made upon the Department to which he had the honour of belonging. The original Return of the Report of Admiral Warden was numbered 128, and ordered on the 5th of March. It was supposed to contain and did contain the despatch of the gallant Admiral, the remarks of the Controller of the Navy, Admiral Warden's abstract with diagrams of trials alluded to in the Report of December 3rd. The Return took some time in printing, in consequence of the unusual pressure on the Parliamentary printers. It was not till the 4th of May that it was printed and delivered, and then in an incomplete form. The first document was omitted, but the Report on it and the abstract were printed. There could be nothing wilful in the suppression of the despatch, for the Controller of the Navy in his Report gave nearly the whole substance of it to the House. Four days after, on the 8th of May, Admiral Robinson the Controller of the Navy, finding the Paper had been printed and delivered in an incomplete state, came over to the Admiralty and pointed out to him that the Report had been left out, and thereupon he made a Minute dated the same day, using these words—

> "This Report of Admiral Warden was accidentally omitted from Return No. 128, and should be added to it. H. G. L."

As no fresh Motion was necessary for its production it was made to bear the same No. 128 as the Return, of which it originally formed part. On the 20th of May the copy was sent to Messrs. Hansard, and it was the 10th of June before the first proof was received; this delay being owing to the plans. On the 13th of June, three days afterwards, the Report was returned to Messrs. Hansard, and on the 25th of June the revise was received; on the 7th of July it was issued to Members. The great delay that had occurred was owing to the increased demands upon the printer and the great labour involved in the production of Returns which contained the plans and diagrams in question. The gallant officer the Member for Rye (Captain Mackinnon), not content with making this charge against the Admiralty of suppressing a despatch, the greater part of which was given by the Controller in his Report, made a personal charge against him, and he must say he regretted extremely that after thinking it right to indulge in the language he used he did not wait to learn what answer he would make. In the remarks he had made on the *Bellerophon* that gallant officer said he (Lord Henry Lennox) had been guilty of gross inaccuracy, and that his statement was the correct one. He (Lord Henry Lennox) had to reply that the statements he had made with reference to the *Bellerophon* were correct in every particular; and those statements were endorsed in the most exact manner. If the gallant officer would only do him the favour to wait a very few days, an interesting document would be laid on the table from those Admirals who had been consulted, which would prove that his statements were quite correct. There was another charge made against him. If he had known that the statement of Admiral Ryder as to the qualities of the *Bellerophon* was part of a private letter he should not have read it to the House without having first obtained the consent of that gallant Admiral to his doing so. The House would remember that he was not aware until the night before, that in consequence of his right hon. Friend's (the First Lord of the Admiralty's) illness, he should have to move the Naval Estimates. He had in consequence been compelled to go hurriedly through a vast mass of Papers, and he had not time to do more than to cull from them what he thought were the most striking points to lay before the Committee. It was in consequence of this haste that he had been led to read the extract in question, which otherwise he should not have made public until the gallant Admiral had repeated his statement in the Report, which was subsequently published. He was the more anxious to state that fact because it appeared that some good persons out-of-doors had taken into their heads the extraordinary notion that by reading that extract he had implied that Admiral Ryder was opposed to all turret-ships, and had faith in the broadside system only. Their minds must be strangely constituted, for it so happened that the speech he had made on that occasion was the only one which had been made of recent times in which the turret system had not been alluded to. What Admiral Ryder intended by his statement was that the *Bellerophon* was a most powerful and admirable armour-clad ship of war, and to that opinion he still adhered. These were the three charges which the hon. and gallant Gentleman had brought against him. With reference to the charges that he or his Colleagues had wilfully suppressed the despatch, he need only refer to his career since he had entered that House to convince hon. Members that it was impossible that he could have been guilty of being a party to such a proceeding. The hon. Member had attributed not only the worst, but the most stupid motives to him with reference to the accident that had occurred with respect to this despatch. He did not think it worth while to reply to such a charge, but he could not help saying that when the hon. and gallant Member used the word "suppressed," he had gone beyond all proper decorum of that House. He turned with the greatest pleasure from the remarks of the hon. and gallant Member to those of the other distinguished authorities who addressed the Committee that evening upon naval matters. There was not a single word which had fallen from the hon. Members for Tavistock, Lincoln, Liverpool, and Birkenhead to which he as the organ of the Admiralty in that House could take the least exception, although he had listened with the greatest attention and interest to their remarks. The hon. Member for Tavistock (Mr. Samuda) had made it matter of complaint against the Admiralty that they had now afloat so many different types of vessels. But surely the hon. Member would not say that in this age of continual advance in science the Admiralty were to adopt one fixed and unchangeable type of vessel, even though some years ago it might have been the most powerful known? A ship that was built to-day upon the most scientific principles would become obsolete in a few years, and it was, therefore, no fault on the part of the Admiralty that they had endeavoured to keep pace with the advance of scientific knowledge by making improvements in the type of the vessels they were building. He would pass by the speeches of the hon. Gentlemen the Members for Liverpool and Birkenhead, because he thought they could be more conveniently answered in his reply to the hon. Member for Lincoln. He took it generally that the hon. Members for Liverpool (Mr. Graves) and Birkenhead (Mr. Laird) were in favour of turret-ships. The former, however, expressed a high opinion of the *Bellerophon* and of the *Hercules*, while the hon. Member for Birkenhead anticipated nothing but evil from them. The hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely) took very much the same line, and he would now address himself to the observations of that hon. Member. In the first place, the tone of the hon. Member's remarks was most agreeable to him as the representative of the Admiralty. From what the hon. Member had said he deduced the fact that his constant intercourse with Admiral Robinson during the time he presided over the Committee, had produced in his mind the conviction that Admiral Robinson was one of the most conscientious, painstaking, and energetic of our public servants. The hon. Member in the first place objected to the *Minotaur* class having five masts; but that rigging had been given them by the recommendation of a Committee of naval officers, consisting of Admiral Schomberg, Captain Mends, and Captain Hall, Superintendent of the Sheerness Dockyard. If the hon Member had taken the trouble to inquire he would have found that he (Lord Henry Lennox) had not to defend the present but a former Board of Admiralty with respect to them. With reference to the *Achilles*, her four masts were not given her by the advice or the wish of the Controller of the Navy. The hon. Member had then proceeded to draw a graphic picture of the horrors of going to sea in Her Majesty's gunboat *Vixen*. She was certainly not a popular vessel in the service; but of her sister ship, the *Viper*, her commander had reported more favourably. It should, however, be recollected that these vessels were built for a particular purpose; they were intended to be very small, of very light draft of water, to be heavily armour-plated, and to carry the most powerful guns. It was impossible that ships built under such conditions could be very comfortable sea-going vessels, although he believed they had been found perfectly efficient for the purposes for which they were intended. The hon. Member next observed that we had not got an iron-clad fit for anything—that not one of them was fit for ocean work. On the contrary, however, it was a fact that we possessed iron-clads, of not the most favourable type, which had done and were doing ocean work in an admirable manner. The converted ship *Ocean*, an iron-clad of an old-fashioned type, had met with the most terrific weather on her journey, being caught in a cyclone of the greatest violence, and yet had behaved admirably, and had performed important services in distant seas. The hon. Gentleman further objected to what he called the vacillation and the uncertainty of the Constructive Department, and had pointed to three ships—the *Research*, the *Pallas*, and the *Bellerophon*—as having undergone extensive alterations since they were originally laid down. The *Research* was the first of the converted ships, and was the first attempt to build a small iron-clad with a low deck, which rendered her liable to ship great quantities of water. She was built at the time when turret-ships were coming into vogue, one of the main points of which was the low deck, and the Constructor of the Navy built her with a low deck in order that if she did not answer she might be economically converted into a turret-ship. The *Pallas* was not then finished, but was in the hands of the builders. He was sure it was unnecessary for him to point out that it was by no means an unusual course, after a new ship had been in commission and was brought home, to make alterations; and the alterations made in the *Pallas* and the *Research* were not more extensive or more expensive than those usually made. The alterations in the *Bellerophon* were little more than alterations on paper. In answer to another point referred to by the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely), he could assure the hon. Member that it was through no want of confidence in the Constructive Department that his right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty issued the circular inviting private shipbuilding firms to send in designs. The reason of their doing so was that so much had been said of the superiority of the designs of private builders over those of the Admiralty that the Admiralty were desirous of testing the point. They were anxious to see whether there was anything in the private trade which could add to the efficiency of the ships of the Royal Navy. The hon. Gentleman had also alluded to what he alleged was the failure of the *Amazon* class. But the hon. Gentleman was in error on that point, for the two sloops of that class, which were either leaving or had left for foreign stations, had fully realized the expectations which the Lords of the Admiralty had entertained of them. Again the hon. Gentleman had asked, "If the Secretary to the Admiralty avers the *Bellerophon* to be perfection, why are not more *Bellerophons* built?" The speech of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves) supplied the answer. He must remind the hon. Gentleman that he had never stated that the *Bellerophon* was the perfection of a ship-of-war. What he had stated was that she was an excellent vessel; but the fact was that in the *Hercules* we had the same class of ship improved. The *Hercules* was an improved *Bellerophon*, and when she went to sea, which would be before long, the hon. Gentleman would, he believed, fully acknowledge that she was a most efficient ship. He now came to the Motion of the hon. Member for Lincoln—

> "That a Committee of scientific men be appointed to take into consideration the leading characteristics that should be adopted in the future construction of the Vessels of the Navy."

There were several reasons why he hoped the hon. Member would not press his Motion to a division. Two hon. Members on that side of the House had pointed out that the effect of granting such an inquiry as that for which the hon. Gentleman asked would be to diminish the Parliamentary responsibility of the Board of Admiralty; because if such a Commission were composed of gentlemen out-of-doors who were not Members of that House their Report would be binding on the Admiralty, who would consequently come there, not to defend their own ships, not to defend their own policy, not to defend the acts of their Constructor or Controller, but simply to say they had carried out the recommendations contained in the Report of the Commission. But another reason against this Motion was that the present was an exceedingly bad time for arriving at a decision on this subject. He might also point out to the hon. Gentleman the difficulty attending the appointment of a Commission which would carry out the objects which he desired, because that Commission would be utterly worthless unless it was so composed as to gain for its decisions the universal assent of public opinion. But the hon. Gentleman must recollect that the Commission would have to decide among other things between the respective merits of the broadside and the turret-ships; and, were they to commence their labours now, they would have to decide between practical experiments on the one side as against theoretical views on the other. The *Captain*, designed by Captain Coles, and the *Monarch*, the turret-ship built by the Controller of the Navy, would be completed during the ensuing winter, and the trials of the two vessels would be made next spring, but until that trial was made it would be impossible that a decision could be fairly arrived at. He really must beg to correct the impression which the hon. Gentlemen entertained — that the iron-clad ships which had been completed had not yielded the results which had been anticipated. That that was not the case the following statement would show:—

> "The estimated speed of the *Royal Oak* was 12 knots, and the actual speed 12·52; of the *Royal Alfred* 12 knots, as against 12·35; of the *Caledonia* 12·4, as against 13·0; of the *Ocean* 12·4, as against 12·8; of the *Prince Consort* 12·4, as against 12.77; of the *Zealous* 12, as against 12·49; of the *Bellerophon* 14, as against 14·171; of the *Lord Clyde* 13, as against 13·43; of the *Lord Warden* 13, as against 13·49; of the *Pallas* 13·8, as against 13·05; of the *Viper* 9·25, as against 9·58; of the *Vixen* 9·25, as against 9.02; of the *Penelope* 12·00 as against 12·77."

He now approached what really was at the bottom of the whole subject — the question why the Admiralty did not build more turret-ships? The question was asked also by the hon. Member for Tavistock (Mr. Samuda), who not only implored them not to build more broadside-ships, but wished them to build two more turret-ships during the present year. But the House would not, he trusted, listen to the proposal of the hon. Gentleman. The Admiralty had no plans for turret-ships which they could conscientiously recommend for adoption during the present year. Then there was the reason stated by the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves). It was always an invidious thing to refer in that House to the doings of foreign countries, and he was the last man who would feel any jealousy or suspicion of the motives of the powerful Sovereign who ruled so near our shores. But we could not shut our eyes to the fact that the French were getting an enormous iron-clad fleet together. They were already on an equality with ourselves, and if the House refused to grant the two ships which it was proposed to build, they would be superior. On the other hand, the French fleet was composed exclusively of broadsides, for they had not embarked in turret-ships at all. They had not spent, as we have done, nearly £1,000,000 in making these experiments. If the House would grant these two vessels, as he hoped they would do at his solicitation, we should be building two more broadsides to enable our navy to bear comparison with other navies, none of which had turret-ships. His right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty had fondly hoped up to the night before last to be able to attend that evening, and be enabled, with that deep knowledge and great attachment which he had always felt for the Department over which he now presided, to give the House the reasons why he wished to build these two broadside-ships instead of turret-ships. He had written to him very clearly on this point, requesting him to say that he was not speaking as the irresponsible Secretary of the Admiralty; he must, therefore, be accepted as the feeble mouthpiece of his right hon. Chief, who would be the last man to reject turret-ships. Indeed, so far from having any prejudice against them, he had over and over again spoken of their advantages for home defence, and of the desirability of getting the pattern of a good sea-going vessel of that description. So lately as 1865 his right hon. Friend had made a speech to that effect, and most of his Colleagues, he believed, were anxious to find such a model. There was, in fact, but one feeling in the Admiralty—namely, that we are not in possession of such information and such a model as would warrant us in building turret-ships instead of broadsides. The opinion of Admiral Yelverton had been referred to. His gallant Friend had stated in his Report that the sea was so rough in the Channel that the broadsides could not open their ports, and that the turret-ships could have silenced all their impotent opponents. But in the same breath the Admiral stated what ship he would like to see built. He said that the ship that he wanted was one that would ensure the comfort and health of his men, and he would chose a vessel with a freeboard of from 12 feet to 14 feet.

Mr. SEELY asked, whether the Admiralty did not ask for a vessel having her guns 12 feet above the water; not 12 feet of freeboard?

Lord HENRY LENNOX said, he would read the gallant Admiral's words—

> "There is, no doubt, a thorough sea-going turret-ship, say 12 feet, or 14 feet, out of the water."

But with such a freeboard the very first principle of the advocates of turret-ships would be transgressed. A low freeboard was always put forward as the grand charm of a turret-ship, but with 12 feet or 14 feet of freeboard the builder would immediately have to resort to armour. The ship *Captain* had a freeboard of 8 feet; the hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Laird) proposed a vessel of similar proportions; the hon. Member for Tiverton (Mr. Samuda) proposed a 9 feet 6 inch freeboard; and the turret-ship launched the other day had been built from designs by the Chief Constructor of the Navy, with a freeboard of 14 feet. The designs of Admiral Halsted, which were the admiration of everyone at the French Exhibition, presented a freeboard of 16 feet. It was easy for hon. Members to urge the Admiralty to build sea-going turret-ships, but what sort of turret-ship would they agree to recommend? They did not want a turret-ship of the *Miantonomah* class; but a vessel such as that described by Lord Clarence Paget, which would go to sea, keep at sea, and be able to remain there for weeks. He therefore asked hon. Members to place themselves in the position of the Admiralty, and realize the difficulties of their position when they were asked to decide what was and what was not a good design for a *bonâ fide* sea-going ship-of-war. Respecting this, his right hon. Friend had asked him to point out that two turret-ships designed for cruizing would be tried in the spring. One of them was designed by the arch-priest of the turret system, Captain Coles; and in order that the trial might be unquestionably fair, Captain Coles had chosen tonnage, armour, and builders. He had fixed on the yard of the hon. Member for Birkenhead—[Mr. Laird: It's my son's yard]—and when that ship was finished it would be a model ship, realizing the ideal of the projector. The other was being constructed on the plans of the Admiralty, with a higher freeboard. It was for this, among other reasons, that his right hon. Friend had been induced to go on again with broadsides, instead of entering on the construction of turret-ships. If his right hon. Friend had any prejudice on the subject it was in favour of the turret principle, and not against it: he felt that the weight of opinion in the country was in its favour. So strongly had his right hon. Friend been impressed by the public opinion on the subject that he had written to several gallant commanders of the Channel Fleet to ask them whether they thought the Admiralty would do well to pause before embarking in any more turret-cruizers until these two vessels had been tried? The answers were very brief. Two gallant officers were in favour of turret-ships, but they did not appear to have much confidence in their sea-going properties, for they remarked, that if they fail they can be cut down and converted; but of the other opinions his gallant friend Admiral Warden said—

> "It may, indeed, be quite open to doubt whether it is wise at the present time to commence building two more turret-ships when there are two so near completion, and which will be so soon on their trial."

Admiral Yelverton, after regretting that the trial would not occur sooner, said—

> "All things considered, I am clearly of opinion that the two turret-ships, *Captain* and *Monarch*, ought to be fairly tested as sea-going ships before we venture on building other vessels of the sort. When the numerous advantages of the turret system are found to be compatible with the many and varied requirements of a sea-going ship in all weathers, it will be time to depart from what I hear you now intend doing."

Captain Foley, of the *Cambridge*, lately flag captain to Admiral Yelverton, said—

> "With regard to what I think of turret-ships, and whether it would be advisable to build two turret in lieu of two broadside-ships during this year, I think it would be extreme folly to do so until such time as the *Captain* and *Monarch*, now building, have had a trial at sea, to test their sea-going qualities. Having had, during the last year, some experience in the *Prince Albert*, I consider the low freeboard turret-ship as useful in the English Navy only to protect the port to which she belongs as a coast defence, and not as a trustworthy sea-going ship, from the fact that in rough weather the sea breaks over the deck and will cause the turret-ship to bar up her ports to keep the water out, which would otherwise pour in; besides other reasons which a captain would find out when placed in such a vessel in a heavy

sea. For protection of harbours they are admirable, and better than forts."

Captain Hood, of the *Excellent*, was of opinion that—

> "All things considered with regard to sea-going iron-clads, ships armed properly on the broadside principle are most decidedly to be preferred to turret-ships."

Captain King Hall, Superintendent at Sheerness Dockyard, said—

> "I take the liberty of writing frankly to you, because I deem it a public duty, and seriously trust that no pressure of irresponsible opinion will tempt the Board of Admiralty to order other sea-going turret-ships to be built until the *Monarch* and *Captain* have been fairly and honestly tried, their defects discovered, and improvements suggested."

Captain Vansittart, of the *Achilles*, was in favour of turrets, but did not believe any deck above turrets could be made strong enough to stand. He would commence building turrets at once, and if not a success as sea-going ships would convert them into harbour defences. Captain Chamberlain, of the *Asia*, was of the same opinion. That, as he had already pointed out to the House, was not a policy which the Admiralty felt themselves justified in pursuing at the present moment, when they were anxious to increase the number of their iron-clad ships to a reasonable proportion, as compared with those of foreign Powers. Captain Willes, of the Steam Reserve, Devonport, said—

> "I think the Admiralty quite right in not substituting two turret-ships for the broadside ones in the building programme, until the *Captain* and the *Monarch* have been properly tried at sea. I beg that it may be distinctly understood that in my opinion a turret-vessel proper, the *Royal Sovereign*, has all the elements necessary for harbour and coast defence."

Nearly all those gallant officers were in favour of the construction of turret-ships for the purposes of harbour and coast defence; but his right hon. Friend was determined to go on with the building of broadside-ships until the two turret-ships to which he had referred had been tried. He might add that his hon. and gallant Colleague, the Member for Stamford (Sir. John Hay), had begged of him to state that, while their views as to the turret system remained entirely unchanged, they most cordially supported the line of policy which his right hon. Friend at the head of the Admiralty had deemed it right to adopt. His right hon. Friend, too, wished him to say that he would do everything in his power to hasten the trial of the two turret-ships which were being built. On several occasions, owing to the admirable workmanship and great zeal displayed by the firm with which his hon. Friend the Member for Birkenhead was connected, much more rapid progress had been made with those ships last year than was thought possible, and his right hon. Friend had lately written down to ask whether their completion might not be still further hastened. With respect to another question—the qualities of the *Invincible* class of ships—it would be, perhaps, more convenient to deal with it when Vote 10 came under discussion. The hon. Member for Tavistock (Mr. Samuda) had a distinct Motion to make on the subject. Before he sat down he was about to take a somewhat unusual course, but he hoped that under the peculiar circumstances of the case the House would give it its sanction. His right hon. Friend had hoped from day to day that he would be able to attend in his place, but being, owing to continued illness, disappointed in that expectation, he had written him a letter, which he should wish to read to the House. In that letter his right hon. Friend said —

> "I have always been most anxious to give a fair trial to turret-ships at sea (and I made a long speech on the subject in 1865), and nothing I could do since I have been in Office have I neglected to expedite the trial which will come off in the case of the *Captain* and *Monarch*. That trial will come off two years before any new turret-ship laid down under my authority this year would be ready, and I do think it only common prudence to wait for the trials of the *Captain* and *Monarch*, which will come off in the spring, more especially when it is considered how great is the preponderance of naval opinion as to doubts attending the turret system as applied for sea-going and cruizing purposes."

In conclusion, he had simply to express a hope that the hon. Member for Lincoln would not press his Amendment to a division. He thought he had said enough to show that in the hands of the present Board of Admiralty the turret system would have a fair trial, and he would merely add that it was most painful to the members of the Board to have to dismiss so many dockyard labourers employed on wooden shipbuilding, in order that they might devote the money to the purpose of laying down two ships to be added to the strength of our iron-clad fleet. He had to apologize for having trespassed so long on the patience of the House.

MR. CHILDERS said, he was sure the House would feel that no apology was needed from the noble Lord for any want of efficiency on his part in supplying the place of his Chief after the very clear and fair explanation which he had just made. He had in the course of his speech referred to the great difficulties which the Board of of Admiralty had to encounter in dealing with professional questions of the great importance of that under discussion, and nobody, he thought, who had watched the naval debates of the last eight or nine years could have failed to perceive that those who when out of Office spoke somewhat lightly on the subject, and especially on the merits of turret-ships, were disposed very much to alter their tone as soon as they became responsible for the management of affairs. He (Mr. Childers) did not suppose that politics had anything to do in influencing the opinions of hon. Members on this question, for he was not aware that a turret-ship was either a Tory or a Liberal production, but the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Stamford (Sir John Hay) had been very candid in his admissions, and he hoped that the change in his views would moderate the tone of those who were so fond of dogmatizing on this subject. His noble Friend had, he thought, in the present instance, given good reasons why the Inquiry proposed by the hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely) should not be instituted; but he (Mr. Childers) could at the same time have wished that the noble Lord had been able to lay before the House some plan which, without destroying the liberty of action of the Constructive Department of the Admiralty, or diminishing its responsibilty for all that was done under its superintendence, would give it the advantage of a certain amount of scientific investigation and advice. That was a policy which had been more than once advocated by his noble Friend (Lord Clarence Paget) —and he should like to see some such plan adopted. He endorsed most fully what had been said on both sides as to the great labour, pains, assiduity, and public spirit displayed by the Controller of the Navy, and those engaged in all matters connected with the construction of ships in late years. He believed that they had in that gallant officer and in Mr. Reed and the other members of the Department a most efficient body of public servants. The proposal of the hon. Member for Lincoln, whatever might be the views of those who supported it, would have the effect of divesting the Board of Admiralty of a considerable amount of responsibility, and of casting a reflection upon the ability of eminent men who at present advised the Board. On that ground he should feel compelled to vote against the proposed Resolution. The noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty was quite right in saying that until the *Captain* and the *Monarch* were afloat, and experience was obtained of their performances, the Commission, if appointed, would find itself for some months with practically nothing to do, and he would advise the Board of Admiralty by all means to expedite the construction of the iron-clads which they had in hand. He trusted that by next spring the *Captain* and the *Monarch* would have had their trial, and as he, for one, was not an opponent of the turret system, and had more than once done all in his power to encourage it, he looked forward to the result with the greatest interest and confidence.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:* — Ayes 47; Noes 37: Majority 10.

PRINCESS OF WALES.

REPLY TO ADDRESS.

VISCOUNT ROYSTON (CONTROLLER of the HOUSEHOLD) *reported* Her Majesty's Answer to the Address [9th July] as follows:—

"*Your loyal and dutiful Address on the Birth of the Princess, My Granddaughter, has afforded Me much satisfaction; and I thank you for the renewed assurance of your attachment to My Person and Family.*"

VANCOUVER'S ISLAND AND BRITISH COLUMBIA.—QUESTION.

VISCOUNT MILTON said, he rose to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, What direct means of Postal or other Communication exist between this Country and the above Colonies? Although the *Postal Directory* announced mails three times a month to Vancouver's Island, they were forwarded only by the United States as far as San Francisco, where they awaited the arrival of a vessel of large tonnage, which was occasionally sent from the Pacific squadron for the purpose of conveying despatches or mails to that island or British Columbia. This duty might be performed by a despatch boat at much less expense. He wished to know, whether it was the habitual practice of Admirals in charge of large vessels in Her Majesty's Service to carry mails, and whether despatch boats similar to those used by the Trinity House would not be better suited for the conveyance of mails than ships like the *Sutlej* and the *Zealous*, which were of 3,066 tons and 3,716 tons measurement respectively? He wished to know under what head in the Estimates the cost of the occasional conveyance of the mails of which he had spoken is charged?

MR. SPEAKER said, the noble Viscount must confine himself to asking a Question.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that having listened for some time to the statement of the noble Viscount he was really at a loss to understand the object he had in view. He could readily understand that as the noble Viscount was interested in the prosperity of Vancouver's Island he might feel it to be a matter of regret that the colony should not enjoy postal communication with this country. But that was not the only colony which had to forego that advantage. It was only the other evening that it was stated that the important colony of Penang had been deprived of such communication. He hoped the day might not be very far distant when direct postal communication might be established, but it must be somewhat remote, as the expenditure would probably be not less than £10,000 a year in addition to what was already paid, and the correspondence with Vancouver's Island was diminishing in amount. He believed the whole difficulty arose from this, that the colony of Vancouver's Island was unable or unwilling to pay the money that would be necessary to keep up a postal communication with San Francisco, but was no doubt very desirous that the Imperial Government should be at that expense. Any of Her Majesty's vessels that might happen to stop at the colony might carry the mails, but that was an act of grace; there was no obligation on them to do so. If direct communication with this country were the object, it must be effected by means of the Russian steamers from the Isthmus of Panama; that would involve very serious expense, and he was not aware of any intention of incurring it at present. It was for the colony to make arrangements for a line of vessels between itself and San Francisco; and if that were done the communication might be sufficiently speedy. The noble Viscount had asked under what head of the Estimates the expense was charged. [Viscount MILTON: The casual expense.] Under no head of the Estimates whatever. A stamp was affixed according to what the American Government charged, and he was not aware that Her Majesty's Navy if they chose to carry those mails would receive any remuneration. They certainly would not. The noble Viscount would find one or two items in the Postal Estimates which might have a bearing on this question—for instance, there was an item of £150 for a Post Office agent at San Francisco, and another for conveyance of mails by private ships; and it was a fact that ships did take out mails from time to time, but there was no direct communication with the colony. The noble Viscount wished for all the Correspondence since 1859, but it would be a waste of money to produce all that had occurred since that remote date. He was sure, however, that his right hon. Friend (Mr. Adderley) would be willing to produce any letters which might bear on the subject, if it were not a fact that the communications were in an altogether imperfect state at present. Remonstrances had certainly come from the colonial Government, but the Government at home did not see its way to establishing this communication. He saw no object in producing the Correspondence; but if the noble Viscount at a future time should move for information in a different shape, it would, if possible, be produced.

MR. M. CHAMBERS said, that the House was very much indebted to the noble Viscount for having brought so important a subject before it as the correspondence between British Columbia and this country. The noble Lord had stated that he was informed by a publication from the Post Office that if he wished to send a letter to British Columbia, put it into the Post Office, and paid a certain sum, it would arrive at a certain time, and, in like manner, that an answer would be received at a given time. But it appeared from the statement of the noble Lord that there was no security whatever that the promise thus given to the public would be kept. Something like a deception was practised by the authorities in this country, in stating through the *Postal Directory* that there was a weekly communication with Vancouver's Island, when, in fact, such communication did not exist. The Government ought carefully to consider whether it would not be cheaper to employ small vessels to carry the letters, instead of transmitting them by men-of-war. The Commanders of the naval force stated that they were put to great expense, and the Admirals complained that they were worried in consequence of carrying despatches and letters. The answer which had been given was that our young colonies must find the means to carry on their postal communication. But surely it would be better to give them a small subsidy. The money expended for coals for men-of-war carrying letters, and for agencies, would suffice to supply small vessels for the service. It was the fashion of the day to tell colonists that they must do everything themselves, which was grossly unfair.

Mr. ADDERLEY said, that at this moment letters were despatched every Saturday by New York across America to San Francisco, and from San Francisco by an American packet to Portland in Oregon, and so to Victoria and New Westminster. Up to last year the authorities in Vancouver's Island had made their own arrangements, but the result was a complete failure. They got into debt and were unable to continue the subsidy. Since then Her Majesty's Government had been attempting to make some arrangement for establishing communication between San Francisco and Victoria. The negotiations were now going on, and would, he had no doubt, terminate satisfactorily. The Correspondence between 1859 and 1867 would be absolutely useless, as it related to an arrangement which had fallen to the ground, and the colony itself had changed its condition; while it would be inconvenient to produce the subsequent Correspondence, because it was incomplete at present, and because it involved the part which the United States Government were taking in the negotiations. This country could not undertake the communication by subsidy. He assured the House that the matter was receiving the most careful consideration, and he hoped it would soon be satisfactorily settled.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—NAVY ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £87,179, Victualling Yards and Transport Establishments at Home and Abroad.

(2.) £64,824, Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad.

(3.) £20,709, Marine Divisions.

(4.) £592,908, to complete the sum for Naval Stores, &c.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he wished for some explanation of the sale of ships at less prices than were afterwards given by the Government for the old stores taken from the same ships. One ship was sold by Government for £2,600, and the purchaser received from Government for old materials £3,477. Old ships ought to be sold not privately but publicly to the highest bidder. Sales of vessels by the East India authorities had been made on better terms than the Government obtained.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, he feared that when selling their old ships the Admiralty proceeded on false principles, and that the result was a very serious loss to the country. From a pamphlet which had been published in reference to these matters it would appear that the Admiralty did not ask for tenders from all the world for those ships, but invited one, two, or three persons to send in tenders for the purchase. It did so happen, too, that the ships were sold for a third or fourth of the sum at which they had been valued by our own valuers. One particular ship would appear in the Estimates as having been purchased for £34,000, but it would be a very great mistake to suppose that the buyer had really handed that sum to the Admiralty. In accordance with the custom, he sold the stores of the ship back to the Admiralty, so that he had to pay them only about £13,000 or £14,000, the ship having been valued at £70,000 or £80,000 by our own valuer. It was alleged — he did not say so—that there was an understanding between the authorities at the Admiralty and those who were invited to send in tenders for the purchase of ships. The Admiralty were discharging workmen from the dockyards. Why did they not employ those men in breaking up the old ships? If they adopted this plan they could keep the stores and merely sell the timbers.

Lord HENRY LENNOX said, that the ship to which the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. Alderman Lusk) had referred as having been sold at a very low price had been so sold because of the prevalence of a disease aboard some time before the sale. The hon. Member had asked why the Admiralty did not sell more of their old ships and get good prices for them. They would be very happy to do so; and he hoped the hon. Member would induce some of his wealthy constituents to come forward as purchasers. He could assure the hon. and learned Member for Devonport (Mr. M. Chambers) that there was no understanding of the kind referred to by the hon. and learned Gentleman between the Admiralty and any tradesmen or any professional persons. He was not sure that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would concur with the hon. and learned Member in thinking that the country would gain by having the discharged dockyard men re-employed for the purpose of breaking up old ships. Employment might, however, be afforded to those men by persons who bought the ships to break up. The question of the manner in which old ships should be disposed of was now engaging the attention of a Committee, and he did not think it would be respectful to that Committee if, on the part of the Admiralty, he were to pronounce a positive opinion on the question at present.

MR. CANDLISH said, that in reference to an observation of the hon. Member for Finsbury, to the effect that the East India Company used to sell their old ships at better prices than those now obtained by the Admiralty, he wished to remind the Committee that the ships of that Company had been built for commercial purposes. Ships bought from the Admiralty would have to undergo very considerable alterations to adapt them to commercial purposes, and it was well known that the sailing and managing the vessels as commercial ships which had not been built as such was more expensive than sailing and managing under ordinary circumstances. It was an undoubted fact that in one case, where the vessel was sold for £2,000, the Admiralty re-purchased the old copper for £4,000. He thought, however, that it would be as well to postpone any searching inquiry into this subject until the Report upon it was published.

MR. GRAVES said, he wished to draw attention to the cost of coaling vessels-of-war. The cost of coals put on board Her Majesty's ships at Spithead was from 28*s.* to 38*s.* per ton, whereas coal was delivered by merchant ships at Gibraltar and Malta at 25*s.* per ton. He would recommend that Portland should be formed into a coaling station. They had there a magnificent harbour, and at an expenditure of £10,000 or £13,000 they might have a coaling station in direct communication with the collieries. The railways might bring down the coal from the collieries, and it might be at once put on board the vessels—a plan which, if adopted, would save 30 per cent of the coal now rendered useless for steam purposes by breakage. The expenditure for this purpose he estimated would be only about £10,000 or £15,000, while the yearly saving would be very large. It would be of infinite advantage to us in times of emergency if a continuous stream of coal could be relied upon for coaling the ships, instead of their having to wait for a fortnight before they could complete their coaling. He thought that the subject was one of sufficient importance to justify the noble Lord and his Colleagues turning their attention to it.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, with reference to his previous remarks in regard to the sale of old ships, he knew, not of one, but twenty instances like that he had referred to, in which ships had been sold far beneath their apparent value. He regretted that the noble Lord should have thought it consistent with his duty to tell him that he had better go to his constituents and ask them to buy those old ships. His constituents knew how intelligently to do their own business, which was more than the Admiralty seemingly did. He recollected having been told on one occasion, when he had complained of more anchors being asked for, when there were sufficient in store to supply the Navy for twenty-five years, that they required seasoning. He hoped the present Admiralty were not, seeing they were expending large sums for Dantzic deals, going to lay up sufficient for twenty-five years.

MR. LIDDELL said, he thought the difficulties under which the Admiralty laboured in the sale of old ships and the criticisms they underwent for selling those ships too cheaply, and buying in the old copper, &c., in them at an unduly high rate, arose from the restrictions imposed by Parliament in the Naval Stores Act, and he should like to know whether the Government intended to seek a repeal of that Act?

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, he was anxious to assure the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Alderman Lusk) that nothing was further from his wish than to appear to answer the Questions which were put to him in a flippant manner, but the fact was that, finding the discussion rather dull, he had endeavoured to promote the hilarity of the evening. What he wished, however, to say in earnest was that each of the old ships now cost £1,000 per annum in ship-keeping, and that it was desirable to get rid of them on the best terms that could be obtained, and he should be glad if the hon. Member would bring forward customers for them. If the ships were not sold for what they would fetch, they would have to be broken up by the shipbuilders in the dock-yard at Sheerness, which would cost a large sum of money. In answer to the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. Liddell), he could not pledge himself to recommend the Admiralty to repeal the Naval Stores Act, which was re-enacted last year at their instance.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, he must draw attention to the fact that the noble Lord had not answered the Question he had put to him concerning the sale of old ships by public tender, instead of by the present system of one or two firms only tendering for the vessels. If they could not get a proper price for the vessels they should break them up themselves.

Lord HENRY LENNOX said, that the latter proposal of the hon. Member would involve a large expense, as it would be necessary to engage men to break up the ships, and their labour would be just as expensive as if they were building ships instead of pulling them to pieces. In the only instance in which the plan of public tender had been tried the ships had been sold for far less then the price they usually realized.

Mr. CHILDERS said, that what Mr. Cobden had said was perfectly true, that there should be buyers and sellers who would deal with these matters in the ordinary commercial way of business. It by no means followed that the system of public tender was the best. Generally it was, but not always.

Mr. DU CANE said, he would beg to state in reply to the observations of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves), that the present system of coaling vessels-of-war by means of pontoons was only temporary. They were in hopes that an arrangement might be made with the railway companies for the transit of coal between Portland and the Welsh coast. But as it would involve a considerable outlay to adopt the proposal of the hon. Member, they thought it better to wait until another year before asking for the sum necessary to carry out any improvement upon the present system.

Vote *agreed to.*

Lord Henry Lennox

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £742,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Expense of Steam Machinery for Her Majesty's Ships and Vessels, and for Payments to be made for Ships and Vessels building or to be built by Contract, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869."

Mr. SAMUDA said, he rose to draw attention to the circumstances under which the sanction of the Committee to the building of two vessels of the *Audacious* class, the *Triumph* and the *Swiftsure*, was asked for. Those vessels were of 3,800 tons and 800-horse power each, and of which the House had already sanctioned the building of four vessels of that class. He proposed that instead of the building of these two being proceeded with two turret-vessels should be substituted for them. A great deal of valuable information might be gained from two such vessels as he proposed, although, of course, their relative fighting powers, as compared with those and the broadside-vessels, could only be ascertained after several severe engagements had been fought. We should be in the region of experiment for many years to come; and for the Government to refuse experiment was to refuse all progress. The Admiral of the Channel Fleet had expressed his opinion of our broadside iron-clads in no measured terms. He stated that they rolled to the lower part of their ports in fine weather, and to the upper part of their ports in bad weather. Consequently, in moderately bad weather they could not fight a single gun. This arose from the fact that broadside-ships were always obliged to be placed in the trough of the sea. Turret-vessels could be fought head to the wind, and rolling was thus prevented. Much had been made of alleged objections by Admirals and captains to building turret-ships, but he must remind the Committee that the opinions quoted were not really against turret-ships. The commanders whose opinions were asked had a case put to them in a particular way, and they answered it as all prudent men would have done. The Admiralty said, "We are building two turret-vessels for sea; we shall be able to try them very soon: do you think it will be advisable to build others now or wait till we try those which we are building?" Of course the answer was, "We would prefer to wait till we saw those that are building completed." That would be a safe enough principle to go upon if waiting involved only delay; but when it involved the building of another and defective class of ship, he said "No; if you must build, build turret-vessels." Everyone knew of the advantages of turret-ships, and it was equally well known that their possible disadvantages would be few; therefore, the balance was decidedly in their favour. To keep the ports of a broadside-ship out of the water it was necessary to build them high above the water-line; they presented a good target to the enemy, and unless loaded with armour would be in the utmost danger from every shot. The alternative plan was to plate the vessel heavily in the centres and leave the ends comparatively unprotected. This he condemned utterly. The French Navy had been often pointed to as a model, and he could tell the Committee that whatever armour it was decided to put on a vessel in the French Navy was with very few exceptions distributed in equal thickness all over. That was a much better plan than the one we had tried of merely plating the centre of a ship heavily and leaving the fore part and the stern part unprotected. The plan could more easily be carried out in the case of turret-ships, because from not having any ports their armour did not require to cover nearly so large a surface and yet afforded complete instead of only partial protection. The turret-vessel had thus two advantages. First, being much lower in the water it presented a less prominent mark to the enemy's fire; and secondly, what mark in the shape of hull did exist was entirely covered with armour, and was consequently stronger. The turret-ships, moreover, were immensely superior as regarded their offensive power. The whole horizon could be swept by the guns of the former, whereas the range of the latter was limited to some 60 out of the 180 degrees. The Government might say the complete range could be gained by the sponsons; but that plan was decidedly inconvenient. He thought, therefore, he had given very considerable reasons why, in the present instance, the Admiralty should accept the view he had put before the House, and why they should allow the experiment he advocated to be tried. The advantages of the turret system were so great that some allowances might easily be made for deficiencies. So far as as iron-clads were concerned everything partook of the character of an experiment; but, seeing that so much more could be said in favour of the turret-ships than could be said of the broadside-ships it was surely wiser to try experiments with the former than the latter. The noble Lord the Secretary of the Admiralty had told the Committee that there was no such thing as a sea-going turret-ship; but that was a mistake. He (Mr. Samuda) hoped that the hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Laird) would address the House, and would read an extract from a communication he had received from one most competent to judge on this matter. That extract stated, on the word of one of the best known naval commanders in the world, that a turret-ship had been tried at sea in the most unfavourable weather, and had proved equal to everything that was desired or expected of her. Much was said upon the point that the turret-vessels were but an experiment; but it was to be remembered that the same remark applied to the *Audacious* class. The noble Lord said the Admiralty had not recommended the building of a turret-ship, because they had not one on which they could rely as a sea-going ship. But that was not always the opinion of the Admiralty, for in the first copy of the Estimates provision was made for the building of a turret-ship instead of one of those ships which he now asked the Committee to give up. The House was then asked to build an additional turret-ship at Chatham, to be called the *New Monarch.* What he asked was that that ship should be restored. He said at the beginning of the evening that he did not wish to embarrass the Admiralty, and he would now show that he was sincere in that expression, for he proposed to omit from his Motion all suggestion of the class of ship they were to build, and leave it to them to suggest whatever form of turret-ship they might approve of, confining his proposal to the substitution of two turret-ships in place of two broadside-vessels. He would beg, therefore, to move to reduce the Vote by £500.

MR. LAIRD said that, having been personally referred to in that discussion, he wished to make a very few remarks. It had been alleged that there were no sea-going turret-ships now afloat. That was not correct. He knew of one sea-going turret-ship of 3,716 tons which went to South America, and encountered very bad weather in rounding Cape Horn, in which she showed great sea-going qualities.

Another turret-ship, which had been afloat for twelve months, had also encountered all sorts of weather; and with the permission of the Committee he would read first a description of one of our broadside-ships in a gale of wind in the Atlantic, and then a description of that turret-vessel in a gale in the Bay of Biscay. That, he thought, would show the Committee that a turret-ship could encounter bad weather and get out of it as satisfactorily as a broadside-ship. Admiral Warden, in his Report on the Channel Fleet in 1866, at Paragraph 21, said—

> "To have opened all the main deck ports, judging by the effect of opening only five, would have been to have washed the men away from the guns, and consequently they (the guns) would have taken charge of the deck by getting adrift, but with what consequences it would be utterly impossible to predict. The most of the cartridges, if not all of them, would have been destroyed in the guns, and the guns which could have been got off would have hurt nobody."

That was the account given by a most experienced naval officer of a broadside-ship in a gale in the Atlantic. He would now quote the description given of a turret-ship of 2,000 tons, with four 300-pounder guns and two turrets (the *Prins Hendrik*), in a very heavy gale, by her commander, Captain Jansen, a distinguished officer of the Dutch Navy, who was known to many Members of that House. Captain Jansen, in his letter bearing date 21st December, 1867, Cherbourg, wrote—

> "I went to sea at 11 a.m. on the 2nd of December, blowing hard from the N.W., with heavy squalls of hail, which nearly prevented me going through the passage Dufour out, from Brest. When outside I found myself on a lee shore, with a furious storm from the N.W., and a tremendous sea, enough to frighten an old sailor. The *Prins Hendrik* behaved nobly as long as she was head to sea. She went six knots through the sea, which went over her as high as the chimney, which is now still entirely white with the crystals of salt. The day after, although blowing hard, with a more regular sea, we were able to move in all directions without a heavier roll than 15 degrees. The *Prins Hendrik* is an excellent ship, and could use her battery on Tuesday with great ease, when all the ships we met were close reefed, and several wrecks that we saw indicated uncommonly bad weather."

He would put it to the Committee, after hearing that account of the behaviour of a turret-ship of 2,000 tons in a heavy gale from so good an authority, whether that was not a satisfactory answer to the statement made that night that no sea-going turret-ship had yet been built? That argument had been used before. It had been refuted twice to his knowledge in the instances to which he had adverted; and although he should not have been able to support the hon. Member for Tavistock's (Mr. Samuda's) Motion, as originally framed, he was ready to support it in a modified form, because he believed that from the experience which the Admiralty had, or which they could get if they chose to seek it, they could give the country two turret-ships of the same tonnage as the other ships that they proposed to build, but which would be very superior to them in every respect, and which would do much more credit to the Admiralty themselves, while they would be much more useful to the nation.

Lord HENRY LENNOX said, he had no reason to complain of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Tavistock (Mr. Samuda) in introducing his Amendment. Although misinformed on some of the points which he had mentioned, it was natural that the hon. Gentleman should try to press upon the Committee the adoption of his favourite system of the turret. The hon. Member said that in the first copy of the Estimates laid on the table there was a turret-ship to take the place of the *Monarch*. That would only prove, if anything, the extreme good-will of his right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Corry) towards the turret system. [Mr. Samuda was understood to say that the vessel was not the *Monarch* but the *Triumph*.] No; the turret-ship that appeared in the Estimates was to have been of the *Monarch* class, which some Gentlemen had so much decried; but, for reasons previously stated, his right hon. Friend could not recommend the building of that turret-ship this year. The hon. Member for Tavistock had dilated in glowing terms on the rolling propensities of the broadside iron-clads; but rolling, like everything else, was a matter of comparison. The old two and three-deckers were not free from rolling propensities in bad weather. The hon. Member had probably read with interest the able Report of Admiral Dacres on the Channel Squadron in 1865. That gallant Admiral was afloat in an old two-decker, and he had two iron-clads, the *Prince Consort* and the *Warrior*, among his ships; and he reported that both of those vessels rolled less heavily than he did in his comfortable old two-decker. Therefore a sweeping condemnation of the present class of ships on the score of their rolling propensities was not altogether fair. The hon. Member had been misinformed with regard to the French Navy. The French Navy had adopted, and were now building, their ships upon what was familiarly called the belt and box principle. With regard to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Laird), perhaps in the course of his remarks he (Lord Henry Lennox) had not sufficiently guarded himself on every point; but what he had meant to say was not that no turret-ship had ever gone to sea, but that no model possessing the principal attributes of the turret system had ever been submitted to the Admiralty of which they could approve. The second vessel alluded to was open to the objection of the hon. Member for Tavistock, that the ends were unarmoured, and that a shot would easily penetrate her. In fact there was no such thing as a fully armoured sea-going ship.

MR. LAIRD said, the *Zealous*, a vessel of 3,716 tons, which went round Cape Horn, was a fully armoured sea-going ship.

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, that was true, and it was also true that she sailed nearly as well as the *Ocean*; but she was an armour-plated vessel with only 4½ inches of armour, which would present very little power of resistance against modern artillery. The hon. Member for Tavistock had objected very much to the sponsons or overhanging deck, but in that respect the Admiralty were for once in entire accord with the private builders. In the competitions of designs every one of the competitors sent in a broadside design with an overhanging deck or sponson, which would add to the security and steadiness of the vessel. No doubt the hon. Gentleman was aware that the worst rollers in the fleet were the converted wooden ships, because in them the centre of gravity was lower than the upper deck. The hon. Gentleman was in favour of turret-ships in general, and he (Lord Henry Lennox) did not deny that the two Admirals to whom the hon. Gentleman had referred were in favour of the principle of turret-ships; but as to whether the Admiralty should go on with these two vessels of the broadside class he must appeal to the two Admirals as witnesses in his favour, for they had stated in the letter he had read that it was not advisable to build any more sea-going turrets at the present time. This did not arise from any crotchet or fancy of the Controller's Department; but he was authorised to say that Sir Alexander Milne and Sir Sidney Dacres, two good authorities, approved these ships, and would regret if anything interfered with their design. And when he had said this he trusted he had said enough to induce the Committee to support the Admiralty in the plans they had laid down.

MR. O'BEIRNE said, that the turret principle had a large number of scientific men in its favour, and a complete series of vessels, forming a turret navy, by Admiral Halsted, were now exhibited at South Kensington Museum. These might supersede the system of building broadside-ships; but he thought that both the broadside and the turret-ships were at present simply experimental. If the hon. Member for Tavistock would limit his Motion so as to stay all further expenditure, until experiments had shown the relative value of turret-ships and broadsides, he would support him.

MR. GRAVES said, that if the Vote were pressed, and if the House were to build two vessels, he must vote against two turret-ships on a design which had been condemned by the Admiralty. With reference to the sponson-ships proposed to be built, they were a great experiment, but he did not think it would be successful. The Admiralty possessed all the information they required, and all they had to do was to apply it. It was professional and practical rather than scientific and theoretical knowledge that was wanted, and there was too much science and theory. The question was, whether the Committee would suspend the Vote altogether, or whether the Government would test the opinion of the Committee as to two turret-ships or two sponson-vessels. He would support the Motion if it were confined to staying any further expenditure on experimental ships which, judging by the past, would prove failures. He believed there was great merit in Admiral Halsted's designs.

Motion made and Question put,

"That a sum, not exceeding £742,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Expense of Steam Machinery for Her Majesty's Ships and Vessels, and for Payments to be made for Ships and Vessels building or to be built by Contract, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869."—(*Mr. Samuda.*)

The Committee *divided*:— Ayes 59; Noes 92: Majority 33.

MR. GRAVES said, he rose to call attention to the defective development of steam in the case of some of the vessels of the Channel squadron last year. He had some doubt as to the present system of tendering for machinery. The engines of the *Bellerophon* cost £71,000, yet they had failed to exert the power guaranteed except on flash trial trips, and those of the *Invincible* and *Audacious* cost £103,700, although makers of the same class sent in tenders for £72,200. He contended that very great injustice was done by the present irresponsible mode of tendering, and would on some future occasion bring the whole subject before the attention of Parliament.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(6.) £564,237, to complete the sum for New Works, Buildings, Machinery, and Repairs.

MR. GRAVES said, he had intended to propose a reduction of the Vote by £500, with the view of closing the Deptford and Woolwich Dockyards; but, in the absence of the First Lord of the Admiralty, he would not raise the question. He was glad to hear that the Deptford yard would be closed, and hoped that Woolwich also would shortly be given up.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, that last year much more money was asked for on account of this Vote than had been expended. He wished to know why that was, and what had become of the excess?

MR. DU CANE said, he could only answer that it had not yet been paid into the Exchequer.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) £78,164, Medicines, Medical Stores, &c.

MR. CHILDERS said, as this Vote contained a charge of £12,500 for carrying out the Contagious Diseases Act in arsenals and garrison towns, the operation of which had been very beneficial both to the army and navy, he wished to ask, whether, during the coming Recess, the Government would be willing to appoint a Commission to inquire into the working of the Act, with the view of extending it to other parts of the kingdom?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, it was the intention of the Government to appoint a Commission to inquire into the public health, and he thought this subject, to which his hon. Friend had called attention, might very well form part of the inquiry.

Vote *agreed to.*

(8.) £20,365, Martial Law.

Mr. Graves

(9.) £175,800, Naval Miscellaneous Services.

MR. ALDERMAN SALOMONS said, he wished to call attention to an increase of £300 for advertisements in connection with this Vote. He thought the matter required explanation.

SIR JOHN HAY said, the increase was due to the greater degree of publicity which they wished to be given, in order that there might be a larger competition.

Vote *agreed to.*

(10.) £500,166, to complete the sum for Half-pay, &c. Navy and Royal Marines.

(11.) £400,447, to complete the sum for Military Pensions and Allowances.

(12.) £123,498, to complete the sum for Civil Pensions and Allowances.

(13.) £200,600, to complete the sum for Freight of Ships.

(14.) £42,079, Greenwich Hospital and Schools.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK asked that the Vote might not be brought on that night, as it was not put down in the Order for the Day, and he knew several Members who were interested in this Vote, but who were absent.

MR. DISRAELI said, that on Friday an opportunity would be given, according to the forms of the House, for bringing the subject under consideration. The hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) had left the House on the clear understanding that his Motion on the subject was to come on on Friday. It would be for the public convenience that this Vote should be taken to-night. He therefore hoped the hon. Alderman would allow the Vote to be taken.

MR. CHILDERS said, that it might be as well to take the Vote now, provided the present proceeding was not to be made a precedent. He would like to ask the Government what was the Business that would be taken to-morrow?

MR. DISRAELI: I do not propose, Sir, to take any Estimates to-morrow morning; but that we should meet at two o'clock to go on with the Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill. To-morrow evening I propose we should take a Military Estimate, which, I trust, will not lead to much discussion, and afterwards the Civil Service Estimates. Perhaps I may be allowed to say with reference to the Foreign Cattle Market Bill that I said, in answer to a Question early in the evening, that as soon as I could see my way with respect to Supply and the Corrupt Practices Bill, I should state what would be done. So far as I can judge now, I hope that on Thursday evening hon. Members will have an opportunity of discussing the question, and that the measure will be advanced.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he wished to inquire if the Government intended to go on with Class II. to-morrow evening?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH sain, that the whole of Class II. would be taken, and also a Supplementary Estimate, which would be laid on the table to-night.

Vote *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

SIR ROBERT NAPIER.

Resolution from the Committee upon Her Majesty's Message [9th July] *reported :*

"That the annual sum of Two Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to be settled upon Lieutenant General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., and the next surviving Heir Male of his Body, for the term of their natural lives."

Resolution *agreed to, Nemine Contradicente :*—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Disraeli, and Sir Stafford Northcote.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 230.]

BRISTOL ELECTION.

Ordered, That the Evidence taken before the Bristol Election Committee having been delivered, Mr. Speaker do not issue his Warrant for a New Writ for the City of Bristol until three days' Notice of a Motion for the Writ shall have expired.—(*Mr. Bass.*)

POOR LAW BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

On Motion of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Poor Law Board under "The Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867," with reference to the City of Salisbury, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Sir James Fergusson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 231.]

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 14, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit* (237); Assignees of Marine Polices* (225); Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland)* (222); Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland) (224); Petit Juries (Ireland)* (231); Bank Holidays and Bills of Exchange* (200); Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Court* (123); Indorsing of Warrants* (240); Court of Justiciary (Scotland) (232); Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland)* (233).

Committee—Bankruptcy Act Amendment (208); Entail Amendment (Scotland)* (183·250); Land Writs Registration (Scotland)* (213); University Elections (Voting Papers)* (201); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (206); Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal* (214); Metropolitan Police Funds* (230); Fairs (Metropolis)* (223); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2)* (207); Libel (Ireland)* (209); Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (177); Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* (175); Local Government Supplemental (No. 3)* (194); Hudson's Bay Company* (244); District Church Tithes Act Amendment (236-251).

Report—Land Writs Registration (Scotland)* (213); University Elections (Voting Papers)* (201); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (206); Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal* (214); Metropolitan Police Funds* (230); Fairs (Metropolis)* (223); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2)* (207); Libel (Ireland)* (209); Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (177); Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* (175); Local Government Supplemental (No. 3)* (194); Hudson's Bay Company* (244).

Third Reading—Consular Marriages* (198); Lee River Conservancy* (217); Railway Companies* (226); Curragh of Kildare* (195); Renewable Leasehold Conversion (Ireland) Act Extension* (184) and *passed.*

NEW PEER INTRODUCED.

Alexander Nelson Baron Bridport of that Part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland, Major General in Her Majesty's Army, having been created Viscount Bridport of the United Kingdom — Was (in the usual Manner) introduced.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Lord Cranworth.*)

(No. 208.) COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into a Committee on the said Bill, read.

Lord WESTBURY said, that from such a hasty perusal as he had been able to give to this Bill he had come to the conclusion that one-half of the clauses were unnecessary, and the other half extremely inconvenient if not mischievous. He would appeal to the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cranworth) who had charge of this Bill, whether it was desirable to proceed with it at this late period of the Session?

Lord ROMILLY desired to join in the appeal to his noble and learned Friend. It had been impossible to give due consideration to the Amendments, which occupied three pages and a half, and were only presented that morning. So far as he knew, the great commercial bodies were opposed to the measure in its form as introduced. He had received serious representations from three of the great commercial bodies interested, objecting to portions of the clauses as they stood, and a communication had been placed in his hands from the Incorporated Law Society in which they objected to legislation without due time being allowed for consideration. The argument that the Bill has passed the House of Commons in a case of this description is not conclusive. He remembered the late Mr. Hume in the House of Commons saying, "Don't let us waste time in Committee; we are incompetent to decide how it should be altered; let the Bill go up to the House of Lords; they have judges amongst them, and will do what it is proper." Accordingly, the other House often trusted to their Lordships to set these matters right. If so, they ought to be allowed proper time for this purpose; but he defied their Lordships to give due consideration to a Bill brought in and passed in so hasty a manner that it was impossible to judge what its effect would be. It was not becoming the dignity of their Lordships' House to pass a Bill in such a manner that next Session an amending Act would be necessary. The question of bankruptcy was one which ought to be considered as a whole. This had been done by the Lord Chancellor, but he had, unfortunately, been compelled to withdraw his Bill for the present Session. A fragmentary piece of legislation, however, like the present, was calculated to do a great deal of harm. He trusted that his noble and learned Friend would not press this measure at this time; but if he would not leave the law as it now stood until next Session, that he would at least postpone the consideration of these Amendments for some days.

Lord Westbury

The LORD CHANCELLOR: If the suggestion I am about to offer should appear to be opposed to the progress of the measure, I trust my noble and learned Friend (Lord Cranworth) will give me credit for being quite disinterested. The Bill having been fixed for the Committee to-night, and feeling that the main object of the Bill was desirable, although the composition of the clauses was in many respects defective, I thought it my duty to prepare for the discussion, and I put on the Paper the Amendments that were in my opinion necessary to make this a good and safe measure. With these Amendments the Bill is one which I think it will be proper and advantageous to pass. There are two things to be aimed at in legislation of this kind—first, that any Bill that should be passed should be good; and, secondly, that you should be able to satisfy the public mind that it is good, and to take care that those who are interested in the matter should have sufficient time to lay their opinions before the Legislature. I have observed that various bodies have expressed their surprise that at so late a period of the Session, after a general measure on the part of the Government had been abandoned, one portion of that measure should be taken up and pressed forward with the object of its becoming law. But, in regard to this measure, representations from commercial bodies have been made that objections present themselves, and that they have not had an opportunity of considering them. That being so, your Lordships would run some risk of being accused of hasty legislation if, under present circumstances, you were to pass this Bill, and although its objects are good, and the Bill would, I think, be an improvement of the law, I would suggest that the noble and learned Lord should either allow the Bill to stand over until another Session, or that he should allow at least a week for those representations on the subject of the Bill which persons interested may desire to make. I believe that the adjournment of the Bill until next Monday or Tuesday would be desirable.

Lord CRANWORTH said, that he would postpone the Bill for a few days, although he thought time enough had been given for consideration. The Amendments to be proposed by his noble and learned Friend (the Lord Chancellor) made a great show upon the Paper, but he should be happy to accept them with, perhaps, one exception. He could not admit that this Bill was being pressed against the wishes of the commercial community, for he held in his hand a petition from the Leeds Chamber of Commerce in favour of the measure, and the Secretary of the General Association of Chambers of Commerce had written to state that he had frequently heard the subject of this small Bill discussed, and that he was confident a very large majority of members of the Chambers were favourable to it, and expressing a hope that it would be passed into law. It was true it was only a fragment of the larger measure, dealing with deeds of arrangements only. The whole legal profession were agreed that these arrangement deeds, sanctioned under the existing Act, had given rise to the greatest frauds, there being very imperfect security for ascertaining whether the persons executing them constituted three-fourths in number and value of the creditors, and whether the whole of the property was given up. The Bill was introduced in the House of Commons a few days after the abandonment by the Government of their general measure, and he could see nothing in the mode of its introduction, or in its fragmentary nature, that should hinder their Lordships from legislating on this very small point during the present Session. The Amendments of which Notice had been given were chiefly verbal, and with one or two exceptions he entertained no objection to them. He thought they might go through the Bill in Committee that evening, and discuss the Bill with the Amendments on the Report on Monday.

LORD ROMILLY thought it would be better not to go into Committee till Monday.

LORD WESTBURY said, that if time were given to certain societies interested in the matter they would be able to suggest most valuable Amendments.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he would recommend that their Lordships now proceed with the Bill in Committee; and then between this and Monday their Lordships and the public would see whether there was any valid objection to be urged to its provisions.

House in Committee.

Clause 1 (List of Creditors and Property).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR moved a series of Amendments of which he had given Notice.

LORD CRANWORTH said, he should oppose the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord.

LORD CHELMSFORD moved that the House be resumed. He thought the understanding had been that only verbal Amendments should be now introduced, and that the discussion on the clauses should be taken on the Report.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative.*

House *resumed* accordingly; and to be again in Committee on *Friday* next.

CLERKS OF THE PEACE, &c. (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 224.)

(*The Earl of Devon.*)

SECOND READING.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Devon.*)

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY wished for further explanation, deeming it a rather strong measure to give the Executive power to fix a salary which was to be charged on the borough rates. He wished to know whether any limit was to be fixed on the salary so imposed, and whether there was any precedent for conferring such a power on the Executive Government?

THE EARL OF DEVON said, the object of the Bill was to supply an omission in a former measure, which created an office involving labour without providing for the payment of a salary. He could not quote any precedent for this Bill; and he would consider the question of limitation before the Bill passed its next stage.

THE EARL OF CLARENDON was understood to take exception to this mode of imposing taxes upon ratepayers?

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, that in English boroughs and counties the salaries of the clerks of the peace were settled by the magistrates, and in this case it would seem more rational that the salaries should be settled by the local authorities and approved by the Government. If the usual authorities failed to make provision, the Lord Lieutenant might have the power to fix salaries.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª (according to Order), and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

DISTRICT CHURCH TITHES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 236.)

(*The Bishop of Oxford.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into a Committee read.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD said, the Amendment which that Bill would effect would be this—that under its action all beneficed clergymen who were now rectors would remain under the appellation of rectors, and all those who were now vicars would remain under the appellation of vicars; while all perpetual curates would become vicars. That was to say, there would henceforth be only two classes by name of beneficed clergy—namely, rectors and vicars. There was no sort of use in maintaining the three-fold designation, which was formerly a reality, but was now an unreality, introducing confusion without any countervailing advantage.

House in Committee; Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. No. 251.

COURTS OF JUSTICIARY (SCOTLAND) BILL.—(No. 232.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, the measure was occupied with details in regard to legal proceedings in Scotland on which it would be better to postpone comment until they were in Committee. A strong feeling was entertained in Scotland that a large and comprehensive reform was necessary in respect to legal proceedings in that country, which must be regarded as very cumbrous, dilatory, and he was afraid very expensive. The Government were about to recommend the issue of a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole system of pleading and practice in the Scotch Courts, with a view to the introduction of improvements. The inquiry itself must necessarily occupy some time, and the legislation consequent upon it some further time. It was desirable, however, that the partial but urgent Amendments proposed by the Bill should be made, and there would be an opportunity of knowing how they would work. The arrangements now proposed, however, were not in any way to supersede the inquiry or the action of the Commission, which would deal with the whole subject of the pleading and practice of the Scotch Courts without reference to the Amendments to be made by that Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a." (*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD WESTBURY understood that the Commission would embrace the subject included in the Bill, and that if the measure passed it would not be made the pretext for withdrawing the matter comprised within it from the inquiry of the Commissioners.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock,
to Thursday next, half past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 14, 1868.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class R.P.

Resolutions [July 13] *reported*—NAVY ESTIMATES.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions in Committee*—Colonial Shipping.

Ordered—Colonial Shipping; Drainage and Improvement of Lands* (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4).

First Reading — Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4) * [235]; Colonial Shipping* [236]; Railway Companies* [237].

Second Reading — Sir Robert Napier's Annuity* [230].

Committee — Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-comm.*) [63]—R.P.; Poor Relief* [186]—R.P.; Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment* [218]; Public Departments Payments* [212]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment (*re-comm.*)* [226]; Militia Pay*; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3) [229]; Liquidation* [220].

Report—Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment* [218]; Public Departments Payments* [212]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment (*re-comm.*)* [226]; Militia Pay*; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3)* [229]; Liquidation* [220].

Considered as amended — Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* [149]; Public Schools* [135]; Vaccination (Ireland)* [217]; Municipal Elections (Scotland)* [211].

Third Reading — Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* [222], and *passed.*
Withdrawn — Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment* [103]; Non-traders Bankruptcy (Ireland)* [98].

The House met at Two of the clock.

ARMY—INVALID OFFICERS FROM INDIA.—QUESTION.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether the travelling allowance of Officers invalided home from Abyssinia has been disallowed; and, if so, for what reason?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that he very much regretted the terms in which the Question had been put, because it was calculated to mislead the public in two very important respects. Any person who was not conversant with the Rules and Regulations of the Army would infer that officers invalided home from Abyssinia came home entirely at their own cost; and, secondly, that these officers had been treated in a different way to which officers who came from any other part of the world were treated. He must protest against any such inference. It might also be inferred that the War Office had a discretion in the matter, when the truth was that they had no power in reference to it. This case came under rules which applied to all officers from whatever part of the world they came. Officers who came home on sick leave were landed free of all cost in their own country; and the only cost to which they themselves could be put were travelling allowances as affected by accidental delays upon the way and the expense of travelling to their own homes from the place where they were landed. He thought, however, that the rule, restricted as he had explained, bore hardly upon some of the officers who came home ill, and that they should be sent free of cost to their homes, wherever those homes might be. On this account they were now considering a new rule. The rule had hitherto been that officers on sick leave should be considered in the same position as officers on general leave; but the new rule would be that officers sent home by a Medical Board should receive all their travelling expenses.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he wished to know whether this would be prospective only, or whether it would apply to the officers whom he had referred to?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON was understood to say that he could not answer that Question.

"RUNNING HIS LETTERS" IN SCOTLAND.—QUESTION.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he wished to ask the Lord Advocate, What expense is entailed upon a prisoner by the process termed in Scotland "running his letters," and whether he does not think it advisable that this process should, in the interests of accused persons of small means, be made as simple and inexpensive as possible?

THE LORD ADVOCATE stated, in reply, that the process in Scotland termed "running his letters," was one by which a criminal could have his trial removed from the provinces to Edinburgh. The expense was about £2 10*s.*, and if that amount were diminished, many more prisoners would be induced to resort to the process, which would lead to as much inconvenience as the removal in England of all criminal trials from the Circuit Courts to London.

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS [*re-committed*] BILL—[BILL 63.]

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress, 10th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 17 (Report of the Judge as to Corrupt Practices).

MR. J. STUART MILL: The addition which I propose to this clause is one of great importance, since it raises the question of providing better security against corrupt practices in municipal, as well as Parliamentary elections. No one is likely to deny that bribery in municipal elections deserves repression as much, and is as unfit to be tolerated or indulged, as bribery in Parliamentary elections; and the special reason why it should be dealt with in this Bill is that, as we are told by all who know anything about the matter, municipal bribery is the great school of Parliamentary bribery. Hon. Members of this House have on a former occasion testified to this fact from their personal knowledge, and I shall quote only two authorities for it. One is that eminent Conservative solicitor, Mr. Philip Rose, formerly as intimately known to hon. Gentleman opposite as his partner, Mr. Spofforth, now is. Mr. Rose, before the Select Committee of this House on Corrupt Practices, in 1860, expressed himself in these words—

> "My strong opinion is, that all the efforts which are now being made to check bribery at Parliamentary elections will fail, for this reason, that you do not attempt to strike at the root of the offence. The real nursery for the evil is the municipal contests; and those oft-recurring contests have led to the establishment of what I might almost term an organized system of corruption in the municipal boroughs throughout the kingdom, which provides a machinery ready made to hand, available when the Parliamentary contest arrives."

My next authority is the Committee itself, before whom this evidence was given, and who reported—

> "That it has been proved to the satisfaction of your Committee, that an intimate connection exists between bribery at municipal and Parliamentary elections, and it is expedient that the provisions as to punishments and forfeitures for the offences of bribery at each such election should be assimilated as far as possible."

Notwithstanding this recommendation of the Select Committee, which I hope that the next House of Commons will see the propriety of adopting in its integrity, I have not ventured to propose that the present Bill should provide a machinery for the investigation and punishment of corrupt practices at municipal elections. But I do propose, by the present Amendment, and by an additional clause which will follow in due course, that when the machinery which the Bill does provide for the investigation of corrupt practices at Parliamentary elections is actually set in motion, the inquiry may extend to municipal as well as to Parliamentary corruption. If the House adopt my Amendment, the Special Commission, which is already empowered to inquire into Parliamentary elections previous to that which caused the issue of the Commission, will have the power conferred on it of inquiring, to exactly the same extent, into previous municipal elections. By the additional clause, the Judge who tries an Election Petition, may take evidence to prove that an elector who voted at the Parliamentary election had been guilty of corrupt practices at any municipal election within two years previous, for the purpose, of course, of showing that his vote was corruptly influenced at the Parliamentary election. The period of two years is selected with reference to the term fixed by the 56th clause of the Municipal Corporations Act; and I confidently claim, both for the Amendment and for the new clause, the support of all hon. Members who really desire to lay the axe at the root of electoral corruption. The hon. Member moved to add at the end of the clause the following words:—

> "And it shall be competent for any such Commission to inquire into corrupt practices at previous municipal Elections within the county or borough as fully as into corrupt practices at previous Parliamentary Elections."

The CHAIRMAN said, the Amendment of the hon. Member was not sufficiently relevant to the Bill to enable it to be inserted in the Bill in the absence of a direct Instruction of the House to the Committee on the subject. The Amendment had reference to municipal elections, and the Bill referred only to the elections of Members of Parliament.

Mr. TREEBY submitted, that if bribery at municipal elections tended to corruption at Parliamentary elections, the Amendment was relative.

Mr. BOUVERIE observed, that, under this clause the whole practice would be changed. The Judge, and not the Committee, would have to inquire into the seat, and the alleged corrupt practices at the election. The Judge, and not the Committee, would hear the evidence. The Judge, and not the Committee, would report to the House whether extensive corruption had or had not prevailed among the constituency. Hitherto it had devolved on the Chairman of the Committee to bring the matter on the Report before the House; but on whom would that duty devolve under the new system? On the Government? They had already enough to do. Was it, then, to be left haphazard to any private Member on either side of the House who might read the shorthand writer's notes, but who had neither seen the witnesses nor heard their evidence? That would be a most lame and impotent conclusion, more likely to encourage party feeling and give latitude to corrupt practices than the present system. The arrangement proposed would lead to nothing being done. What he suggested was that the issue of the Commission should depend on the finding of the Judge, and not on any Address being moved. He was prepared to move the insertion of words in this clause, making the issuing of the Commission obligatory whenever the Judge stated in his Report that he had reason to believe that corrupt practices had prevailed at an election.

MR. J. STUART MILL observed that he had so altered his Amendment as to obviate the difficulty started by the Chairman. He proposed it should run thus—

> "And it shall be competent for any such Commission to inquire how far corrupt practices at any previous municipal Election may have conduced to corrupt practices at the Parliamentary Election."

THE CHAIRMAN felt bound to say that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Westminster, even as it now stood, extended beyond the *bonâ fide* limits of the Bill, and the Committee could not well entertain it. He would therefore suggest that the hon. Member should bring up a clause to the effect stated on the Report.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he would avail himself of that suggestion.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH supported the proposal of the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) and hoped he would frame a clause such as he had described.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he thought that the clause as it stood was very important and valuable in itself, and that, therefore, the Committee would not wish to get rid of it altogether. It proposed to enact that when the Judge should report that corrupt practices extensively prevailed in a county or borough the House should be placed in exactly the same position as it was at present when a Committee made a Report to a similar effect. The Amendment to be proposed by the hon. Member for Westminster would, if substituted for this clause, deprive the House of the discretionary power it had hitherto exercised upon the Report of a Committee being made to it alleging the existence of extensive corrupt practices in a county or borough. It was the more necessary that this discretionary power should be left to the House, seeing that the present Bill made the ratepayers liable for the expenses of the Commission. He therefore hoped that the clause would be allowed to stand.

MR. M. CHAMBERS said, he was afraid that the Judges who were appointed to try these Petitions would be placed in a very awkward and unpleasant position by this Bill; they would first be requested to make a Report as to whether or not corrupt practices extensively prevailed in a borough or county, and when they had made that Report they were to be told that they were not to be believed, and that the whole Inquiry must be gone over again before the House could act in the matter. He thought that a Commission should issue as a matter of course upon the Report of the Judge that corrupt practices were extensively prevalent in a county or borough being made. He did not think that in one case out of ten the Judge would make such a Report, as he would content himself with ascertaining the existence of one or two cases of bribery, and would then make a dry Report to the effect that the seat was vacant by reason of bribery having been committed.

MR. NEATE said, he agreed with the hon. and learned Member who had just spoken that the clause should either be struck out or considerably amended. He was of opinion that a Judge should not be called on to say extra judicially "that he had reason to believe" that bribery extensively prevailed.

MR. WHITBREAD said, he did not think the House could compel the Crown to issue a Commission in these cases. The best plan would be to pass the clause and discuss the question in a separate form. He trusted that the Committee would be allowed to make some progress with the Bill.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he had endeavoured to discuss the provisions of the Bill with a view to rendering it more efficient. No one, he thought, could accuse him of trying in any way to retard its passing. ["Oh!"] He thought that the course now being adopted would render corruption more easy, instead of more difficult; but, finding the Committee against him, he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 18 to 22, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 23 (Service of Petition).

MR. BOUVERIE wished to know whether a Member was to be tapped on the shoulder and served with an Election Petition in the same way that a man was now served with a writ?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he had never understood that tapping on the shoulder was a necessary accompaniment to the serving of a writ.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 24 and 25 *agreed to.*

Clause 26 (Shorthand Writer to attend Trial of Election Petition).

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, he objected to the construction of the clause, which would throw a monopoly of the shorthand writing into the hands of Messrs. Gurney, who already enjoyed the monopoly of the shorthand writing of the House of Commons. Without in the slightest degree wishing to impugn the skill of those gentlemen and their staff he thought that the shorthand writing business arising out of these Inquiries should be thrown open to the shorthand writing profession generally. He suggested that the shorthand writer to attend these Inquiries should be appointed either by the Judge or by the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

Mr. NEATE said, he would move the Amendment of which Notice had been given by the hon. Member for Hereford (Mr. Clive), to leave out—

> "On the trial of an Election Petition under this Act, the shorthand writer of the House of Commons, or his deputy, shall attend, and shall be sworn by the judge faithfully and truly to take down the evidence given at the trial, &c."

and insert—

> "On the trial of an Election Petition under this Act, a shorthand writer shall be appointed by the judge (in the manner hereinafter provided), to attend, and shall be sworn by the judge faithfully and truly to take down the evidence given at the trial, &c."

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he should support the clause as it stood, seeing that if they were to interfere in this way with every small matter in the Bill they had better at once proceed to construct a Bill themselves, and to treat the initiatory action of the Government as amounting to nothing. The shorthand writing of the House of Commons as performed by Messrs. Gurney was incomparably well done. He had never seen any operation of the human mind combined with that of the hand that appeared to him so wonderful as the precision with which the proceedings in the Committees of that House, where the utmost confusion frequently prevailed, were taken down and read off fluently by the shorthand writer. If the Government were to announce that this Bill was merely of a temporary character the greater part of these discussions would at once fall to the ground.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS observed that his object was merely to permit the direct employment of those who now did the work.

Mr. DISRAELI: With the permission of the Committee I will take this opportunity of stating that it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to propose that this shall be a limited Bill, to remain in force for three years only.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 27 *agreed to.*

Clause 28 (Practice of House of Commons to be observed).

Mr. MAGUIRE observed that perhaps this would be the proper time for him to move a proviso, to which he believed the Government would not object. As the Bill stood Parliamentary agents would not be entitled to appear professionally in Election cases before the Judges. The object of his proviso was to provide that agents or counsel now entitled to practise in the House of Commons in respect of election matters, should be entitled to practise before the Judges in respect of similar matters.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he would make some additions to the hon. Member's proviso, and bring it up as a new clause.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 29 *agreed to.*

Clause 30 (Reception of Judge).

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he was about to propose the insertion of words which would throw the expenses of the Court held by the Judge upon the locality whose misconduct had been the cause of the outlay. He apprehended that the object of the House of Commons was to educate public opinion to bear against electoral corruption. With that view he thought it would be well to make the existence of such corruption in any community inconvenient to that community. The presence of a Judge for a short time in a borough was not looked upon as either a disgrace or an inconvenience to that borough. On several occasions the House had seen the anxiety displayed by communities to have their particular locality selected as the assize town. There were festivities of various kinds — including the "Assize Ball"—during the visit of a Judge to a county town. Perhaps next year they should hear of "the Bribery Ball." The House as much as possible ought to avoid giving the smallest ground for the supposition that the visit of the Judge to try a case under this Bill was to be an occasion of merrymaking. He had taken the words of his proviso from those of a clause framed by the Government, and applying to the expenses of a Commission. He was willing to add words providing that where the allegations in the Petition were found to be frivolous and vexatious, the expenses of the inquiry should be borne by the Petitioner.

Page 10, line 25, Amendment proposed,

To leave out the words "by the Commissioners of the Treasury, out of monies provided by Parliament," in order to insert the words "as if they were expenses incurred in the registration of voters for the county or borough,"—(*Mr. James Lowther,*)

—instead thereof.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that no one would go further than he was ready to go in punishing a constituency found guilty of corrupt practices; but the House must take care not to press that principle too far. In their anxiety to suppress corruption they must not do what was unjust. The intention was that a Judge should proceed to the particular borough in order to try whether there had been corrupt practices there or not. Now, the Judge might arrive at the conclusion that the charges were unfounded, and yet not be prepared to hold that they were frivolous and vexatious. There was a great difference between those two findings. Again, the charge of an undue return might be sustained in consequence of five or ten persons in a borough having taken bribes. The general rule was that the country provided the expenses of judicial investigations.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 134; Noes 67: Majority 67.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 31 to 36, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 37 (Withdrawal of Petition and Substitution of new Petitioners).

Mr. AYRTON said, that nothing could be so well contrived as the clause to prevent the presentation of Election Petitions, for which the utmost freedom ought to be allowed; and he moved the omission of the words—

"Subject, as aforesaid, a substituted Petitioner shall stand in the same position as nearly as may be, and be subject to the same liabilities as the original Petitioner."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL observed that it was only where the Judge was of opinion that the withdrawal of a Petition was the result of a corrupt bargain, and that the first surety was a party to the corruption, that in case another Petitioner came forward to prosecute the inquiry, the old sureties would remain liable. He thought that a very proper provision.

Mr. WHITBREAD explained that the Committee intended by this clause to prevent the withdrawal of *boná fide* Petitions; and with this view where the Judge was satisfied that a corrupt bargain existed for the withdrawal of a Petition the clause provided that the £1,000 lodged by the first surety should be impounded and applied, so far as it would go, to pay the legitimate expenses of the inquiry.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. LOWE observed that the sureties were required by the clause to guarantee that the prosecution of the Petition should be effective, and not merely that the expenses should be paid.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that the object of the clause was to prevent the Petition being withdrawn from corrupt motives.

Viscount AMBERLEY thought that the Petition should not be allowed to be withdrawn under any circumstances.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, he could not see how the Judge was to ascertain whether the withdrawal of the Petition was owing to corrupt motives. If he endeavoured to cross-examine the Petitioner the latter might refuse to answer on the ground that he declined to criminate himself, or else one or two witnesses might be brought forward who had no evidence to give, and it might be said that the case had broken down, as in either of these cases the Judge would be helpless.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that the object of the clause was to prevent Petitions being withdrawn in pursuance of corrupt arrangements. The hon. and learned Baronet who had just spoken had shown how it was possible for the ends of justice to be defeated, and the present clause only endeavoured to meet a certain number of the contrivances that might be adopted with that view. A former clause provided for this difficulty, because under it the Judges were enabled from time to time to prescribe rules under which Petitions might be withdrawn. He did not mean to say that there could be no evasions of the Act; but if they desired to prevent the corrupt withdrawal of Petitions it was worth their while to try whether the machinery now devised would not effect that result.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, he was of opinion that the only remedy would be found in the appointment of a public prosecutor.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 38 to 40, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 41 (Respondent not opposing not to appear as Party or to sit).

Mr. BOUVERIE called attention to the fact that there were no means by which the House could be officially informed of the steps taken from time to time affecting seats, and consequently a Member whose seat had been declared vacant might still take part in these proceedings, and vote in important divisions.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL remarked that the means of information were just as great as they were at present.

Mr. BOUVERIE replied that at present the proceedings before Committees needed no notification to the House, because the deliberations and duties of Committees were really deliberations and duties of the House; but in this case they were constituting a new tribunal, with which they would have no connection whatever.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he did not wish to say anything impertinent, but the right hon. Gentleman must remember that the proceedings of the Court would not be transacted in a cellar.

Mr. LOWE remarked, that the objection of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bouverie) ought to be removed by a previous portion of the Bill, where the determination of the Court was ordered to be reported to the Speaker.

Mr. BOUVERIE moved the addition of the following words:—

> "The court or judge shall, in all cases where such notice has been given, in the prescribed time and manner, report the same to the Speaker of the House of Commons."

Mr. HENLEY said, he thought there was an important omission in the clause, because, if the person petitioned against did not choose, from want of means or any other reason, to defend his seat, nobody else could come forward to rebut the charge of bribery and corruption made against the borough.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Henley) would find that that difficulty had already been provided for by an earlier clause.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 42 *agreed to.*

Clause 43 (General Costs of Petition).

Mr. J. STUART MILL proposed, in page 14, line 11, to insert after "on the whole successful" the words—

> "And in the case of any such Petition where any corrupt practice is charged to have taken place, and where the court or judge has decided that any corrupt practice has been proved, the court or judge shall have power to order any portion or the whole of the costs, charges, and expenses to be defrayed by any party or parties who may have been proved guilty of corrupt practices, or by the county or borough, in the same manner as expenses incurred in the registration of voters for the county or borough, regard being had to the importance of securing the best efforts of the county or borough for repression of corrupt practices.
>
> "In the case of any Petition complaining of general or extensive prevalence of corrupt practices, if the court or judge shall be of opinion that there was reasonable and probable ground for its allegations, the petitioner or petitioners shall be relieved of all costs, charges, and expenses incurred in and about the inquiry, and it shall be in the power of the court or judge to distribute the said costs, charges, and expenses in such proportions as it or he may think fit between parties who shall have been found guilty of corrupt practices, or who shall have caused expense by vexatious conduct, unfounded allegations, or unfounded objections, and the county or borough, as the case may be, the expenses charged on the county or borough to be defrayed in the same manner as expenses incurred in the registration of voters for the county or borough."

The principle of this Amendment is that to bring to light, and prosecute to conviction, acts of bribery or other corruption at elections, is a public service; and that, being a public service, those who are judicially decided to have performed that service ought not to be required to pay the expenses of it from their private purse. It is enough that they take upon themselves the risk of failing to establish the charge, which, we all know, may easily, and does frequently, happen when it is perfectly notorious that the charge is true. But when it has been proved true, and is judicially declared to be so proved, I maintain that the Petitioners have a clear moral right to be indemnified for the expense. Their first claim, no doubt, is upon the parties who, through their instrumentality, have been found guilty; but the Judge may not always think fit to inflict even upon proved corruption, so heavy a penalty as the entire expenses of the Petition; and it will often happen that the parties have not the means of paying it. I propose, therefore that the Judge should have the power of apportioning the expense in whatever manner he deems most just, between the persons convicted of corrupt practices, and the county or borough.

Mr. AYRTON remarked, with reference to the earlier part of the clause, that, as persons would be less able to inform themselves of their grounds of action through the shortening of time during which a Petition could be presented, a provision making the payment of costs depend upon the event would almost entirely prevent Petitions being presented.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the Petitioner did not pay costs unless the Committee decided his proceedings had been vexatious. The Committee desired on the one hand to put an end to corrupt practices; but at the same time to protect a Member from improper Petitions. The Judge was vested with a discretion as to awarding costs.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed, and he did not believe the hon. Member would press it when he understood what it comprehended. It actually gave the Judge power to award costs against any man whom another might have charged with bribery under circumstances in which he could offer no defence. Any voter might go before the Judge and say, without the least foundation, "Such a one offered me a sum of money." He was sure, too, the latter part of the Amendment went far beyond the intention of the hon. Member.

Mr. J. STUART MILL asked, whether since Judges could be trusted to decide cases of political importance, the Attorney General believed they could not be trusted to exercise proper caution in awarding costs?

Mr. LOWE thought costs, properly so called, could only fall on persons who, as parties to the suit, could be heard; here, however, was a proposal to impose an arbitrary fine on persons not parties to a suit, and having no power to make themselves heard. The same remark applied to the borough or county as to persons, and the only possible precedent which could be quoted in support of either case was that of making an attorney pay costs for improper conduct in a suit.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 44 *agreed to.*

Clause 45 (Punishment of Candidate guilty of Bribery).

Mr. POWELL observed that there was surplusage in the use of the word "personally," as referring to the person guilty of bribery.

Mr. J. STUART MILL moved, in page 14, line 35, to leave out the word "bribery," in order to insert the words "corrupt practice" in its stead. "Corrupt practice" were the words used generally throughout the Bill as a description of the offence with which the measure dealt. His object was to extend the operation of the clause to persons guilty of treating or of intimidation.

Page 14, line 32:—Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "bribery," in order to insert the words "any corrupt practice,"—(*Mr. Mill,*)—instead thereof.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that the Amendment would effect a very important change in the Bill. The question raised by the hon. Member for Westminster had been very fully discussed and considered by the Select Committee, and that Committee thought it would be going too far to exclude a man from the House of Commons for seven years because he had been found guilty of treating or guilty of intimidation. That penalty was by the clause now under discussion inflicted on any person found guilty of bribery.

Viscount AMBERLEY observed that treating was bribery by means of eating and drinking, and therefore it was morally as bad as bribery by payment of money.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he hoped the Government would not assent to the proposed Amendment. He did not think that a punishment which was almost as bad as transportation for seven years should be inflicted merely for giving a man half-a-crown to get something to drink.

Mr. FAWCETT hoped the hon. Member for Westminster would persevere with his clause.

Mr. CLAY thought that intimidation was even worse than bribery.

Question put, "That the word 'bribery' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 175; Noes 80: Majority 95.

Mr. POWELL proposed to leave out in page 14, line 37, the words "during the seven years" to the end of the clause, with the view of adding the words "or sitting in Parliament for such county or borough during the Parliament then in existence." He observed that the Bill as now drawn did not retain the provision that a candidate found guilty of malpractices by himself or his agents should be incapable of sitting in the House of Commons during the then existing Parliament for the same constituency. He thought that a just and wise provision. Else a candidate unseated on Petition might at a subsequent election—that election being a pure election, and therefore free from attack—be returned by force and by virtue of that very corruption which had vitiated the former return. The Amendment raised the whole of the large question whether a single Judge sitting alone without a jury should have the power of depriving a citizen of his civil rights. A man so charged was entitled to a trial by jury. Before a citizen was found guilty of such an offence, and was subjected to such a punishment, his trial should proceed, not on a collateral and accidental issue, but on a fair issue fairly raised, and the verdict should be arrived at after careful investigation by a jury under the guidance of a Judge in reference to the special and individual case. It was not necessary for him to enlarge on the horrible nature of the punishment which sent a man forth into the world deprived of all that made life worth having, by rendering him incapable of sitting in Parliament for seven years. It had been found that extreme severity of punishment defeated its own object, and he was of opinion that an English citizen should not be liable to suffer this punishment by the sentence of a Judge sitting without a jury. He therefore proposed to omit from the clause the words rendering the candidate with whose knowledge and consent bribery had, in the opinion of the Judge, been committed, "incapable of being elécted to and of sitting in the House of Commons during the seven years next after the date of his being found guilty;" and to substitute for them a provision rendering such candidate incapable "of sitting in Parliament for such county or borough during the Parliament then in existence."

Amendment proposed,

In line 37, to leave out from the word "Commons" to the end of the Clause, in order to add the words "or sitting in Parliament for such county or borough during the Parliament then in existence,"—(*Mr. Powell,*)

—instead thereof.

Mr. Powell

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER said, that the observations of the hon. and learned Member directed attention to a matter which it was necessary should be properly understood. It was desirable to know whether it was intended by the clause to repeal altogether the present law, which declared that, if a candidate were found guilty of bribery, treating, or undue influence, by himself or his agents, he should be incapable of sitting in the House of Commons during the Parliament then existing. The Committee would observe that agency was not mentioned in the present clause, and that omission would have the effect of operating as a very great stimulus and encouragement to bribery in those cases where the present law discouraged such offences. The unpopularity of the persons who spent large sums of money in corrupt practices was not so great as the advocates of purity of election might desire, and if a candidate who had committed bribery were allowed to stand again for the same place where the bribery had been practised, it would be ten to one in many cases that he would be returned. In abolishing Election Committees it was manifest that, if the House intended to retain the substance of the existing law, some words must be introduced into the Bill to make the present consequences of agency applicable to a person convicted by a Judge.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL stated that the intention of the Bill was that the penalty in the case of a candidate personally guilty of bribery should be more severe than at present; but it was not intended to alter the law applicable to candidates guilty of bribery by their agents, and he would, in order to preclude all doubt on the point, undertake to bring up a clause relating to the matter upon the Report.

Mr. LOWE thought that the clause seemed framed with undue severity. An immense penalty was annexed to the offence mentioned in the clause, and they were obliged to exaggerate the character of the offence before they could bring themselves to assent to the penalty. The clause stated that where, by the report of a Judge upon an Election Petition, it should be found that bribery had been committed with the knowledge or consent of a candidate, such candidate should be deemed to have been personally guilty of bribery. They might say that, but their saying so did not make the candidate personally guilty, though by the use of those words they might seek to excuse themselves for providing so heavy a penalty. In the case of murder they might say that any person with whose consent or knowledge murder was committed should be deemed personally guilty of murder; but that was not law. Such a person was not a principal, but an accessory. This constrained construction being put on the Act mentioned in the clause, the penalty imposed was seven years' exclusion from the House of Commons. The penalty here would be worse than transportation for life to some persons. It would be extremely wrong to put this tremendous power into the hands of a single Judge. They would defeat their own object, for no Judge would ever take on himself the responsibility of saying what he might think in his own mind, because he would shrink from the consequences it would involve. But let them look at the matter with reference to political expediency. They were not saying that every man who had done this must be dealt with after a certain manner, but everyone who had been proved to have done it. There was the difficulty of deciding what was true and false on such testimony as was given in these cases; it was not on the fact of a man having done it, but of the witnesses being able to impress the mind of a Judge that he had done it, they were proceeding. There were Gentlemen sitting in that House whose presence there was most important to the interests of party and the interests of the nation; and there was hardly anything that might not be contrived by wicked and unscrupulous persons to procure their absence. Yet their absence during the past seven years, and still more during the next seven years, would revolutionize and alter the whole history of the country. Everything would depend on the presence or absence of those two Gentlemen; and would they leave so tremendous an issue to be decided in this manner? He could not reconcile his mind to such a conclusion. He did not stand there as an advocate of those who gave or took bribes; but by such arbitrary and harsh constructions they strained the laws into what they were not; and their penalties, being utterly wild, violent, and extravagant, would not check bribery, but rather enable many to escape the stigma justly due to their misconduct. They would act much more wisely by leaving these matters to be dealt with as they had been already—not to outrun, but trusting to the force of public opinion to put down this offence. He was quite sure that here, as in all other cases, laws too severe and extravagant had only a tendency to defeat themselves.

MR. AYRTON said, he thought the observations of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) struck at the root of the whole Bill. Observations very much to the same effect had been made on many of the clauses of the Bill; but it was only now the right hon. Gentleman had arrived at a conclusion as to the real character of the Bill, and denounced it as a most deplorable calamity. They were attempting to combine a civil and criminal suit — to blend two very different things, and involving such tremendous penalties as seven years' ostracism from the House of Commons. But the objection of the right hon. Gentleman came somewhat late. After constructing the most excellent tribunal they could by possibility devise, and entitled to every confidence, they suddenly turned round, and would not allow justice to take its course. He, on the other hand, maintained they were bound to accept the legitimate consequences of what they had done in the penal character of the clause.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he found that the clause now under discussion was accepted by the Committee on the Corrupt Practices Bill last year *nem. con.* Seventeen Members were present, and fifteen Members of the Committee voted for it, among whom was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne.

MR. LOWE: I did not vote for it.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The Motion was made and the Question put—

> "That it is desirable that persons found guilty of bribery or reported by the Judge or Commissioners as having been guilty of bribery should, notwithstanding any indemnity, be for seven years incapacitated from being elected as Members of Parliament, or voting for Members of Parliament, or holding municipal offices, or being included in a Commission of the Peace."

That question was put at the instance of the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Russell Gurney), and agreed to. Of course he was not able to say, from the report of the proceedings, whether the right hon. Gentleman had before then left the room.

MR. LOWE: I did leave the Committee-room.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The right hon. Gentleman was there immediately before.

Mr. LOWE: I was.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No Member of the Committee took exception to the Resolution. Of course, it was open to any Member of the Committee to change his mind.

Mr. LOWE: I did not change my mind on that matter.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER did not say that the right hon. Gentleman had changed his mind. But he did not record his vote against the proposition. With regard to the question whether it was desirable to have such a provision he would say a few words. Why was money spent in bribery? The object to be attained was a seat in that House; and if it were provided that on Members being convicted of spending money illegally in order to obtain a seat in Parliament that object would be defeated, very strong discouragement would be given to bribery. No doubt there might be combinations and conspiracies to prove distinguished Members of the House guilty of bribery; but they must trust, as in other cases, to the acumen of the tribunal to detect and defeat those conspiracies.

Mr. CLAY said, he hoped that the Government would not be induced to consent to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell), which proposed to place the man who was cognizant of bribery being committed for him with the individual who was so unfortunate as to have over-zealous friends who bribed on his behalf, but without his knowledge. He doubted whether seven years' exclusion was a sufficient punishment for those who had been guilty of bribery.

Mr. PAULL said, he was afraid that the words of the clause would not carry the punishment intended.

Mr. WHITBREAD, as a Member of the Committee, explained that the penal clauses had been very much discussed, and that the right hon. Member for Calne voted with the minority against them. The best course would be to withdraw the penal clauses, and to leave the law upon the point as it now stood.

Mr. SANDFORD said, he thought it was not just to treat an accessory in the same manner as a principal, although it appeared the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Clay) was incapable of understanding the distinction.

Mr. HENLEY said, he thought the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Powell), both on grounds of justice and expediency, was a good one. After the stigma had been cast upon a man, all the witnesses might admit that they had made a mistake, or might be convicted of perjury, yet there would be no means of setting him right for seven years. He should like to know how long such a regulation would remain in force after one of the Leaders of that House was excluded under this provision. The best way would be to leave the period of exclusion in the discretion of the Judges who tried the Petition.

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he thought the stigma resulted from the conviction of the offence, and not from the punishment inflicted by the tribunal. The real foundation of all who spoke against the clause was want of trust in the tribunal. He did not include the right hon. Member for Calne in the number, for he had been all along in favour of the tribunal. The Amendment did not provide against the candidate trying his fortune in another borough or county; for it might happen that the reputation which a candidate had acquired in this respect would tell in his favour in a locality where bribery was valued.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 197; Noes 26: Majority 171.

Viscount AMBERLEY moved that the Chairman report Progress.

Mr. MONK asked whether the Bill would be taken as the first Order on resuming Business this evening?

Mr. DISRAELI said, he hoped the noble Lord (Viscount Amberley) would withdraw his Motion that the clause might be agreed to.

Viscount AMBERLEY said, he would withdraw his Motion.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 46 (Penalty for employing corrupt Agent).

Mr. POWELL, said, he wished to limit the words, to prevent candidates from being entangled by acts of which they were not conscious. Under the clause it might be considered that, by the most casual proceeding, a candidate had engaged a person to act for him. He therefore proposed to insert after the word "engaged," the words "as an agent."

MR. CANDLISH moved that the Chairman report Progress.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday*, at Twelve of the clock.

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH stated that, through the wrong Paper being placed in the Chairman's hands, a much smaller sum was voted for Greenwich Hospital last night than was actually required, that being the last Vote that was taken. In order to remedy this he would move that the Report of Supply take precedence of the other Orders.

Resolutions *reported :*

First Thirteen Resolutions read a second time, and *agreed to.*

Fourteenth Resolution read a second time, and *re-committed* to the Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. CHILDERS said, he rose to call the attention of the House to the extent, cost, and classification of the Civil Service. Premising that on account of the late period of the Session, to which, in order that certain Returns might be prepared, the question had been deferred, he was unwilling to delay the progress of the Estimates, and should not therefore address the House at so great a length as he had originally intended, he remarked that although there had recently been debates upon particular portions of the Civil Service, the entire subject of its organization had not been discussed for some time past. The present, he thought, was an appropriate time for considering it, for this was the end of a Parliament and of an electoral system, and the impending change would undoubtedly lead to considerable alterations in the manner of dealing with the public expenditure and public Departments. He was anxious, too, at a moment when our finances were not in a condition to afford any increase in these charges, to strengthen the hands of the Government; for an increase had unfortunately of late been the rule. Moreover, the new system of examinations, whether competitive or test examinations — the result of the labours of two very valuable civil servants some years ago—had been in operation long enough to show what its effect had been upon the service, and whether any amendment was required. Another reason for considering the question at the present time was that whereas some years since only a fraction of our civil expenditure was included in the Estimates —owing to the charges on the Consolidated Fund, the Civil List, and various fee and other funds not coming directly under the cognizance of Parliament—we had gradually brought the whole of it, with the exception of the Court of Chancery and one or two minor Departments, and the charges of the Judges and great Officers of State, within the annual Votes. The House was thus able, on the face of the Estimates, to ascertain the charge of the Civil Service, and to deal with it as a whole. In the suggestions and criticisms he was about to offer, he wished it to be understood that he did not wish to interfere with any existing vested interests, or with the fair claims of any member of the service; for he thought the inadvertent neglect of this rule when making great changes had had a mischievous effect. His principle, too, in dealing with these great establishments would be to economize, not by here and there cutting £50 or £100 off salaries, but by endeavouring to reduce the numbers where the charge was too great; and he thought he should be able to show that there was an excellent opportunity for an enterprizing Chancellor of the Exchequer of making such reductions. He would proceed to give the House some figures as to the expense and condition of the Civil Service, meaning by that term the body of persons employed in the Government service in civil capacities, and charged directly or indirectly on the Consolidated Fund or the Votes of Parliament—including members of the Judicial, Legal, and Police establishments, the Revenue Departments, and the civilians employed in the army and navy, but excluding all officers, whether combatants or non-combatants, provided for in the Votes for the Army and Navy. He would now give to the House the present charge and the present number, as accurately as he had been able to obtain them. And here he would say that he had to thank his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who with great kindness had placed at his disposal the resources of the Treasury, and enabled him to obtain those figures, if not quite accurately, yet as nearly so as it was possible to do in the case of such vast establishments. The state of things was this — The salaries, wages, payments for services in the shape of remuneration, stipends, or whatever else it might be called, in the Civil Service proper amounted altogether to £1,855,000 a year. The similar payments in our Judicial and Police establishments amounted to £2,833,000. The payments in our Revenue Departments for the same services amounted to £3,280,000 a year; and the payments of civilians, strictly so called, in the Naval and Military Departments, or in other words, in the War Office, the Admiralty, and the Dockyards, amounted to £2,868,000 a year. The House was therefore dealing with no less a sum than £10,839,000 a year in respect of the civil expenditure of the country. The House would be interested in comparing that sum with the strictly Military Votes or the Votes for the pay and allowances of the combatant and noncombatant forces of the army and navy. Separate Votes were taken in the Army and Navy Estimates for the pay and provisions of the officers and men of the two forces; and these together made up a sum of £8,785,000. Therefore, the expenditure for what were strictly speaking civil salaries and wages exceeded by no less than £2,000,000 the entire annual charge for pay and allowances of the officers and men of the army and navy. [General PEEL asked the number of men included in the Returns.] He was on the point of giving this information. There were 650 persons in the higher grades of the four divisions of the Civil Service who received annual salaries to the amount in all of £1,092,000 a year. Of course, he excluded from this the officers near the person of the Sovereign charged on the Civil List. There were 364 clerks receiving altogether as salaries £368,000, and here he was only taking clerks of the highest grade, with salaries of, or above, £800 a year. Then there were 13,808 clerks and others receiving salaries under £800 a year, which made a sum of £3,369,214; so that there were altogether in the Civil Service 14,822 persons employed receiving salaries to the extent of £4,830,392. Then there were on wages 79,554 persons who received £4,448,106. Both classes made a total of 94,376 persons, who received from the State £9,278,498. In addition to that the State had to pay for clerical assistance a sum of £154,131, and for salaries and allowances to persons not entirely, but only partially, paid from Imperial funds £1,406,392. The sum total, therefore, amounted to £10,839,021. But we not only paid this large sum to our sivil servants, but we allowed in the shape of civil pensions and superannuations a very large sum besides. There was for this purpose a charge on the Consolidated Fund of £352,000; Civil Votes for Police, £118,000; for others, £255,000; Law Funds, £50,000; Revenue Votes, £468,000; Army Votes, £135,000; Navy Votes, £223,000; making a total of £1,601,000, which, added to the charge for salaries, &c., gave a grand total of £12,440,000. He did not think there was any country in the world in which so large an expenditure was made in the Civil Service at the present time. It was exceedingly difficult to make a comparison in this respect with foreign countries. In the case of France, as the House well knew, the whole expenditure of the Administration, with very slight exceptions indeed, was charged upon the public Revenues, not as in this country, in which the charge to a very great extent was borne on the county, borough, and other local rates. He had said that he could not make a complete comparison of our civil expenditure with the civil expenditure of France; but he had taken some pains to compare the cost of one branch—that of the administration of justice—in both countries. The items of cost for the administration of justice in France was as follows:—Salaries—Department, £23,000; Cour de Cassation, £47,000; Cours Imperiales, £279,000; Cours d'Assises, £6,000; Tribunaux de Prèmiere Instance, £410,000; Tribunaux de Commerce, £7,000; Tribunaux de Police, £3,000; Juges de Paix, £315,000—£1,090,000; other expenses, £245,000—total, £1,335,000. The cost of the administration of justice in England was as follows:—Chancery, £180,000; Common Law, £182,000; Probate and Admiralty, £106,000; Bankruptcy, £120,000; County Courts, £491,000; Police Courts, £41,000; all other Courts, £33,000; prosecutions, £212,000; sundry expenses, £50,000; total for England, £1,415,000. In Scotland—Courts, £205,000. In Ireland — Courts £244,000; prosecutions, £18,000; sundry, £32,000; total fo

Ireland, £294,000. Total for the United Kingdom, £1,924,000; and if the £315,000 (the salaries of the Juges de Paix), was, as in fairness it ought to be, deducted for the purposes of comparison from the French Estimate, the result was, that our Estimate was nearly £1,000,000 in excess of that of France. Now, what were the real facts as to our civil expenditure? There was no doubt that within the last twenty or twenty-five years that expenditure had greatly increased. It had not increased in the years from 1861 to 1865, but it had gone on increasing within the last two or three years. He did not say that at the present time by way of reflection on anyone, but it was impossible to deny that the tendency for the last twenty-five years had been in the direction of a steady increase in our civil charges. He had tried to compare English with foreign expenditure, and also the expenditure of particular Departments at home with one another. It was exceedingly difficult to do so, because the system had altered very much of late years. There were Departments, however, as to which you could legitimately compare their state in 1853 and their state now. For example, the Foreign Office, in 1853, employed fifty-one persons; it now employed eighty-five. In 1853 the Colonial Office, before the great colonial changes, which one would have thought would have reduced the staff there, employed thirty-seven persons; now it employed fifty-three. The Department of Works then employed thirty-seven persons; now it employed eighty-four. Again, in 1853, the expenditure of the Admiralty Office proper was £122,000; it was now £182,000, showing an increase of £60,000. On the other hand, the Treasury, where eighty-four persons were employed in 1853, now had eighty-five; and in the Pay Office at both periods there were seventy-three persons. It was not therefore impossible in some Departments to keep down this increase of numbers and of expense. In the other cases mentioned, to his mind the increase was such that nobody could wonder if the Civil Service Estimates showed the effects of it. It was impossible, without an immense amount of trouble and of official knowledge — which, of course, at the present moment he did not possess— to compare the total expenditure in the Civil Service at the two periods, because there had been so many transfers of charge from the Consolidated Fund to the Votes, and from the Naval and Military Votes to the Civil Votes, and so on, that the mere figures, if quoted, would only deceive the House. But he had adduced facts which could be substantiated, and those facts evidently deserved the attention of the Government. One of the principal evils in the Civil Service, as at present constituted, sprung from the entire want of systematic classification in the different salaries of public servants. There were not two Departments in which civil servants of the same class had the same rates and augmentations of salaries. When he was at the Treasury he examined into this question in reference to one Department — the warehousing Department of the Customs—and there he found not less than eighteen varieties of classification, with different minimums, different maximums, different augmentations, and different proportions of salary, so that an officer had eighteen different sets of chances with reference to his promotion. The same system prevailed in other Departments. Now, he did not mean to say that the whole service should be classified in the same way; but at present there was an entire want of system, in spite of the exertions of the Treasury. Such a state of things produced the worst results, because it led to constant complaints and grumbling on the part of the officers; and when complaints and grumbling prevailed the public service could not be satisfactorily carried on. The next evil was the want of a sufficient distinction between officers who worked with their brains and officers who worked with their hands. One common word "clerk" was applied to gentlemen of the highest education, whose information and ability rendered immense service to their country, and men who were well paid at £100 or £150 a year for the merest routine work. This want of a distinction between brain and hand work was a greater cause of difficulty than that to which he had just alluded. And he would give a practical illustration of the mistakes made even recently in not recognizing this distinction. There were formerly in the Customs two distinct classes of officers—the one known as landing waiters and gaugers, men of considerable education, who rose to £400 or £500 a year, and even to the highest posts in the Customs; and below them were weighers, tidewaiters, and inferior officers. For a reason which, he admitted, possessed considerable weight, these two classes had been practically amalgamated. You now had the landing officers, who were the old landing waiters and gaugers, and the out-door officers, who were the weighers and tidewaiters; and all appointments to the superior were made from the inferior class, so that no landing waiters could obtain employment unless they had passed through the inferior class of out-door officers. The result was that you had far too good men as out-door officers, and you would find a difficulty by-and-by in obtaining sufficiently good men as landing officers. There was a story—he did not know whether it was anything but a story—that a high wrangler at Cambridge, who might have been a Fellow at one of the small Colleges, was to be found among those doing the duty of weighers, because he hoped by-and-by to become a landing waiter, with a superior salary. The effect, also, of the competitive system of examination was gradually to raise the standard, and thus to give you too high a class of men for the simple duties which inferior officers had to perform. He was in favour of competitive examination for the class of persons for whom it was originally intended; but he thought that in the case of minor appointments, from which there was no promotion to the establishment, it should be left to the heads of Departments to engage or dismiss upon their own responsibility. At present you got men who were above their work and were always asking for increase of pay. Examination and even competitive examination was very well in the right place; but he was not for competitive examination run mad, and he feared that the system was tending in that direction. Another evil was the want of any systematic control over the expenditure of Departments and over the salaries and numbers of public servants. What was the case with regard to our legal Department? Who was responsible for the legal arrangements of the country? The Treasury knew nothing about them until an application was made; the Home Office would repudiate all responsibility; the Attorney General was overwhelmed with work, and did not attempt administrative functions; the Lord Chancellor had no charge in the matter, and thus there was nobody who was responsible for the financial arrangements of our Courts of Justice. The result was an expenditure of from £300,000 to £500,000 more than was necessary; and if we had a Minister upon whom we could call to redress abuses these things might be remedied. With a responsible Minister for instance there could hardly have been such a scandal as the Middlesex Registry and its three sinecures created since the so-called reform of the Law Departments. An evil which it was delicate to allude to was the absence of interference on the part of the House. Instead of endeavouring to repress extravagance, hon. Members were perpetually urging greater expenditure at the instance of individuals or Departments; thus the Treasury had to do that which the House ought to do; and, in the absence of proper Parliamentary interference and support, the Treasury was becoming, as a Department, unpopular with the other Departments, and much of its time expended on contests with other offices, to the detriment of its efficiency as the highest authority on general questions of finance. He therefore ventured to say that the House ought to interfere to a greater extent than it did in the direction of enforcing economy in the public Departments. Another evil in the Civil Service which must be looked into before long was unnecessary superannuation. The object of superannuation was two-fold. One was to retain valuable public servants and not expose them to the temptation of more remunerative employment, and the other to provide in old age for those who might have given more time to the public than to their own affairs and so prevent them being turned out as beggars into the streets. Of the two objects the former was of course the more important; and the latter would become insignificant, as the facilities for making provision for old age through companies or the Government annuity system became better known. But we applied the system to a mass of public servants as to whom it was a matter of comparative indifference whether they left the service or not. The practical effect was we did not get those servants for any less pay than we should get them for if there were no superannuation; and the very fact of its being looked forward to as a sort of vested right did harm instead of good, because it led us to retain inefficient public servants. We ought to confine superannuation to the higher ranks of the service—to those working with the brain. In the other ranks it would be desirable to introduce the system of deductions from salaries, the amount paid in to be returned with interest when a man left the service. To add the right of superannuation to a salary when the office could be adequately filled without the superannuation was to a great extent to throw money away. He now came to the remedies he would propose. First, he would give all public servants to understand that if they could reduce their numbers, the reduction should be taken into account in dealing with their salaries. He believed that if this were done, in many instances two public servants would be able to do work which now required three. Next a clear distinction should be drawn between clerks and writers, between brainwork and handwork. In the clerical part of the service we should extend the system adopted in the Admiralty and Customs of employing an inferior class of men as writers, and paying them by the day, without any right to superannuation, and with power to discharge them if their services were not satisfactory. We might certainly carry out this plan much further than we did in the Military and Naval Departments, and he should like to see soldiers employed upon work for which we paid at the rate of three or four times as much as a soldier's pay. The third remedy he proposed was simplification of class. It was possible by degrees to lay down a rule as to classification, which, of course, would not apply to all Departments equally, but still one which would prevent enormous additions to our expenditure. Fourthly, for the future when persons as to whom we did not require the present system of superannuation entered the service, he would give them no right to superannuation; but would treat them as we treat a large number of persons in the dockyards, in fact all the officers and men in the factories, who remained in the service just as much as they would if they were entitled to superannuation. In this way we should in process of time save between £750,000 and £1,000,000. The last remedy he would propose was that the House should, by its own efforts, endeavour to increase the control of the Treasury, and enable them to carry out those financial reforms which, if they were well-treated by this House he knew the Treasury was capable of carrying out. In making these suggestions he meant to convey no reflection upon right hon. Gentlemen opposite. It was not a party but an economical question which was involved; it was simply how the House could best discharge one of its most important functions; and if he had done no more for the present than direct the attention of some hon. Members to the subject his object would have been gained.

DEPARTMENTS OF PUBLIC HEALTH, &c.

RESOLUTION.

SIR J. CLARKE JERVOISE rose to move—

> "That it is expedient that the Departments of Public Health, Cattle Plague, and Quarantine should cease to exist as Establishments, due regard being had to all personal interests and to all individual claims."

He reminded the House that this was no new subject with him. He had addressed the House more than once on the subject of the public health, though he had not been able to make himself intelligible to the noble Lord at the head of the Department (Lord Robert Montagu) who fancied on one occasion that in referring to the illness of the Minister for War, he was referring to his official conduct. The case of the Minister for War or of Prince Arthur proved that the remedies of the noble Lord were of no avail. It was not from faulty vaccination, for it might be said of them, what Hood said of Miss Kilmansegg—

> "In short she was born, and bred, and nurst,
> And dressed in the best from the very first,
> To please the genteelest censor;
> And then, as soon as strength would allow,
> Was vaccinated, as babes are now,
> With virus taken from the best bred cow
> Of Lord Althorp's, now Lord Spencer."

The failure of the precautions in the case of the right hon. Gentleman and the illustrious Prince was a proof of the practical inutility of the Department. He contended that the whole of the establishments referred to were based upon a theory which was easily refuted by the Sixth Report of the Medical Officers of the Privy Council, and a vast expense had been incurred without any corresponding results. Some time ago it was determined to employ special conveyances for persons taken to the hospitals; but the very first one that refused to employ them was the Smallpox Hospital. Passing from that point to the cattle plague, he contended that the employment of special railway cars had failed, because, it was not in the cars but in the conveyance of cattle that the so-called infection lay. He denied altogether that the cattle plague had been communicated by infected cattle imported from abroad. The doctrine of the Privy Council was not founded on scientific grounds. ["Agreed!"] As for quarantine, the Vice President of Council on Education had stated that it was not established for sanitary purposes.

When the Estimates were brought forward he should move that the expense charged for these Departments should be disallowed and the establishments suppressed.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he had failed to observe the hon. Baronet's Notice on the Paper; otherwise he would have risen immediately after his hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) had concluded his speech. With regard to the observations of the hon. Baronet, he understood that for some time the Treasury had been considering the question, whether there might not be a further reduction in the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council. He believed that if the provisions of the Metropolitan Cattle Market Bill should be carried out it would enable the Treasury to effect a considerable reduction in the expenses of that Department. But, apart from the question, whether that should be carried or not, the Treasury were considering whether a reduction could not be made. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Member for Pontefract, (Mr. Childers) he thought the hon. Gentleman had done good service in calling the attention of the House to the regulations with respect to the Civil Service. The hon. Gentleman had referred to the large amount of salaries and pensions, and the figures to which he had called the attention of the House, showed that this was a matter of no little importance. He had compared the number of persons employed at the present day in the different Departments of the Civil Service with the number employed some years ago; but he had himself admitted most candidly that that comparison would be imperfect unless you went into all the causes of increase, and into the different duties assigned to the Departments now in contrast with the duties assigned then. Anyone who had followed the course of legislation for the last few years must be aware that the tendency had been to require a much greater supervision over different branches of trade, of agriculture, and of the other descriptions of employment in which the population of this country was engaged, than had been required formerly. There was now a close inspection of the factories in which young persons and children were engaged in manufacturing operations. Now, such supervision required an increased number of civil servants and an enlarged organization. Again, there had been a rapid progress in luxury and refinements. Persons were content a few years ago to live in a much more frugal way than they did now. Persons now required luxuries and refinements which a few years ago were only enjoyed by those in a higher grade than they occupied. All those circumstances tended to increase the expenditure for the Civil Service. He was not at all sure, either, whether those additional luxuries did not make persons in the Civil Service think that the hours formerly spent in public offices were too long, that so constant an attention to business as had formerly been paid to it was irksome, and that they ought to be afforded more frequent opportunities of absenting themselves from duty. In fact, there was much greater luxury in every department of life now than there had been in the days of our fathers. There was more luxurious living and a greater number of hours and days were spent in pleasure; and the effect was felt in increased demands on the public purse. He thought all that must be taken into account. Not only had the salaries of different officers been raised, but more persons were required to do the work. He thought it probable that something might be done in the way of reducing the number of persons employed in the public service; but, as regarded salaries, he could assure the House that the Treasury was the great keeping down Department. He had heard it alleged that the Treasury was the spending Department; but it was in the other Departments—more particularly the War Department and the Admiralty—the great expenditure took place. If any hon. Gentlemen attended even for one day in the Treasury he would hear there the constant cries of "Give, give, give," and "Lend, lend, lend," followed on the part of the Office by the reply, "No, no, no." But, with great respect, he must say that in its efforts to keep down the public expenditure, the Treasury was not always backed up by the House of Commons. It was true that in Parliament loud complaints were made of the amount of that expenditure; but when pensions and salaries were brought under the notice of hon. Members the tendency of the House was to increase those charges. His right hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Queen's County constantly blamed the Treasury for refusing to make certain payments—[General DUNNE: Hear, hear!]—but it was his belief that if hon. Members supported the Treasury in its attempts to keep down the public expenditure, they would do much more good than they could possibly do by making abstract speeches and so forth. His hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract had compared the expenses connected with the administration of justice here with the expenses connected with the administration of justice in France. He had said he possessed no means of making a comparison between any other items in the Civil Service expenditure of the two countries. Now, he did not go so far as his hon. Friend, because he thought he had no means of making a comparison between the two items compared by his hon. Friend. He believed that the administration of justice in this country and the administration of justice in France proceeded on different principles. He thought it quite likely that under a system by which the administration of justice was so much centralized that administration might cost much less than it did in our country, where to a very great extent it was localized. But that which satisfied France might not satisfy England. It was of the last importance that a country should be satisfied with the system under which justice was administered to its people, and therefore this was one of the things in respect of which we must have regard to quality as well as to quantity. He confessed that to a great extent he went with his hon. Friend, as regarded the competitive system. He believed that when we carried it into the very low branches of the Civil Service we made a mistake. In these branches our object was to get men of good character, and trustworthy. Of course it was necessary that they should have a certain amount of education to enable them to perform their duties; but the effect of going too low with competitive examinations was to get men who were above their work. A man who passed a competitive examination, and was then appointed to a humble position, said—"I have passed an examination and obtained so many marks. I am entitled to something better than this." The consequence was that he became a discontented man. He was not content to give his services for the salary which had been paid to the man who had preceded him. He believed that the feeling to which he had just referred was at the bottom of a good deal of the discontent in the Civil Service. Therefore, while admitting the utility of competitive examinations in the higher branches, he did not think they should run the system too far. His hon. Friend had spoken of the want of classification. A good deal might be said on that score; but he did not know a more difficult question with which the Treasury had to deal than that of the adjustment of the duties and the salaries of officers in the Civil Service. The matter was one on which scarcely any two persons could be found to agree. The classifications of Departments and of ranks on some general principle was matter to which he had been turning his attention for a long time; but though in theory such a classification was one which recommended itself, in practice it presented serious difficulties. It could not be started without leaving vested interests untouched. In almost every Department a place had to be made for some person, who, though not properly coming within it, was really indispensable to the office. It would be almost impossible to lay down any rule to which there would be no exceptions. If a uniform system were established, and regard were had to vested interests, the rule so established could not be carried out for a century, or for fifteen or twenty years at least; and before then, some new notion might spring up, which would make another change absolutely necessary. Those were very considerable difficulties in a practical point of view; and although the theory might do very well if they were starting with a *tabula rasa* in a new society, yet, in an old country like this, with different Departments which had grown up from time to time, and where the existing staff had had their salaries fixed with reference to their special duties, the difficulties in establishing such a system would almost appal anybody who attempted it. At all events, it could only be done by means of a Commission, going not only into the question of the salaries of the different Departments, but also into the duties of almost every officer, and certainly of every class of officer in them. The subject was really one of vast dimensions, and he confessed that he almost thought it would be better to leave pretty well alone than to embark upon an unknown sea. At that hour of the night he would not trespass further on the time of the House, as he wished to get into Committee; but the question was one on which it was possible to speak at almost any length; and if he did not follow the hon. Member further into it, it was from no disrespect towards him, nor from any want of appreciation of the importance of the subject. He thanked him for bringing the question forward, and he hoped that the hon. Member's remarks would not be without their effect on the House when they were considering questions of salaries and pensions.

Motion *negatived.*

COURTS OF APPEAL—ASSESSED TAXES.

QUESTION.

MR. TREEBY begged to inquire of the Secretary of the Treasury, Whether he has directed his attention to the Return which he had brought under the Notice of the House last night, on the subject of Courts of Appeal in cases of Assessed Taxes?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he was exceedingly sorry that he was unable to reply to the hon. Gentleman's statement last night. His attention had been called to the Return for which the hon. Member moved some months back, and which had been laid on the table. That Return showed that throughout the country there were a great number of towns, containing a considerable population, which were situated more than four miles distant from a Court of Appeal for Assessed Taxes. Considering the great amount of apparent inconvenience which that must occasion, it was surprising that the complaints of the taxpayers were not more frequent or more bitter than they were on that account. He could only say that, having made inquiry of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, he was informed it was very rarely that serious complaints were made to them of the inconveniences which must undoubtedly exist, and that practically they found little difficulty, when complaints were made, in getting the Local Commissioners to appoint more convenient places for holding the appeals. Still the subject was, no doubt, one requiring consideration with a view to the provision of a remedy. That was only one instance among many of what the people of this country were willing to bear in order to enjoy the advantage of a tribunal which was independent of the Government. The Local Commissioners were generally country gentlemen, and were entirely unpaid. He would take care that inquiries should be made into the extent to which those difficulties prevailed, and hoped in the course of the Recess to be able to inform himself whether legislation on the matter was necessary, or whether it was possible by other means to remove great part of the inconvenience to which the hon. Gentleman had referred.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer

CIRCULAR DELIVERY COMPANY AND THE COMMISSIONAIRES.

QUESTION.

MR. WYLD said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Post Office authorities are aware that the Circular Delivery Company (Limited) was a strictly co-operative Company, delivering documents, newspapers, and circulars for their own members only by their own servants; and, whether it is their intention to press for the penalties in the case, as it appears that the proceedings of the Company in question have been strictly within the provisions of the Post Office Act; and, whether it is intended to prosecute the body of Commissionaires, who have been for years employed publicly in doing precisely the same kind of work; and, if the Post Office authorities do not intend to prosecute in that case what are the reasons for the exemption, and how the Commissionaires can legally do that which the Circular Delivery Company (Limited) is prosecuted for doing?

MR. STEPHEN CAVE said, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was prevented by the rules of the House from speaking again; but if it had been otherwise, his right hon. Friend would not have been able to answer the question put by the hon. Gentleman, because the matter to which it related was at the present moment before a Court of Law.

IRELAND—ROYAL IRISH ACADEMY.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. GREGORY said, he rose to call the attention of the Government to the present condition of the Royal Irish Academy, owing to the operations of the Irish Board of Works. There were three different operations carried on under one Department in Ireland, and the result was mismanagement, confusion, and expense.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The threefold operations just named have been brought to a termination.

MR. GREGORY said, he was extremely glad to receive this assurance. The Royal Irish Academy possesses the most remarkable collection of Scandinavian—he meant Celtic antiquities; and this vast collection is shut up in boxes scattered here, there, and everywhere. He wished to know, Whether anything is going to be done to enable the Royal Irish Academy to exhibit its Museum to the public? Large sums have been contributed by the public, and the collection ought to be open to the public.

MR. DISRAELI said, he would remind the hon. Gentleman that there was a Commission appointed to inquire into all the Art Institutions in Ireland, and he hoped the result of their labours would be to terminate the abuses to which the hon. Gentleman referred.

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £35,609, to complete the sum for the Treasury.

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £28,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for Her Majesty's Foreign and other Secret Services."

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, that this Vote had gone unchallenged since he had the honour of a seat in that House. In this country it was part of our creed that public matters should be discussed in the light of day. Open doors and full newspaper reports were advocated as necessary to political health, and he could not understand why there should be a Vote of this kind. He had been informed that part of the money asked was not for the purest objects, and unless the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury could assure him that none of this money went for base and corrupt political purposes, he should move that the Vote be reduced by £10,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £18,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for Her Majesty's Foreign and other Secret Services."—(*Mr. Lusk.*)

SIR JOHN GRAY agreed that the Committee ought to know what was done with this secret service money. It might, for all they knew, be employed for base purposes, as in the payment of informers and spies. If they were told what the secret service money was wanted for they would vote it freely.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, it was obvious that no detailed explanation could be given of the destination of secret service money. It had been the practice of the House for many years to entrust the Government with the distribution of this sum, no part of which went in "base or political purposes." Almost the whole of the amount was disbursed by the Foreign Office, and none of it went to the Treasury.

MR. ALDERMAN SALOMONS said, he hoped that the explanation would be satisfactory to the worthy Alderman (Mr. Alderman Lusk).

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, it was hardly so explicit and to the purpose as he could have wished; but, under the circumstances, he would not press his objection.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £56,410, to complete the sum for Home Office.

MR. CHILDERS said, there was an understanding that the expenses of the Fisheries Commission should not be increased, and he therefore regretted to see an addition of five persons connected with the Commission.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, there was an increase of £5,600 in this Vote. There was now no need for some of the Inspectors, as the Act under which several were appointed in Scotland had been done away with.

MR. NEATE said, he could not understand how the travelling expenses of the Inspectors were always the same fixed sum. Was it done by contract?

GENERAL DUNNE wished to know when the present system would cease?

MR. WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE said, he thought the fees to surgeons in the Factory Department, which had increased from £1,550 to £2,000, ought to be paid by the factory owners themselves, and not by the Government. The salaries of the Local Government Act Office had increased by £1,000. He thought that fees to cover the expenses of this Office ought to be charged to those towns which employed its agency.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, there had been a considerable increase in the number of Inspectors of late years, and if the House passed Acts which required Inspectors to carry them out, they must not be surprised if this Vote showed an increase. The Fisheries Commission was being wound up, and an additional Commissioner was appointed to bring the matter to a conclusion. Those in Scotland were paid so much a day while actually employed. The fees paid to certifying surgeons under the Factory Acts were for examining children to see that they were of age to be employed, and the House could not expect this expense to be paid by the factory owners.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £52,453, to complete the sum for Foreign Office.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK asked for an explanation of the increased number of clerks employed, and the large augmentation of this Vote year after year.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH stated that the arranging of a large accumulation of papers in the Library had necessitated a temporary increase.

MR. NEATE wished to know who were employed in making the translations, which were often very slovenly and incorrect?

COLONEL SYKES said, he thought there was mystification in these accounts. Items were bandied about from one Department to another, and it was impossible to detect where the items of the net increase were to be found.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he thought the hon. and gallant Gentleman should not object to the introduction of a better classification. He presumed that all the clerks in the Foreign Office were acquainted with modern languages, and were therefore intrusted with translations.

COLONEL SYKES said, he objected, not to an improved classification, but to constant alterations.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £19,990, to complete the sum for Colonial Office.

(6.) £65,725, to complete the sum for Board of Trade.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK remarked that the expenses of this Department were continually increasing. He thought that some of those Inspectors who were considered necessary to be employed to look after different branches of trade should be paid by those for whose benefit they were appointed.

SIR J. CLARKE JERVOISE inquired as to the Inspectors of lime-juice, whose payment was included in the Vote?

MR. CHILDERS, with reference to an increase in the number of temporary clerks from fifty-one to sixty, and of the junior clerks from twenty-four to thirty-one, suggested that temporary and supplementary clerks should be abolished, and that persons of the class of writer should be employed whose numbers might vary with the amount of business which had to be got through.

MR. WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE thought that, instead of employing sixty temporary clerks, persons who had been superseded and pensioned for reasons difficult to understand might be utilized. He was surprised that more notice had not been taken of the large nember of able-bodied officials of the Board of Trade, who had been pensioned off at large retiring allowances, to make room for new appointments.

MR. HEYGATE inquired whether the present system of collecting agricultural statistics was to be continued, or whether a better had been devised?

MR. READ remarked that the expense of these statistics had increased by £4,500. In 1866 the sum was £10,000 for two Returns; whereas it was now £14,500: last year it was £18,000, and only one Return was collected.

COLONEL SYKES said, the hon. Member (Mr. Read) was mistaken, there being a decrease and not an increase of £4,500. He believed these statistics would prove of very great value as the system became better organized, and the prejudices of the agriculturists disappeared.

MR. STEPHEN CAVE stated, in answer to the remarks of his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Childers), that supplementary clerks were extinct as a class, there being only a few left, and no others being appointed. The temporary clerks were exactly the class whose employment his hon. Friend had suggested, they being taken on when wanted on weekly wages, and discharged when the occasion for their services ceased. This was a better plan than the employment of law stationers' clerks, who were often of a class which rendered it undesirable that they should mix with the other clerks. The hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. Alderman Lusk) had noticed the increasing expenses of the Board; but he must be aware that the increase had been caused by various Votes of the House, imposing upon the Board many duties which they were by no means anxious to undertake, and this accounted for the augmented number of junior clerks. Inspection of gas companies had been thrown on the Board of Trade, and next year his hon.

Friend would see an increase of charge on that account. The inspection of lime juice also was one of those things which had been forced upon the Department. Medical officers had declared that lime juice was the proper preventitive against scurvy. The Government knew, however, that the juice which had hitherto been served out to merchant vessels was very bad. It was, in fact, not lime juice at all, but was composed of nitric instead of citric acid. The country demanded that remedies should be taken against the scurvy, lime juice was the best remedy, and therefore the Government were compelled to appoint an inspector of that juice. Then there was an inspection of oyster fisheries and also of cables and anchors, both of which measures were carried in that House against the wish of the late Government, and he feared he was himself instrumental in carrying them. And so it was, hon. Gentlemen in the beginning of the year perhaps urged the Government to undertake such and such a duty, and afterwards when they saw the Estimates complained of increase of charge. But new duties could not be undertaken by any Department without entailing additional expense. With regard to the inspection of ships he had to say that he had always resisted the movement in that direction, because he believed it would add enormously to the Votes. The same remark applied to training ships and sailors' homes. As an instance of the kind of pressure to which the Board of Trade was subjected he might mention that only that very day he had received a deputation, urging upon his Department to undertake the responsibility of seeing that railways were possessed of proper stations and level crossings. With regard to what had been said about superannuation, it should be borne in mind that there was a tendency to have senior clerks, who from various circumstances were not quite capable of performing their duties. He agreed with the hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) that the system of competitive examination, though very bad as regarded the lowest class, would do away with much of the evil to which he had referred. There were some cases, however, in which it was better to get rid of a man by giving him a retiring allowance than to continue him in office. With regard to agricultural statistics he might express the hope that they were year by year becoming more and more correct. He trusted they would become still more accurate. They were practically becoming less expensive so far as collection was concerned, and would in time work more smoothly than at present. He believed that many of the higher classes and of the landlords themselves had need of education on the subject. It was only the other day that he got a letter from a gentleman of high position, who, in answer to a circular asking for agricultural statistics, declined to give them, alleging that this was a legacy which the present Government had inherited from the inquisitorial Whigs. He had answered all the questions that had been put to him, and had only to say, in conclusion, that the heads of Departments were all most anxious to economize as much as possible.

MR. READ inquired whether it was the intention of the Government at any future time to have horses included in the Returns?

MR. STEPHEN CAVE said, he agreed with his hon. Friend that the number of horses in the country would be an extremely valuable addition to the Returns; but as the Returns were entirely voluntary, they must wait for a short time before they could ask people to make any addition to them.

MR. WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE wished to know in what part of the United Kingdom the foreshores were situated which were alluded to in the blue book? Where they in Scotland or in the South of England?

MR. STEPHEN CAVE said, he could not answer the question. Applications were constantly being made to the Board of Trade to arrange disputes with regard to foreshores in various parts of the kingdom.

MR. HEYGATE said, he thought the answer of the right hon. Gentleman, with regard to agricultural statistics, was satisfactory. He hoped the experiment would be persevered in.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £3,176, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Salaries of the Officers and Attendants of the Household of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and other Expenses."

COLONEL FRENCH bore his testimony to the admirable manner in which the present Lord Lieutenant of Ireland discharged the duties of his Office, and expressed his belief that an addition should be made to his allowance. In case of a change of Government, no future Viceroy would be likely to maintain the dignity of the Office with the splendour with which it had been maintained by Lord Abercorn on the sum now allowed.

Mr. DISRAELI said, that the Committee should not contemplate anything so distressing as the retirement of Lord Abercorn from his present Office; and he thought that the hon. and gallant Gentleman had proved that it was not in the interest of the Government to increase the salary of the Lord Lieutenant.

Mr. Alderman LUSK moved the omission from the Vote of the sum of £1,574, appropriated to "Queen's Plates" in Ireland. He saw no reason why the State should contribute to the maintenance of racing and modern racing practices. If gentlemen wished to hunt or to run racehorses they might do so, but should not ask the public to pay for prizes for such questionable objects as the latter. Modern racing had degenerated into something like the lowest description of trading; and when they saw, as they might do by a reference to the public prints and to police Courts, that many of high and low position in society were ruined by following such pursuits, he strongly protested against the House being a party to these proceedings.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item of £1,574 6*s.* 2*d.* for Queen's Plates to be run for in Ireland, be omitted from the proposed vote."—(*Mr. Lusk.*)

Colonel FRENCH said, the hon. Member had never succeeded in reducing any Vote, often as he had attempted to do so. This question had been so often discussed that it was not worth while to debate it now. He felt surprised at finding an Alderman of the City of London, the Corporation of which had always been so strongly supported in that House by the Irish party, opposing a grant of that description. It should be remembered that a much larger sum was contributed from the Civil List to racing purposes in this country. In London when a mob levelled the Park railings they were re-placedat the public expense, and it was hard to object to an item of this kind affecting Ireland. The hon. Member ought not to break the contract between the Irish Members and the Liberal party on so trifling a Vote.

The O'CONOR DON said, he wished to know on what principle the Plates were allocated. If the object were the improvement of the breed of horses, the Plates ought not to be given to one locality only, but ought to be distributed to various parts of the country.

General DUNNE also thought the Plates should be more fairly divided.

The Earl of MAYO said, that the races and the conditions under which they were run were regulated by Her Majesty's Master of the Horse, who was quite ready to attend to any suggestion. The conditions under which the Queen's Plates were to be run for in future had been altered recently, with the view of promoting improvement in the breed of horses. He was sure that the representations of those who were most interested would be readily attended to; but he believed the general opinion was that the running for the Plates was most useful at the Curragh, because more horses were trained there than anywhere else. The hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. Alderman Lusk) had referred to facts which everybody must deplore; but the Irish turf was entirely free from the scandals alluded to.

Colonel SYKES wished to know what were the duties of the Gentlemen-at-Large?

The Earl of MAYO said, a Viceroy must have a Household, and it could hardly be said that the Lord Lieutenant was oversupplied with attendants.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he would this Session withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(8.) £14,927, to complete the sum for Chief Secretary, Ireland, Offices.

(9.) £12,646, to complete the sum for Paymaster General's Office.

(10.) £4,136, to complete the sum for Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, &c.

(11.) £22,700, to complete the sum for Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works, England.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE asked why the property connected with metropolitan improvements made under the direction of this Department had not been sold, and the accounts completed?

Mr. WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE observed that during the time the First Commissioner of Works had been in Office no Royal Arms were allowed to be put on the metropolitan or provincial branches of the

Post Office. He hoped the noble Lord would inquire into the matter. As the noble Lord was a member of the Constitutional party, this conduct must be very painful to his feelings.

Vote *agreed to.*

(12.) £17,546, to complete the sum for Board of Works, Ireland.

(13.) £36,354, to complete the sum for House of Commons' Offices.

(14.) £28,585, to complete the sum for Privy Council Office.

(15.) £1,918, to complete the sum for Privy Seal Office.

(16.) £6,407, to complete the sum for Civil Service Commission.

(17.) £25,500, to complete the sum for Exchequer and Audit Department.

(18.) 16,958, to complete the sum for Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, &c.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE complained that all the charges were not inserted in the account, and asked for an explanation. He also called attention to the fact that the road through Kensington Palace Gardens to Bayswater was closed to public cabs, notwithstanding that to a great extent it was maintained out of the public funds.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that the accounts furnished to the Treasury by the Office of Woods were net accounts, after making certain deductions. They were accounts such as would be furnished by an owner of an estate, after making various allowances. The Woods and Forests had no option in the matter of the road referred to; but he would make inquiries on the subject.

SIR JOHN GRAY thought that the closing of the road against the public was a very questionable proceeding.

Vote *agreed to.*

(19.) £14,926, to complete the sum for Public Record Office.

(20.) £140,183, to complete the sum for Poor Law Commission.

(21.) £30,820, to complete the sum for Mint.

(22.) £13,294, to complete the sum for Copyhold Inclosure and Tithe Commission.

(23.) £7,200, to complete the sum for Inclosure and Drainage Acts; Imprest Expenses.

(24.) £27,961, to complete the sum for General Register Office.

(25.) £11,132, to complete the sum for National Debt Office.

(26.) £3,429, to complete the sum for Public Works Loan Commission, &c.

(27.) £2,820, to complete the sum for Lunacy Commission.

(28.) £1,449, to complete the sum for Registrars of Friendly Societies.

(29.) £12,438, to complete the sum for Charity Commission.

(30.) £19,071, to complete the sum for Patent Office, &c.

(31.) £215,909, to complete the sum for Printing and Stationery.

(32.) £11,867, to complete the sum for Poor Law Commission, Scotland.

(33.) £4,608, to complete the sum for General Register Office, Scotland.

(34.) £3,206, to complete the sum for Lunacy Commission, Scotland.

(35.) £9,223, to complete the sum for Fishery Board, Scotland.

(36.) £2,296, to complete the sum for Public Record Office, Ireland.

(37.) £63,267, to complete the sum for Poor Law Commission, Ireland.

(38.) £14,722, to complete the sum for General Registrar Office, &c. Ireland.

(39.) £250, Boundary Survey, Ireland.

(40.) £1,188, to complete the sum for Charitable Donations and Bequests, Ireland.

Re-committed Resolution, reported this day, read, as followeth:—

"That a sum, not exceeding £42,079, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Greenwich Hospital and Schools, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869."

Whereupon—

(41.) *Resolved*, That a sum, not exceeding £127,600, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Greenwich Hospital and Schools, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869.

(42.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1869, for the Compensation granted to the Portpatrick Railway Company in consequence of the Abandonment of Mail Communication between Donaghadee and Portpatrick."

MR. NEATE moved that the Chairman report Progress, as they had now come to the Supplementary Estimates, and the House had received no information upon them.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Neate.*)

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, this subject had been discussed, and the Vote had met with the approval of the House.

Mr. CANDLISH said, there were only three or four more Votes to complete the Estimates for the year, and they ought to finish the Supply to-night.

Mr. DISRAELI reminded the House they had only sat since nine o'clock. Time was now very valuable, and he wished to get through Supply to-night that they might proceed on Thursday morning with the Corrupt Practices Bill.

Captain VIVIAN observed that there was likely to be a discussion on a postponed Army Vote.

Mr. DISRAELI said, that the Government were ready to take the discussion that night. If it did not come on now, it must take precedence of the Corrupt Practices Bill on Thursday.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that he had postponed the Army Vote in order that a Paper which he had presented might be printed. The Paper was not yet in the hands of Members; but he hoped the House would be content to pass the Vote.

Colonel JERVIS said, that they had been waiting for months for this particular Paper, and without it they could not determine whether the Report of the Select Committee or the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman in respect to a certain scheme of retirement should be considered.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that the hon. and gallant Member laboured under a complete misapprehension. The House had never waited for the Paper, which he only mentioned a few days ago. The Paper contained no scheme of any reform, nor had he any scheme to propose.

Colonel JERVIS stated that for months the hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) refrained from pressing this question because it was clearly understood that the War Office had a scheme to propose.

Mr. CHILDERS observed that the right hon. Baronet had on two occasions stated that he was preparing a scheme, and he, in consequence, asked for the production of the Paper in connection with it.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had never made any promise to produce any scheme. The Report to be produced was simply that of the actuaries on the scheme of the Committee.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he had no intention to charge his right hon. Friend with any breach of faith. It was quite clear if there was to be any discussion on this subject, it could not be to-night.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he trusted they would be allowed to pass the two additional Votes on the Paper, and thus facilitate Business.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(43.) £7,500, Compensation, Explosion at Clerkenwell.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER explained that the sum collected in local subscriptions had been expended in providing medicines and sustenance for the sufferers during the time they were incapacitated for work, and in the case of those permanently injured towards providing them with pensions to insure them against dependence on parochial relief. In some cases, also, it had been applied in the purchase of tools to workmen where their tools had been destroyed. Certain furniture also had been provided out of the fund. The voluntary efforts of that Committee had been of great assistance to the sufferers, and the benevolent persons engaged were deserving of every commendation for their admirable exertions. The Committee had represented to the Government that they were entirely unable to give compensation to those whose property had been destroyed. Some of the parties had been advised that they had a remedy against the Hundred as in the case of a riot; but that had been tried, and it was decided that the diabolical proceeding was not in the nature of a riot, but an attempt to rescue from prison a prisoner who had committed an offence against the State. Under these circumstances it was thought the Government ought to make some compensation to those who had suffered by the destruction of their property. They had therefore sent a proper person to make inquiry, and, although they had not yet got a detailed Report, it was believed the sum now taken would be sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. NEATE said, he thought the Treasury occupied a most unenviable position in allowing that to be done by private individuals which ought to have been done by the State.

Mr. WYLD eulogized the charitable and public-spirited efforts made by the Prime Minister at the time of the explosion to assuage the sufferings of those who were wounded by the explosion, and mentioned that a deputation had called on him to-day to request him to state to the House how highly the inhabitants of the neighbourhood approved the spirit thus displayed by the Government.

MR. ALDERMAN **LUSK** also thanked the Government and the House for the generous manner in which they had rendered aid to some of his constituents who were innocent victims of this deplorable and wicked piece of madness.

Vote *agreed to*.

(44.) £10,000, Registration Expenses.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £389,800, be granted to Her Majesty (in addition to the sum of £81,000 already voted on account), towards defraying the Charge for Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, and Half Pay, which will come in course of payment from the first day of April 1868 to the 31st day of March 1869, inclusive."

COLONEL **JERVIS** moved that Progress be reported.

MR. **DISRAELI** expressed a hope that they should be able to dispose of this Vote on Thursday, as well as of the Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,—(*Colonel Jervis*,) —put, and *agreed to*.

House *resumed*.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

COLONIAL SHIPPING BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to the registration of Ships in British Possessions.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. STEPHEN CAVE and Mr. ADDERLEY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 236.]

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) SUPPLEMENTAL (NO. 4) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, and the Acts amending the same, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH and The Earl of MAYO.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 235.]

House adjourned at
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 15, 1868.

MINUTES.] — SUPPLY — *considered in Committee—Resolutions* [July 14] *reported*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class II.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation * [231]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4) * [235].

Committee—Investment of Trust Funds Supplemental [164],* *negatived;* Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment [181]; Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) * [151]; Sir Robert Napier's Annuity [230].

Report — Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment [181-238]; Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) * [151]; Sir Robert Napier's Annuity [230].

Considered as amended—Public Departments Payments * [212].

Third Reading—Public Schools * [135]; Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment * [218]; Vaccination (Ireland) * [217]; Municipal Elections (Scotland) * [211]; Militia Pay *; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3) * [229]; Liquidation * [220], and *passed*.

IRELAND—ROYAL IRISH INSTITUTE.

QUESTION.

SIR **PATRICK O'BRIEN** said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If the unanimous Resolution of the Corporation of Dublin in favour of the purchase of the site of the Exhibition Palace for the Royal Irish Institute has been received; and whether the Government intend to accede to its prayer?

MR. **GATHORNE HARDY** replied that the Resolution had been received, and that due weight would be given to it. There was a Commission sitting on the subject, and until their Report had been taken into consideration it would be premature on the part of the Government to announce what course they proposed to take with respect to it.

SALE OF POISONS AND PHARMACY ACT AMENDMENT BILL—[*Lords.*]

[BILL 181.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 3 *agreed to*.

Clauses 4 and 5 *omitted*.

Clauses 6 to 15, inclusive, *agreed to*.

Clause 16 (Reserving Rights of certain Persons).

Mr. LOWE moved, in line 6, after the word "dealing," to leave out "nor with the retailing of arsenic, oxalic acid, cyanide of potassium, or corrosive sublimate for use in manufactures."

Page 6, line 6—

Amendment proposed, after the word "dealing," to leave out the words "nor with the retailing of arsenic, oxalic acid, cyanide of potassium, or corrosive sublimate for use in manufactures." — (*Mr. Lowe.*)

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, the Pharmaceutical Society did not wish to retain the words, and they were not originally in the Bill.

Lord ELCHO said, he objected to the omission of those words, which would unnecessarily limit the retail of common articles of household use. The clause which he proposed to substitute for the 17th clause in the Bill, would in the way of regulation give as much security as could reasonably be expected against the careless sale or wrong use of ordinary poisons.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he only desired that poisons should be bought, sold, and kept in bottles or wrappers properly labelled; so that, if possible, no mistakes should occur in their use.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 30; Noes 57 : Majority 27.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he would beg leave to move, at the end of the clause, to add—

> "Provided always that registration under this Act shall not entitle any person so registered to practice medicine or surgery, or any branch of medicine or surgery."

Proviso *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 17 (Poisons to be distinctly labelled).

Lord ELCHO proposed that this clause should be struck out.

Mr. LOWE proposed that the clause should be amended. There were two Amendments, in fact, before the Committee. The noble Lord proposed to substitute a new clause, and he (Mr. Lowe) would amend the present clause. The Committee would have to decide which was the preferable alternative. He admitted that the clause proposed by the noble Lord was a considerable improvement on the present state of things; but there was a good many objections to it. The noble Lord proposed that poisons should be divided into two classes, but both were to remain in one Schedule, and to be distinguished only by asterisks. Now, that was a most inconvenient way of dealing with the subject. The noble Lord proposed :—

> "It shall be unlawful to sell any poison whatsoever to a person unknown to the seller, unless he gives evidence that he requires it for a legitimate purpose, and is aware of the uses, danger, and proper dose, as the case may be, of such poison."

What chance was there that these requirements, if of any value, would be complied with by the little shopkeepers throughout the country? How was the "evidence" that the person "required it for a legitimate purpose" to be given? He might want it "for a legitimate purpose," but he was not to have it unless he was well read up in public and forensic medicine. And, then, who was to be the judge of all this? Perhaps some old woman. This seemed to him a very inadequate way of dealing with the subject. What he proposed was this—They had already the precedent of the Arsenic Act, which, although it dealt with only one poison, was a most salutary Act, and it seemed to him that the proper course would be to place all ordinary poisons under the same restriction. With this view he begged to move in line 18, before "It," to insert—

> "Of poisons which are not articles in the British Pharmacopœia, none shall be sold except under such conditions as are prescribed in regard of Arsenic by sections first and second of the Act fourteenth and fifteenth Victoria, chapter thirteen, intituled 'An Act to regulate the Sale of Arsenic,' which sections for this purpose shall be read as if the word 'poison' were throughout substituted in them for the word 'arsenic;' and of poisons which are articles in the said Pharmacopœia, none shall be sold otherwise than under the same conditions as aforesaid, or else under the written order of a legally qualified medical practitioner, unless it be prepared as an ointment or liniment or otherwise for external use, or, if for internal use, be in quantity not exceeding one ordinary medicinal dose of the article; and"

in line 22, after "any," leave out "seller of any poison not so distinctly labelled," and insert "person selling poison otherwise than as herein provided."

Lord ELCHO observed that the inconvenience of "asterisks" might be got rid of by having two Schedules. His right hon. Friend had admitted that the clause which he proposed to bring up was an improvement on the Bill as originally drawn. The clause embraced all the regulations which the Pharmaceutical Society—a body of gentlemen in daily practice, and to whom the public were under great obligations—considered requisite, establishing, as it did, the proper medium between drawing the law so tightly that it must break in their hands and that laxity which would be prejudicial to the whole community. He was informed that the Arsenic Act was too stringent, and was practically a dead letter. He objected to the proposed Amendment.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, he wished to know how a seller of poison was to ascertain the truth of a customer's assertion that he required the poison for destroying rats? He should support the Amendment.

MR. M. CHAMBERS said, the clause would compel the homœopathist to put the word "poison" upon all his bottles.

MR. LOWE said, the answer to the hon. and learned Member's observation was that a whole bottle of homœopathic medicine would not amount to a dangerous dose. The difference between his clause and that of his noble Friend was that by his clause the buyer of poison must be introduced to the seller, whereas by his noble Friend's clause the buyer might be a person unknown to the seller.

LORD ELCHO said, that his clause required that the buyer should satisfy the seller that he required the poison for a legitimate purpose.

MR. LOWE said, that would leave the decision to the conscience of the seller, who had an interest in selling.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 18 *struck out.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

LORD ELCHO moved, in place of Clause 4, which had been omitted, to insert a new clause—

> "Any person who at the time of the passing of this Act shall be of full age, and shall produce to the registrar on or before the thirty-first day of December, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, certificates according to Schedule (E) to this Act, that he had been actually engaged and employed in the dispensing and compounding of prescriptions as an assistant to a Pharmaceutical chemist or to a chemist and druggist, as defined by Clause three of this Act, shall, on passing such a modified examination as the Council of the Pharmaceutical Society, with the consent of the Privy Council, may declare to be sufficient evidence of his skill and competency to conduct the business of a chemist and druggist, be registered as a chemist and druggist under this Act."

MR. LOWE said, he would submit that the principle of the Bill being to require education on the part of those who sell poisons, the clause was wholly indefensible in making the distinction of a modified examination. It is urged that these persons have a vested interest. A vested interest in what? A vested interest in ignorance—in not knowing enough to pass the examination usually required.

LORD ELCHO said, he thought it would be very hard upon those now dispensing medicines if they had to pass the same examination as apprentices entering the business. A modified examination in their case would give the requisite protection to the public.

MR. THOMAS CAVE called attention to the fact that many of the present assistants had been in business and failed, and others were married. It would be very hard upon them to insist on their passing a stringent examination.

Clause read a second time.

MR. THOMAS CAVE suggested the insertion in the fourth line of the words "for not less than four years."

LORD ELCHO said, he was willing to modify his clause to the extent suggested by the hon. Member for Barnstaple (Mr. T. Cave)—namely, that the assistants must have been actually engaged in the dispensing of medicines for four years.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, he assented to the clause on the understanding that the assistants affected by it should have been engaged in the dispensing of medicines for four years, and should be registered assistants under the Pharmacy Act.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, he would suggest that the term should be reduced to three years.

LORD ELCHO said, he was willing to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member for Finsbury, and to reduce the period of service required to three years.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

MR. LOWE proposed, in place of Clause 5, to insert a new clause (Registration of Chemists and Druggists), by which chemists and druggists should be entitled to be registered under the Act without paying any fee.

Clause *agreed to.*

Lord ELCHO proposed a clause in lieu of Clause 17, rendering it unlawful to sell certain poisons marked with an asterisk in Schedule (A) to persons unknown to the seller, laying down certain regulations respecting the registration of the sale, and imposing penalties for breaches of such regulations.

Mr. LOWE said, he objected to making a dintinction between poisons which a man might sell and poisons which he might not sell to unknown persons. He contended that those poisons referred to in the Schedule as poisons which ought not to be sold to persons unknown were really not more used for criminal purposes than other poisons. The asterisk would apply to arsenic, prussic acid, cyanide of potassium, strychnine, and corrosive sublimate; but oxalic acid, chloroform, aconite, belladonna, essential oil of almonds, and such things, do not fall within the provision.

Lord ELCHO said, the reason why was that these latter are used in the common purposes of life. He would suggest that the Schedule should be divided into two parts —one containing poisons in common use for ordinary purposes, and the other those of a more subtle character, and generally selected for criminal purposes.

Mr. LOWE submitted that the distinction utterly fails.

The distinction between the poisons in the Schedule was omitted from the clause; and—

Mr. LOWE then moved that poisons should not be sold to persons unknown, unless such persons were introduced by a person known to the seller.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE thought that such a provision would lead to a system of touting.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. BRUCE moved, that in the case of the sale of poison the name and residence of the introducer of a purchaser should be entered in the book of the seller.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU proposed an Amendment to the effect that no poison should be sold unless a purchaser could satisfy the vendor that he really required it for medicinal purposes.

Mr. LOWE pointed out that the Committee had already agreed that no poisons should be sold to persons unknown. To pass this Amendment would render legal the sale of poisons to any one.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU asked in what position a person would be if in a strange place where he was unknown he required to purchase a poisonous drug? Suppose, for instance, he was in Birmingham, and wanted a dose of laudanum to cure the toothache, how was he to get it?

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, the chemist might think the noble Lord wanted to destroy himself.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

New clauses *added.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Friday*, and to be *printed.* [Bill 238.]

MINES ASSESSMENT BILL—[Bill 221.]

(*Mr. Percy Wyndham, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Henderson.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into Consideration."

Sir ROBERT COLLIER said, he was not a Cornishman, and had no direct interest in this matter. He accepted the principle laid down by the House, that the law of rating should be applied to all mines. It would be very difficult, however, to apply it to the Cornish mines, unless special provisions were introduced, in consequence of the peculiar circumstances and conditions of that business. It was impossible to determine who was to be looked upon as the owner or occupier of such mines. The subject had been considered by a Select Committee last year, which recommended certain clauses that would have effected the object in view. But, instead of being agreed to, those clauses had been swept clean away at the last Wednesday's sitting. The hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) came to the table, and performed the unprecedented feat of concocting a Bill that was altogether new in five minutes. They had heard of the "Ten Minutes Bill;" but that was nothing to the legislative performance of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets. He felt confident that its provisions would be found not to work. The yield being precarious it would be impossible to ascertain the annual value. Then the Bill said the mine was to be rated; but the mine could not be rated; they must determine on some particular person who was to be rated. If the word occupier was taken, and nothing more, then no one could doubt that both the landlord and the lessees would be liable. In cases of limited liability, all the partners would be occupiers. The only effect of the measure would be to puzzle all the overseers in Cornwall, put a large amount of money into the pockets of the lawyers, and cause a vast amount of confusion to everybody. The Bill would be altogether inoperative except for the benefit of the legal profession. It was beyond the ingenuity even of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets to solve in five minutes a question which had puzzled lawyers and the Legislature for two years. He had had various communications from attorneys and others in Cornwall, all agreeing that under the present clauses it could not be determined who was to be rated, or on whom a distress was to be levied. It would be impossible to leave the Bill in its present condition. The Bill must be altogether re-drawn and re-considered. He believed it would be necessary to revert substantially to the provisions recommended by the Select Committee, which he thought might be adopted with some modification. As it was manifest that the Bill would not work, he thought it ought not to be proceeded with further during the present Session. Precipitate legislation would not promote the object in view, and he therefore begged to move that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed to that day fortnight.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day fortnight."—(*Sir Robert Collier.*)

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, he regretted that the clauses framed by the Select Committee were not discussed last Wednesday, but hoped the provision contained in them would be brought forward again and fully considered. He thought the objections to the clauses were quite secondary to the affirmation of the principle of the Bill. Amendments might be introduced to meet the objections of the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Sir Robert Collier). As to the clause for dividing the rate between the landlord and the occupier, two distinguished lawyers had stated their opinion to be that it would have that effect.. Mines were already rated in many parts of the country, and he did not believe that the Bill would cause the Cornish mines to be rated in an objectionable or oppressive manner.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, his constituents were so much interested in this matter, that he must be permitted to speak on their behalf. He did not speak in virtue of his office. Unless the greatest care was taken in the mode of rating Cornish mines, that industry must come to an end. The Bill as it now stood, he took to be nothing more than a pointed sarcasm on the part of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton). The hon. Member doubtless judged from the discussion which had already taken place, that there was no likelihood of bringing the question to a practical issue, and in the vein of which he was a master, he suddenly drew up a bald clause, which he offered to the Committee as a solution of the difficulties of the case which had perplexed all parties for years, and this clause the Committee, weary of the discussion, had suddenly adopted. It could not possibly work. To pass the Bill, therefore, as being a measure which dealt with all the difficulties of rating would not, he thought, redound to the credit of the House. The subject required further consideration. He could not help thinking that under these circumstances the House would do well to postpone legislation on this subject till the next Session of Parliament.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, that this was a question of Cornwall against all England. The Committee had come to the conclusion that mines in Cornwall as well as elsewhere should be rated; and he was sure that if the general law of rating were applied to Cornish mines, the local authorities would carry it out in a fair manner. If, however, difficulties arose, they could come to Parliament and ask for their removal. If the Bill was unworkable there were a sufficient number of Gentlemen of the long robe in the House to suggest such alterations as would make it workable. Some new clauses had been given Notice of, and he trusted the House would proceed to consider them, so that legislation might not be postponed till next Session, there having already been too much delay.

MR. LIDDELL said, he felt bound to inform the House that his constituents viewed with great dissatisfaction the course which had been taken with regard to this Bill, since it did not attempt to redress the anomalies under which coal mines laboured. He, however, thought it due to the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) to state that what was done on a former occasion was to avoid laying down any hard lines of assessment. The House sanctioned the principle that the exemption of mines other than coal mines ought to be removed. Considering that a Law Officer as well as an ex-Law Officer of the Crown had pronounced this measure to be unworkable, he thought that the only course which the House could pursue was to postpone the further consideration of the matter, and to throw on the Executive Government the task of saying how the difficulty was to be got over, and of bringing in a Bill next Session providing for the proper assessment of mines. The coal mine interest would be sorry to see the anomalies under which they suffered extended to all other mines.

Mr. BRUCE said, that though interested in coal mines, he thought that great question had properly been excluded from the present Bill. He wished to ascertain from disinterested parties whether the objections raised by the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Sir Robert Collier) were well-founded? It had been said that the Bill would not work. In that case, it should be re-committed.

Mr. DENMAN said, that having carefully examined the clause, he was of opinion that the wording of it was so vague that it would not properly work; and he recommended the hon. Member for West Cumberland (Mr. Percy Wyndham) to adopt the suggestion which had been thrown out, and to allow time for the further consideration of the matter.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that what he understood the House to mean was that all the mines in England should be rated on the same principle as far as possible, and that clauses were to be brought up at the present stage to render the measure workable. But on looking at the clauses on the Paper, he considered the objections of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Sir Robert Collier) perfectly valid. He therefore thought it desirable not to proceed further with the Bill during the present Session. He thought that the hon. Member for West Cumberland (Mr. Percy Wyndham) having obtained a decision from the House in favour of the rating of mines, should rest satisfied with that, and postpone further legislation on the subject till another opportunity. He was himself very anxious that there should be legislation on the subject, and, though it would not come within his Department, he earnestly hoped that the question would be disposed of next Session.

Lord GEORGE CAVENDISH said, he would also join in the appeal to the hon. Member for West Cumberland (Mr. Percy Wyndham) to postpone the further consideration of the Bill. He knew that the hon. Member would feel disappointed at not being able to pass the Bill; but it had been shown that it would cause great doubt and uncertainty, and the hon. Member would be much more disappointed if it were to give rise to dissatisfaction among the mining classes.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the hon. Member had obtained a clear expression of opinion on two points—that all mines at present exempted should in future be rated, and that there should be no special mode of rating. Without assistance from the Government the hon. Member could not hope to pass the Bill, and he would do well to withdraw it for the present.

Mr. PAULL said, he must oppose the Bill as one that would involve the mining interests in ruinous complications. The mining interests of Cornwall were not opposed to the principle of rating mines; but they insisted that if a measure were passed to assess mines, it should be a well-considered one, which would deal fairly with all parties.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM said, after the appeal to him by several hon. Members on both sides of the House, he would withdraw the Bill.

Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question," put and *negatived.*

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Consideration, as amended, *deferred* till *Wednesday*, 29th July.

SIR ROBERT NAPIER'S ANNUITY BILL.

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Disraeli, Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

[BILL 230.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he desired to take that opportunity of expressing his opinion that it would be more useful to Sir Robert Napier and his family to give him a lump sum of £50,000 instead of the proposed annuity. Besides, the giving of a lump sum would be to throw all the burthen on ourselves, whereas this pension would throw a burthen on posterity. He very much regretted that Her Majesty had not been requested—if it would not be interfering with Her Majesty's Prerogative—to make Sir Robert Napier a Peer for life, instead of conferring upon him a hereditary dignity. He felt certain that the decision of the Lords on the question of life peerages would have to be re-considered. The introduction of such peerages would be one of the greatest improvements that could be made in the House of Lords.

House *resumed;* Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 16, 1868.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod—The Lord Willoughby de Eresby *added.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading* — Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* (252); Turnpike Acts Continuance* (253); Public Schools* (262); Tithes Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment* (256); Vaccination (Ireland)* (254); Municipal Elections (Scotland)* (263); Militia Pay*; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3)* (255); Public Departments Payments* (264).

Second Reading—Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment* (185); Court of Session (Scotland)* (246); Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies* (238).

Committee—Ecclesiastical Commissioners* (221-259); Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit* (237); Assignees of Marine Policies* (225); Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland)* (222); Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland)* (224-261); Petit Juries (Ireland)* (231); Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Court* (123); Indorsing of Warrants* (240); Court of Justiciary (Scotland)* (232); Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland)* (233).

Report—West Indies* (249); Entail Amendment (Scotland)* (183); Assignees of Marine Policies* (225-260); Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland)* (222); Petit Juries (Ireland)* (231); Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Court* (123); District Church Tithes Act Amendment* (251); Indorsing of Warrants* (240).

Third Reading—Land Writs Registration (Scotland)* (213); University Elections (Voting Papers)* (201); Turnpike Trusts Arrangements* (206); Metropolitan Police Funds* (230); Fairs (Metropolis)* (223); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2)* (207); Libel (Ireland)* (209); Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (177); Local Government Supplemental (No. 3)* (194); Hudson's Bay Company* (244).

Royal Assent — Reformatory Schools (Ireland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 59]; Renewable Leasehold Conversion (Ireland) Act Extension [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 62]; Registration [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 58]; Bank of Bombay [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 63]; Consular Marriages [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 61]; Curragh of Kildare [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 60].

PRIVATE BILLS—RAILWAY BILLS—INCREASE OF RATES.

STANDING ORDER.

LORD REDESDALE said, that, while he agreed in the principle of the Resolution passed by their Lordships a few evenings ago on the Motion of his noble Friend (Lord Taunton), yet it required some little modification. The alteration he proposed was principally confined to the addition that the Report of the Board of Trade should be made "after the Bill had been read a first time in this House." With regard to the policy of increasing the fares and rates on railways, a parallel case would be the tolls on turnpike roads. In the case of turnpike trusts, money had been borrowed and roads had been made, many of which had been ruined by the railways. The policy of Parliament in such cases had been not to increase the tolls, but to reduce the interest, in order that the debt might be paid off. He was more strongly than ever of opinion that no separate increase of tolls should be granted to any railway company. No doubt peculiar circumstances might arise, but they would be such as to apply to all railways, and not to any one in particular. If Parliament once admitted the principle that when a railway by its mismanagement and improvidence had brought itself into difficulties it might come and ask for an increase of fares, there would be no end to such cases. The Legislature would, in fact, be offering a premium upon railway mismanagement.

Standing Order No. 179. amended by inserting after Section 3. the following Section :—

> Section 4. That no Bill which proposes to increase the Rates now payable on the Conveyance of Goods or Passengers on any Railway shall be read a Second Time until a Report from the Board of Trade on the Subject, made after the Bill has been read a First Time in this House, shall have been laid upon the Table of the House.

Ordered, That the said Standing Order, as amended, be *printed.*

PROMISSORY OATHS BILL—(No. 243.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order).

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND moved that the Amendments made by the Commons in this Bill be agreed to.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, that there was a misapprehension abroad as to the 8th clause. There was a notion that the clause as it stood went so far as not only to repeal the Oath of Supremacy, but to exonerate the clergy altogether from any obligation to recognize the Supremacy of the Crown. He believed that was a totally erroneous idea ; but, as the matter was one of very great importance, he had spoken to the Lord Chancellor about it, and he wished to know from the noble and learned Lord what his opinion was upon the subject ?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My noble Friend has been good enough to inform me beforehand of his intention to ask this Question. I own that I am myself very glad that the noble Earl has mentioned this subject to your Lordships, because, judging from observations made elsewhere, there does appear to be a considerable amount of misunderstanding as to the Oath of Supremacy, and as to the consequences of any repeal of that Oath. There can be no greater mistake than to suppose that the Oath of Supremacy and what I may term the law and doctrine of the Queen's Supremacy are the same thing, or that they have been in recent times co-extensive. In point of fact, from circumstances which can be easily explained, the Oath which has been called the Oath of Supremacy has for a long time — for nearly two centuries — ceased to express in any shape or form the doctrine of the Supremacy of the Sovereign. The Supremacy of the Sovereign depends upon a sanction very much higher than the obligation of an oath. Sir Matthew Hale and Lord Coke both say that the Royal Supremacy rests on the Common Law and requires no statute to support it. The three main statutes which relate to the Royal Supremacy are the 24, 25, & 26 *Henry* VIII. I will not trouble your Lordships by quoting at length from these statutes ; but I will mention the words of one of them—the 25 *Henry* VIII.—from which your Lordships will see the form of legislation then adopted with regard to the Supremacy of the Crown. It says—

> "This your Grace's realm, recognizing no superiority under God but only your Grace, hath been and is free from any subjection to any man's laws ; but only to such as have been devised, made, and ordained within this realm, for the wealth of the same, or to such other as by sufferance of your Grace and your progenitors the people of this your realm have taken at their free liberty, by their own consent to be used among them, and have bound themselves by long use and custom to the observance of the same, not as to the observance of laws of any foreign Prince, Potentate, or Prelate, but as to the customed and ancient laws of this realm, originally established as laws of the same, by the said sufferance, consents, and custom, and none otherwise."

And, further, the 24 *Henry* VIII. states that—

> "Whereby divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this realm of England is an empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and King, having the dignity and Royal estate of the Imperial Crown of the same ; unto whom a body politick, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in term, and by names of spirituality and temporality, been bounden and owen to bear, next to God a natural and humble obedience ; he being also institute and furnished, by the goodness and sufferance of Almighty God, with plenary, whole and entire power, pre-eminence, authority, prerogative, and jurisdiction, to render and yield justice and final determination to all manner of folk, resiants, or subjects within this his realm in all causes, matters, debates, and contentions happening to occur, insurge, or begin within the limits thereof, without restraint or provocation to any foreign Princes or Potentates of the world."

That was the form in which the Supremacy of the Sovereign in matters temporal and ecclesiastical stood in the reign of Henry VIII. As a matter of history, your Lordships will remember that all these Acts were repealed in the reign of Mary, but were re-enacted in the 1st of Elizabeth ; and you may take as one of the most condensed explanations of the legislation of the 1st of Elizabeth the statement of Mr. Hallam, who says—

> "The two statutes enacted in the first year of Elizabeth, commonly called the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, are the main links of the Anglican Church with the temporal Constitution, and establish the subordination and dependency of the former."

Now, these statutes of Elizabeth continue to the present day; they are the statutes which are the full and broad expression of the Royal Supremacy; they are binding upon every subject of the realm, whether a layman or a clergyman; and so far as the declaration of the law and the stringency of the law go, that law would remain binding upon every subject of the Crown, whether he did or did not take any Oath or make any declaration respecting it. But now, as regards the case of the clergy, before coming to the Oath of Supremacy, as it is somewhat inaccurately called—the clergy, independently of all statutes and of all rules, are in a position essentially differing from the laity in this respect—that they subscribe, among other things, the 37th Article of Religion, and declare, on ordination and on taking possession of any benefice, that—

> "The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain; and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction."

Therefore, in addition to the general laws which bind all the subjects, there is this specific declaration signed by all clergymen at their ordination, which has a peculiar operation on their consciences from the form of expression used. That is the state of the case as to the law of Supremacy; but as to the Oath of Supremacy, the history of it is a very singular one. Originally, the Oath of Supremacy was passed in the reign of Elizabeth, and it really was what its name professed to be; it was an expression of the law and doctrine of Supremacy in all its breadth—

> "I, A. B., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience that the Queen's Highness is the only Supreme Governor of this Realm, and of all other Her Highness's Dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal; and that no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this Realm; and, therefore, I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, pre-eminences, privileges, and authorities granted or belonging to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and successors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm."

Your Lordships will observe that that was an Oath which had both an affirmative and a negative part. The affirmative part testified to the existence of the Royal Supremacy in all matters ecclesiastical and temporal; the negative part disowned the jurisdiction of any foreign Prince. The second form in which the Oath passed was after the Revolution in the reign of William and Mary, when a remarkable change was made in it; the affirmative part of the Oath was omitted, and it became a negative Oath only—

> "I, A. B., do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare that no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this Realm."

There is no doubt it continued to be called the Oath of Supremacy, but it utterly failed to express a large part of the doctrine of Supremacy. It denied the supremacy of any foreign prince or potentate, but it failed to affirm the Supremacy of the Sovereign in matters ecclesiastical and temporal. That was the second form of the Oath. The third Oath, adopted in 1858, still continued simply a negation; and the Act of 1858 used these words—

> "Instead of Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, when the same are now by law required to be taken, and taken and subscribed respectively, the following Oath shall be taken and subscribed."

I should have imagined from these words that the intention was that the name of the Oath of Supremacy should cease. However that may be, the only words again touching the Supremacy in this Oath are as follows:—

> "I do declare that no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this Realm; and I make this declaration upon the true faith of a Christian."

Your Lordships will see that this was still a negative Oath without any affirmative words. The fourth time that the Oath was dealt with was in 1865 by the Clerical Subscription Act, which enacted that—

> "Every person about to be ordained priest or deacon shall, before ordination, in the presence of the Archbishop or Bishop by whom he is about to be ordained, at such time as he may appoint, make and subscribe the declaration of assent, and take and subscribe the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy according to the form set forth in the Act of 1858."

Therefore, before the present Bill was brought into Parliament, the law of Supremacy continued without any change. The clergy subscribed the 37th Article, which affirmed that law in all its breadth, and they took in addition what was called rather improperly the Oath of Supremacy, which was nothing more than a negation of the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. This Bill does not alter in any way the doctrine or the law of Supremacy, which is left exactly as it stood. Every clergyman is under the same obligation as before to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, including the 37th. All that the Bill does is to terminate that Oath of negation which, as regards a clergyman, is perfectly unnecessary, because it is contained in the 37th Article; and as regards all the other subjects of the Crown, it is unnecessary too, because the subject-matter of that Oath of negation is regulated by the general law of the country, whether the Oath continues or not. I think, therefore, your Lordships will be of opinion that there is really no ground for any of the apprehensions that have been entertained that the law or doctrine of Supremacy is in any way interfered with by this Bill.

Lord WESTBURY: As one of the Members of the Select Committee to which this Bill was referred, I beg leave to be allowed to make a few observations respecting it. Notwithstanding what has fallen from my noble and learned Friend (the Lord Chancellor)—which in law and good sense too, is perfectly correct—I very much regret that we permitted this Bill to come down with one form of expression which is contained in it. For although to persons conversant with the subject that form of expression cannot create any error or lead to misconception, yet to the generality of persons I am afraid it will give rise to considerable difficulty. The form of expression I allude to is that contained in the 8th section, whereby it is proposed to enact that—

> "The form of the Oath of Allegiance provided by this Act shall be deemed to be substituted in the case of the Clerical Subscription Act, 1865, for the form of the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy therein referred to."

This mode of expression seems to import that the Oath of Supremacy shall henceforth be annulled, and the simple Oath of Allegiance substituted for it. Now, it is perfectly true, as the Lord Chancellor has said, that it does not in the smallest degree affect the obligations of the clergy or the obligations of the laity. Supreme jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters in all cases ecclesiastical or spiritual is the essence of the Supremacy of the Crown. The Crown has not supremacy in any matter of doctrine, nor any authority whatever to assert anything with respect to doctrine except the meaning of the written law. The Supremacy of the Crown is this—that all jurisdiction proceeds from the Crown, and must be exercised by virtue of appointments made by the Crown. The final jurisdiction in all matters ecclesiastical and spiritual is centred in the Crown. Now, your Lordships will be good enough to observe that I use the word "jurisdiction," and not "authority." There may be spiritual authority and pastoral authority; but jurisdiction, which is the right *jus dicendi*, is vested in the Crown, and can only be exercised by authority of the Crown. This was the prerogative of the Kings of England even before the Reformation. At the time of the Reformation the Supremacy of the Crown was finally asserted and established in this—that there should be no appeal to Rome, but that the ultimate decision of all ecclesiastical cases should centre in the Crown, and in persons appointed for that purpose by the Crown. My noble and learned Friend on the Woolsack has stated what is the true idea of the Supremacy of the Crown. It is also given in the right form in the words by which the clergy bid us pray for the Queen as being "in all matters ecclesiastical and spiritual within these her dominions supreme." Supreme, as I have already observed, for the purpose of finally declaring the law upon these subjects. The 37th Article also contains a correct expression of the positive or affirmative doctrine of the Supremacy of the Crown, and, after laying this down, it proceeds to give a more express definition. It says—

> "The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates in this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain; and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction. When we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief Government, by which Titles we

> understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments, the which things the Injunctions also set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify, but that only Prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scripture by God himself; that is, that they should rule all Estates and Degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers. The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England."

The temporal sword and the spiritual sword are, for the purposes of ruling all estates and degrees, constitutionally vested in the Sovereign, but the office of the clergyman is not interfered with.

In answer to an observation of the Earl of HARROWBY,

LORD WESTBURY said, that if he had observed the form of expression contained in the Bill, he would have suggested the propriety of altering it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the history of the legislation on the subject was not creditable in respect of the way in which Acts of Parliament were drawn. The Act of 1865 was drawn at a late period of the Session, and an Amendment was inserted introducing the term "Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance" contained in the Act of 1858: and that error had been perpetuated in the present Bill.

Commons, Amendments *agreed to.*

THE WAR OFFICE — DEPARTMENT OF CONTROL.—QUESTION.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON asked the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether the Arrangements for the Establishment of the new Department of Control in the War Office and for the closer Union of the Civil Departments of the Army are completed; and, if so, whether he will state the general Nature of those Arrangements? Their Lordships were no doubt aware that the evidence taken by Lord Strathnairn's Committee afforded convincing proof that the existing arrangements in regard to the administration of the civil branch of the army were highly unsatisfactory. Those who took an interest in the subject had watched carefully what had gone on, and he believed everyone who took any interest in the army heard with satisfaction in November last of the appointment to the office of Controller of Sir Henry Storks. He (Earl de Grey) fully approved the step, and he believed that Sir Henry was the very fittest man that could have been selected. Sir Henry Storks entered on his duties on the 1st of January; and the question now was what was to be the practical result of that appointment, and what steps were to be taken to promote the union of the separate Departments, as recommended by Lord Strathnairn's Committee. It was not until the month of June, however, that any information was given or any discussion took place as to the results of Sir Henry's appointment. At that time there was laid before the other House of Parliament the Correspondence which had passed between the Treasury and the War Department. When the Correspondence first appeared he (Earl de Grey) turned to it with much interest, in the hope that it would afford a clear explanation of the position which Sir Henry Storks was to occupy in the War Department as Controller-in-Chief, likewise of the duties which he was to discharge, and of the steps taken with the view of carrying out the amalgamation during the six months which had elapsed since his appointment. He regretted to say, however, that after a careful perusal of the Correspondence he could not find in it that full and clear information which he trusted would have been afforded, and consequently he had felt it his duty before this Session closes to ask the noble Earl opposite, the Under Secretary of State, to supplement the information contained in the Correspondence, and to clear up some points which were obscure. Now, in order that he might make clear to the noble Earl and to their Lordships his object in asking the Question of which he had given Notice he must in the first place remark that he was strongly convinced that one of the most important reforms in connection with our military Departments was that closer union of the various civil Departments of the army — the Commissariat, Purveyors, Transport, and Barrack Departments— which formed the basis of the recommendations of Lord Strathnairn's Committee. He believed, indeed, that the present state of these Departments was so unsatisfactory that if we were to engage in a European war we should at the outset of such an undertaking find ourselves involved in serious difficulties. Therefore, as he understood the matter, the first and principal duty of the Controller-in-Chief was to effect a complete amalgamation of those Departments, giving, of course, due consideration to existing interests. It was, however, a great mistake to suppose that such a duty could be effectually performed in a short time. The task was, in fact, a most arduous one, and, he believed it would test all the administrative ability even of so experienced a man as Sir Henry Storks. At any rate he felt confident it was an undertaking which could not be carried to a satisfactory issue if the officer charged with it in the first instance were merely empowered to lay down general regulations for the guidance of the Departments and to frame the rules which were afterwards to be followed. It was also necessary that he should see those rules carried into effect, and that he should not relinquish his post until the new Department was in a position to run alone—if he might use the expression. Such being his opinion he not unnaturally referred to the Papers in order to ascertain what was the precise position in which the Controller-in-Chief had been placed, but he confessed there was much obscurity on that point. He was unable to make out, for instance, whether Sir Henry Storks had been appointed Controller-in-Chief with the intention that he should hold the office as long as his doing so might be for the benefit of the public service, and as long as it might be necessary for him to hold it in order thoroughly to carry out the work on which he was engaged; or whether it were merely intended that he should hold it only a short time for the purpose of laying down general regulations under which the contemplated reforms were to be accomplished. Sir Henry Storks had been appointed Controller-in-Chief, with a salary of £2,000 a year, and with a position equal in all respects to that of a permanent Under Secretary of State. This was clear from the commencement of the Correspondence; and yet Sir Henry's position was described in the last letter from the Treasury as a provisional arrangement entered into with a view to his framing regulations, carrying out the impending changes in the War Office, and bringing the establishments into working order. For his own part, he should not have contemplated that the Controller-in-Chief would, as a rule, be in the position of an Under Secretary of State, nor was it as a rule necessary that he should be so. But when he saw Sir Henry Storks placed in that position he concluded that that step had been taken because the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the War Department felt it was only right that so distinguished an officer should, while he held the post of Controller, have the official rank and status of an Under Secretary. He should deeply regret if, for the sake of saving £500 a year by reducing the salary from £2,000 to £1,500, any risk should be run of losing the advantage of Sir Henry Storks' services as the head of the Control Department, even for a single day, before he had completed the work which he had undertaken to perform. He trusted the noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) would give a distinct explanation as to the real position which Sir Henry Storks now occupied. This letter from the Treasury went on to state what were the relative positions of the Department of Control and the other Departments of the War Office, particularly the Finance Department. The Treasury appeared to apprehend that there would be a collision between those two Departments; but he confessed he did not share in that apprehension. It seemed to be intended that the Account or Finance Department should freely lay before the Secretary of State their comments on the proposals of all the other Departments, as far as expenditure or financial affairs were concerned. He quite concurred in the propriety of such an intention, and he should even hesitate to place any narrow interpretation on the phrase "financial affairs." Whenever an increase of expenditure, either actual or perspective, was involved, it ought to be the duty of the Finance Department to state their views on the subject to the Secretary of State for his consideration. On that point, therefore, he had no issue to raise. He should, however, like to know the precise interpretation which the noble Earl placed upon that sentence in the letter which related to the compilation of the Estimates. It was laid down that it should be the duty of the Financial Department to compile the Estimates for all army expenditure. Now, the Estimates went through various stages in the course of their preparation. In the first instance, they were prepared by the branches intrusted with the administration of the various Departments, and then sent to the Finance Department, where they were brought together and checked one with another, and also considered in their general financial bearings. He hoped it was not now intended to take the first preparation of the Estimates from the various administrative branches; and further he hoped the noble Earl would be able to show that the responsibility for the Estimates and for every one of their details would still rest on the Secretary of State alone. The Account or Finance branch was a Department of the War Office precisely like the other branches. It was responsible to the Secretary of State, and to him alone; it took its orders from him, and from him alone. He did not wish to under-rate the importance of the duties of the Account or Finance Department; he believed they were of the utmost importance. He only desired to make it clear that its duties were entirely conducted under the authority of the Secretary of State, and under a responsibility to him and to him alone. So far was he from being disposed to undervalue the importance of that Department, that it had more than once crossed his mind whether advantage would not be derived from placing the chief superintendence of financial business in the War Office — of course under the Secretary of State—in the hands of a Parliamentary officer somewhat analogous to a Civil Lord of the Admiralty. He did not give that as a positive opinion, but wished merely to show that in holding that that Department was not outside of the War Office, but was one under the Secretary of State, his remarks did not proceed from any desire to depreciate that Department, but from a desire that all those Departments should be kept in due subordination, so that the authority and the responsibility of the Secretary of State should not be weakened or over-shadowed. He looked upon it that the real and important duty which Sir Henry Storks, or whoever might be the Controller-in-Chief, had to perform was to re-organize upon a thoroughly efficient basis the civil Departments of the army outside the War Office. They should, as far as possible, assimilate their arrangement so that their army should be managed at home in the same manner as it was managed abroad, and and also, that as far as practicable—of course, with the necessary differences—it should be administered in time of peace in the same manner as in time of war. It was obvious that that was the only means by which they could really get the administrative branches of the army into a proper state for the outbreak of hostilities; and that the more closely they could assimilate their Departments in time of peace to the system requisite for a time of war the more they would be prepared for war. And it was because he knew the unsatisfactory condition of those Departments at present, and because he felt that a grave and serious responsibility would rest on any Government that delayed the re-organization of those Departments on such a basis, that he trusted he should hear that evening that the Secretary of State was fully alive to the importance of the subject, and also that Sir Henry Storks was now about to set himself to work in carrying on outside the War Office that re-organization of the civil Departments of the army which he believed to be one of the most important reforms of our military system.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, that this was a subject which had on various previous occasions occupied the attention of Parliament. In 1859 or 1860 the House of Commons appointed the Committee on Army Organization; and in 1861 the late Lord Herbert of Lea took up the question and proposed to the Treasury a reform somewhat of the nature of that now under consideration. The course of events in the five following years was not favourable to the consideration of the proposed changes, and nothing was done until 1865, when the project was revived. The year 1866 and a great part of 1867 was occupied by the most valuable Inquiry of Lord Strathnairn's Committee, whose valuable Report was presented in the summer of 1867. At the end of the same year Sir John Pakington proposed to the Treasury the appointment of Sir Henry Storks as Chief Controller, for the purpose of carrying into effect the contemplated reforms. The appointment was concurred in by the Treasury, and Sir Henry Storks at once assumed his office to prepare for the execution of the scheme of re-organization of which he was to have the direction. In the following March his proposals were submitted to the Treasury, who in April asked for further information, which was immediately afforded them. Then followed some correspondence respecting the Royal Warrant for the constitution of the new Department, and on the 28th April the Royal Warrant was issued. On the 29th of June the Treasury wrote expressing their views as to the arrangements then contemplated, and suggesting various modifications in those arrangements; and a day or two later Sir John Pakington substantially accepted the modified terms proposed by the Treasury; and now there remained several points to be considered. That was the position in which the matter at present stood; and he hoped that in a very few days they would commence to bring the new arrangements into gradual operation. It was true that the discussions between the various Departments of the army hitherto had been rather complicated; that their harmonious action had been somewhat overlooked in their original constitutions; and that they were not so designed as to work together well on the occasion of a great strain. That, however, would now be remedied, and the Chief Controller would be the sole authority at the War Office to govern Departments and Staffs which had hitherto been under four or five different heads. The illustrious Duke (the Commander-in-Chief), on a former occasion when that subject was mentioned, appeared to fear that the Chief Controller would have too much power, and that it would be difficult to control that officer himself; but he (the Earl of Longford) trusted the illustrious Duke would find that any objection on that ground had been obviated. One of the causes which had tended rather more than another to delay the preparation of the scheme was a little over-anxiety on the part of the Treasury to secure to themselves sufficient financial control against the presumed tendency of the Secretary of State towards extravagance. But on that point the Treasury and the Secretary of State had, he thought, now come to an understanding, and he trusted that there was now no risk of collision between the two Departments. The scheme was now so far organized that its gradual adoption would be immediately proceeded with. Rather an exaggerated importance out-of-doors had been given to that reform, which was a re-distribution that would, he trusted, effect certain improvements in the Departments; but the new Controller would not not be a magician, who by a wave of his wand could prevent the possibility of future delay or disappointments. He hoped the public service would gain greatly by the adoption of the scheme; but the measure should be taken for what it was —an important interior re-arrangement, and not a panacea against all future shortcomings. There would still be some red-tape and a considerable amount of correspondence connected with the Administration, and there would also still be prejudiced persons ready to circulate and to listen to any story against the War Office. Nevertheless, he hoped the scheme would result in great advantage to the country.

The Earl of Longford

The Duke of CAMBRIDGE: The subject of the noble Earl's (Earl De Grey's) Question is one of such vast importance to the service that I feel bound to express my great satisfaction that it has been brought before your Lordships' House; because certainly since this Treasury Minute has been published and circulated there has been such a variety of opinion as to the meaning of that Minute that it is extremely difficult for an outsider to understand what its effect is. I trust we shall get that information to-night—although I do not think we have yet obtained all we could wish. It is one of the most singular documents I ever read. Its intention appears to tide over any difficulties and make everything smooth and easy; but I cannot help thinking that it puts the War Office in an undesirable position. I do not see how two bodies can be placed on an equal footing and yet both have the opportunity of referring to the Secretary of State, without there being continual collision between them, and without the Secretary of State being kept in a state of perpetual hot water between the two. I understand that this is not the intention, but that what has hitherto been the practice shall continue to be followed. I most sincerely hope that this will be so; for one of the most essential points in our military organization is to bring matters into some sort of ship-shape in the War Office. We are perpetually told that our military organization is so defective that it will break down on the first emergency. No doubt a great deal is wanted, and I cannot help feeling that on all sides, and without reference to one side of the House or the other, that the modifications required for the War Office are so important that they cannot be delayed a single day longer. I understood that my gallant Friend Sir Henry Storks was wisely, prudently, and judiciously selected by the Secretary of State for War to be Controller-in-Chief, and I presume that it was on account of the high position which he would fill that it was thought inconvenient and improper to offer him this post without at the same time giving him the rank and position of an Under Secretary of State. It might have been expected that after Sir Henry Storks had been selected for this post he would have been placed in a position to deal with the duties of the office. But what has been done? Immediately Sir Henry Storks wished to take his place and perform the functions of his office, difficulties arose. It was discovered that the office of Controller was of so important a character that he ought to be controlled. Objections were raised from a variety of quarters, which produced this extraordinary Treasury Letter, and which for the future considerably modifies the position of Sir Henry Storks. I hope that whatever may be hereafter the decision with regard to Sir Henry Storks one thing will be clearly understood, and I shall be glad of some assurance from my noble Friend after I have sat down that he will be left in the position for which he has been selected until he has not only been able to carry out the reforms recommended by himself, but until he has seen that the whole system works efficiently and well. It is not enough that he should always be there to indicate what ought to be done, but he ought to be continued in that position, irrespective of whatever other arrangements may be made, until he has seen the working of the new system and satisfied himself that it would produce good results. He ought also to satisfy the Secretary of State that matters were in such a state that his successor would follow in his footsteps and carry out the duties of the office so that they would work smoothly and well. If that is to be the effect of the Letter, and if my noble Friend will give me an assurance that this is the feeling of the War Office, the effect which this Treasury Minute has produced upon me will be greatly relieved. There is another observation I wish to make on this remarkable document, and on which I feel very strongly. It contains a most singular paragraph, in which, among other recommendations, it is stated that there should be an additional Under Secretary appointed to assist the Secretary of State on military matters, who shall generally, if not always, be a military man. I apprehend that the meaning of that is that this official shall give military advice to the Secretary of State on points connected with the working of the office. If that is the intention my mind is greatly relieved, for I regard this as a wise and prudent arrangement. But it appears to me that the effect of the Minute is to make this officer supersede all other military advisers, including the Commander-in-Chief, who has hitherto been considered the military adviser of the Secretary of State, whatever political party he might be connected with. Providing that this arrangement does not place the Commander-in-Chief in an inferior position to that of the Under Secretary—who need not be a military man at all—and provided also that military advice is to be given by the Commander-in-Chief, and that the advice given by the Under Secretary shall be confined to points connected with the office, I shall be quite satisfied; but I should like to have some assurance on that subject from my noble Friend. I am delighted to hear from the noble Earl (Earl De Grey) that the responsible financial officer of the War Office is the Secretary of State for War. There can be no other authority. He may take any officer of his Department to advise him on special or confidential matters, to whom he may refer those matters which are essential for the proper working of the office; but I contend that what is called the compilation of the Estimates, though made by the various Departments, should be made under the direct authority of the Secretary of State, who should be controlled exclusively by the Treasury. I am delighted to hear that there is not to be a smaller Treasury in the War Office. The Treasurer of the War Office is the Secretary of State for War, and the only controlling power of the Secretary of State is the Treasury itself. Another point of importance is the preparation of the Estimates in the various Departments. The Estimates to be of any value in a large office like the War Office can only be prepared by the heads of the several Departments. They should then be corrected and adopted by the Secretary of State. But if the Secretary of State in his individual capacity, or the Government as a body, should, after the preparation of the Estimates make a considerable reduction in them, I contend that it is the province of the various heads to propose their own reductions in those Departments, and that it should not be left in the hands of a financial officer who may know nothing of the individuality of the Departments, and who has only to deal with the results. It is true that after the question has been considered by the Departments the whole question must go back to the financial officer, who will report to the Secretary of State; but that is a very different thing from having a financial officer to decide upon his own *ipse dixit*, and to say what ought to be the reduction in the various items. Upon that point there seems to be a want of clearness in what fell from the noble Earl who spoke last (the Earl of Longford), and I hope that he will be able to give us some further explanation on this point. I hope there will be no delay in going on with such reforms as are contemplated, for your Lordships may rest assured that the uncertainty that hangs over offices when changes are intended to be made is extremely inconvenient and mischievous both inside and outside the office. It is essential it should be clearly understood that whenever changes are thought desirable and are determined upon they should be at once commenced; although they should be carried out no doubt with the greatest forbearance and consideration for those concerned, but yet with as little delay in carrying out a great measure of reform as possible. There is no point of military interest on which the country has expressed an opinion more strongly than the desirability of some regular system which should avoid confusion and tend to confirm the wise and prudent arrangements which have been made from time to time by the various military Departments. I hope that the result of to-night's conversation will be to satisfy Sir Henry Storks that no intention is implied in this Minute of removing him from the important post for which he is so well fitted, and the duties of which I feel sure he will discharge to the satisfaction of the country, and to the great simplification of the general arrangements of the War Office.

Lord NORTHBROOK said, that no one could have held office, as he had done, in the War Department without feeling the necessity of extensive but judicious changes. The explanation of the noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) must have greatly increased the apprehensions of his noble Friend (Earl de Grey); for though the noble Earl deprecated the importance attributed to the matter, and represented the re-organization of the Department as a very ordinary proceeding, the correspondence on the subject was of a very extraordinary character. In December, 1867, the War Office applied to the Treasury for the appointment of a Controller-in-Chief, with a position equivalent to that of Under Secretary of State, and with a salary of £2,000 a year; but in the following June the Treasury proposed the appointment of a Controller without the rank of Under Secretary, and at a salary of £1,500, and likewise of a principal Financial Officer with a salary of £1,500, and with a deputy. The latter appointment had not been asked for; but the very next day the War Office accepted the proposal of the Treasury with the exception of some details. Discussions must evidently have occurred between December and June, but no light had been thrown on them—though the remarks of the noble Earl seemed to imply that the Treasury objected to the original scheme because they wished to secure efficient financial control. The Treasury, indeed, had of late years shown a disposition, as well in the case of the Admiralty as of the War Office, to set up little Treasuries in the various Departments, so as to hold communications with subordinate officers in them without the intervention of the heads. The question was whether the principal Financial Officer and his deputy were to be the officers of the Treasury or of the War Office—for this was the gist of the whole question. If the intention was that every proposal connected with expenditure should go from the Controller-in-Chief to the new Financial Officer, how was the business of the former to be carried on? It must not be supposed that this would be a mere form, for the fault of the War Department was that it was given to endless correspondence and delay, and he could conceive no proposal more calculated to increase the evils already existing. Moreover, to take off the responsibility from the shoulders of the officer of practical knowledge and transfer it to an officer not having such knowledge was likely to encourage the former to be reckless in his recommendations as to expenditure, since, whether they were accepted or rejected, the responsibility would not rest with him. As to the preparation of the Estimates, the Secretary of State, as the illustrious Duke had remarked, was the person responsible, and unless he was brought in contact with the officer of practical knowledge there was little chance of efficiency or economy. The noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) had not given a full explanation on this point. As a civilian he must protest against that portion of the scheme which implied that no military man was fit to be the Financial Officer, for he had found military men quite as anxious for economy as civilians, and men, moreover, who from their professional knowledge were much more fitted than civilians to offer excellent suggestions with a view to economy. Indeed, at the time the Treasury put forward their scheme the office of permanent Under Secretary was held by a civilian. When, too, the gigantic expenditure attendant upon the Indian mutiny was brought down to something like a peace expenditure, it was military men who did it, General Balfour being one of the most distinguished. He hoped, therefore, that so unwise a rule would not be laid down. He should like some further explanation as to the position of Sir Henry Storks—whether he was to remain Controller-in-Chief with the salary and position originally proposed, or with the less responsible position suggested by the Treasury. In conclusion, he begged to say that this matter was one of very great national importance, and if Her Majesty's Government had been induced to give way to the Treasury, he hoped they would retire as quickly as possible by a change of position from the place which they now occupied, and he had no doubt the country would support them.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD, in explanation, said that there was no intention of interfering with the functions of the illustrious Duke or the Horse Guards as they were at present exercised. It was the most earnest wish of the Department that Sir Henry Storks should continue to hold the position of Controller-in-Chief. The illustrious Duke had spoken of the Estimates. It had been his intention to explain that the Estimates would be framed very much as at present, and would be submitted to the Secretary of State for War. The Financial Secretary of the Treasury would be consulted, but not exclusively. The illustrious Duke was also anxious that no time should be lost in proceeding with the arrangements, which were entirely in accordance with the wish of the War Office. But the delay had been very much occasioned by another matter, to which the illustrious Duke had referred—namely, the necessity of consulting the vested interests of the numerous officers employed in the different Departments. He quite concurred with what had fallen from the noble Lord (Lord Northbrook), that it was not impossible that military men might be found quite competent to conduct, as financiers, the military finances of the accounts of the War Office.

LORD STRATHNAIRN said, that the real question now before the House was, he ventured to think, whether the recommendations of the Committee over which he had presided should be carried out or not. In order to carry those recommendations into effect the Secretary of State for War had adopted two very important measures—he had selected an officer of acknowledged ability and tried experience to preside over the organization of the new system, and he had given that officer the high appointment of Under Secretary of State with a proportionate salary. Unfortunately, however, the Letter of the Treasury bearing date the 29th of June—the last, he believed, of the Correspondence which had been laid before the House—had nullified the advantages of that appointment of Sir Henry Storks as Under-Secretary, and was opposed to the tenour and spirit of the most important recommendations of the Committee over which he had presided. It was evident that an officer in Sir Henry Storks' position required all the assistance he could get in carrying out a difficult task. It was equally evident that the announcement in the Treasury Letter of the date which he mentioned must have very materially interfered with that influence which was so necessary for Sir Henry Storks' success. There was another point in the Treasury Letter to which he wished to refer, and that was, the association of an Officer of Finance with the Controller-in-Chief on equal terms. In other words, the Treasury proposed to associate two officers with wholly different objects, and, he must say from past experience, he feared antagonistic views. Speaking briefly, the Chief Controller might be said to represent expenditure, while the Financial Officer represented economy. There would therefore be a perpetual jarring between the two Departments. That association of incoherent elements was entirely opposed to the most essential recommendations of the Committee, which were that the administrative or civil Departments of the army, now disconnected, should be brought into unity of action with the regimental Departments, under one authority, one head; the Controller-in-Chief representing the authority and duties of the Secretary for War and those of the Commander-in-Chief. He thought the House was largely indebted to his noble Friend on the opposite Benches (Earl De Grey) for the zeal and ability with which he had a second time brought this question before the House. He entirely agreed with the illustrious Duke as to the vital importance of this matter. Their Lordships might be surprised to hear that one of the great difficulties which Sir Robert Napier had lately to encounter was a total disorganization of the transport for the Abyssinian campaign. That disorganization of the transport system at Bombay had been the cause of the delay of the operations for one month. It was really no easy matter to describe all the difficulties that had occurred. Hundreds—he might say almost thousands—of mules were landed on the seashore, and there was no one to take care of them. They ate up fifteen fathoms of rope to which they were attached, they were badly tethered, and the whole arrangements were so bad that the officer in command was obliged to name an officer from the 3rd Dragoon Guards in order to have the commonest attention paid to the animals in the general pursuit of them along the coast. He could only join, therefore, in the wish expressed by the illustrious Duke that no time might be lost in giving full effect to the recommendations of the Committee. In associating the Controller-in-Chief with the principal Financial Officer the Treasury had lost sight of a condition to which the Committee attached the greatest importance, and which they constantly and earnestly advocated as a guarantee of the success of the organization—that was, that the Secretary of State for War should undertake no army measure without the concurrence, if possible, or at any rate the knowledge and advice, of the Commander-in-Chief. Now he would be very sorry that it should be supposed that he was a partizan. So little was he affected by partizanship that when Her Majesty's Government established the office of Secretary of State for War—under the influence, certainly, of a loudly expressed public opinion — he (Lord Strathnairn) at once stated that every military authority in this country—even the Commander-in-Chief himself—must be under the influence of the superior authority vested in the new Secretary of State for War. But, while he said that, he must also say that there was no view which presented itself so frequently and in such different forms to his mind as this —that the greatest harm would be done to the military service by the non-recognition of this great principle—that the Secretary of State for War, while the supreme military authority, should undertake no military measure without the knowledge and advice, and, if possible, the concurrence of the Commander-in-Chief.

House adjourned at a quarter before
Eight o'clock, till To-morrow,
half past Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 16, 1868.

MINUTES.] — New Member Sworn — Ralph Assheton, esquire, *for* Clitheroe.

Ways and Means—*considered* in Committee—

Supply—*considered in Committee*—Army Estimates.

Public Bills—*Resolution in Committee*—Artizans and Labourers Dwellings [Stamp Duty].

Ordered—Expiring Laws Continuance *; Woods and Game Assessment.

First Reading—Hudson's Bay Company* [240]; Expiring Laws Continuance* [241]; Woods and Game Assessment* [242].

Second Reading — Colonial Shipping [236]; Admiralty Suits* [234]; Railway Companies* [237].

Special Report of Select Committee — Electric Telegraphs* [No. 435].

Committee—Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-comm.*)* [139]—R.P.; Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation* [231]

Report — Electric Telegraphs* [82-239]; Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation* [231.]

Considered as amended— Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland)* [151]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment* [226].

Third Reading — Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland)* [151]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment* [226]; Sir Robert Napier's Annuity* [230], and *passed.*

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

SOUTH-EASTERN AND LONDON, BRIGHTON, AND SOUTH COAST RAILWAY COMPANIES' BILL—(*by Order*).

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered ;* several *agreed to.*

Mr. WATKIN moved that they should disagree with one of such Amendments, and reminded the House that the interests of about 5,000 persons were involved in this matter. His object was to get restored to the Bill a clause which their Lordships had struck out, and which clause gave the shareholders power to divide their stock into two classes, preferred and deferred stock, and this had, in other instances, been found to be a most convenient course. One great advantage was, that it discouraged those speculators who endeavoured to keep down the price of stock; and another was that it gave large holders a very valuable mode of distributing their property in the stocks. The South-Eastern Railway Company now wanted to raise £400,000 for the purpose of constructing a railway to Woolwich and elsewhere, and they would have considerable difficulty in raising the money unless this power were granted. There were numerous precedents for granting it, especially in the case of the Great Northern and in the strictly analogous case of the East Anglian. The Railway Commissioners in their Report said that the shareholders ought to be permitted to arrange these things for themselves, and Lord Redesdale, in his model Railway Bill, had inserted a clause giving the power. No one in the other House had objected to the power being in the present Bill except the Chairman of Committees, who carried his point by a small majority, and in so doing he (Mr. Watkin) must express his opinion that the noble Lord had been eminently inconsistent and eminently unjust, and therefore he proposed, in no spirit of offence to their Lordships, that the House disagree to the Amendment.

MR. STEPHEN CAVE : I should be sorry to make any attack on the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees in the House of Lords. I have never found him wanting in courtesy, and I believe him to have frequently done excellent service in protecting the interests of the public. In this instance I regret that a personal attack upon me by the noble Lord obliges me to say a very few words. The noble Lord, in complaining of railway influence at the Board of Trade, is reported to have said in reference to a similar clause to that of which I have given notice in the Railways' Regulation Bill—

> "In all probability the imprudence of the Vice President will impose upon your Lordships the necessity of reversing a decision of the other House."—[3 *Hansard*, cxciii. 1078.]

As to railway influence at the Board of Trade, I do not care to say anything. The opinions expressed to me by the railway interest in this House in reference to this very Bill do not lead me to think that they share in that opinion. With reference to the charge against myself I have three remarks to make. In the first place, that it is somewhat strong ground to take, that a collision between the two Houses is provoked by the introduction into a public Bill of a provision rejected in the House of Lords chiefly because it was not in a public but in a private Bill. Secondly, it would seem somewhat unusual to discuss "elsewhere" an Amendment which is merely on the Notice Paper of this House, and has never been brought forward. Lastly, that the President of the Board of Trade is responsible for the conduct of the Department. He is a Member of the House of Lords. Surely, then, the noble Lord ought to have called him to account, and not have attacked—as I understand, in the temporary absence of the noble Duke—his representative in this House, who acts of course under his direction in these matters. I venture, therefore, to think that the term "imprudence" may be more justly applied to the remarks of the noble Lord than to the conduct of the Vice President of the Board of Trade. I shall not speak or vote in reference to this Amendment, as I shall be prepared to support it to-morrow when it comes before the House in Committee on the Railways Regulation Bill.

Amendment *disagreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed :"—MR. MILNER GIBSON, MR. LAING, MR. LEEMAN, MR. WATKIN, and MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN :—To withdraw immediately ; Three to be the quorum.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

PETITION OF S. A. GODDARD.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN rose to call attention to the Petition of Mr. Samuel Aspinwall Goddard, merchant and gunmaker of Birmingham [presented 24th April], stating his claims for inventions and improvements in the construction of breech-loading cannon. The hon. Member said, that some years ago the Government had challenged the inventive power of the country to solve the problem as to having breech-loading cannon ; and Mr. Goddard was one of the earliest to come forward, and he succeeded in making a breech-loading cannon. The weapon was handed over to the Select Committee on Ordnance, that they might test its powers. The Members of that Committee made various suggestions, and the result was that Mr. Goddard manufactured several other breech-loading cannon and sent them to the Government ; and at last he invented a gun which was said by the Government and by the Select Committee to be as perfect a gun as could at that time be found. Mr. Goddard thought that having found out what was wanted he was in a position to command the attention of the Government. He offered to the Government that they should take the gun to Shoeburyness and fire 500 rounds from it without cleaning, the only condition being that they should put a wet sponge down it. Mr. Goddard described the merits of his invention in the Petition, from which he would read the following passage :—

> "This cannon was taken to Shoeburyness, General Cator, the president, and Colonel W. H. Pickering, the secretary, and other Members of the Select Committee attending, and that it was then and there loaded and fired 360 or 370 times successively without sponging or cleaning, and without any appliance whatever, not even the insertion of the wet sponge, as had been stipulated for. That these facts are in substance recorded in the Minutes of the Select Committee; that this cannon has met and satisfied the essential requirements of a breech-loading cannon; and that the qualities which it possesses are permanent and not transitory, and may be copied and extended to other cannon indefinitely. That General Cator, on the conclusion of the trial, declared that, 'the cannon worked well;' that neither he nor the other members of the Committee then present could see any fault in it, but that 'all that he and the Committee could do was to commend it to the Government, which they would do.' That soon after this Report was sent in, petitioner was instructed by the War Department to get up a 32-pounder upon a similar construction, which was done, and the cannon was delivered at Woolwich, where it was proved, with three several charges of 18, 18, and 20 pounds of powder and ball, after which it was taken to Shoeburyness, and loaded and fired many times, several times with 56 lb. oblong shot, without any obstruction arising and without exhibiting any defect. That this 32-pounder was mounted upon a carriage invented by petitioner, combining an inclined plane upon which the recoil took place, the force of which was retarded by strong india-rubber belts, which also drew it back into position, effecting the double object of preventing shock by recoil, and of placing the cannon in position, without the intervention of much, if any, manual labour, which plan of carriage, though it may not be brought literally into use, suggests valuable ideas to artillerists in Her Majesty's service, and these inventions have, as your petitioner believes, been to some extent applied. That Mr. Armstrong's cannon was accepted, and that of your petitioner put aside, the small one, which had been so successful, being placed in the Arsenal at Woolwich, where it remains at the present time. That after a large number of Armstrong cannon had been manufactured, including 1,000 100-pounders, either finished or in process of manufacture, and a very large sum of money had been expended, and after they had proved defective in service in China or Japan, as was reported, Her Majesty's Secretary of War desired petitioner to go to Woolwich, and see if he could alter to his plan the 100-pounder Armstrong guns which were in preparation. That petitioner did go to Woolwich, and found that his breech-loading cannon, which had been lying at Woolwich, had been got out and put in order, and examined by the Select Committee of the Honourable Board of Ordnance, and your petitioner humbly represents that the request of the Minister of War to your petitioner to go to Woolwich and see if he could not alter the Armstrong gun to his plan, after such examination by the Select Committee had been made, was very conclusive evidence of its possessing substantial merits, and a very high compliment to his invention. That, in examining the butts prepared for the Armstrong 100-pounders, petitioner reported to the Select Committee that they could be finished on his plan, but would not be perfect guns, inasmuch as that they were, in his opinion, already weak where they should be strong, while the alteration would make them still weaker; but that there were at the Arsenal some 70-pounder butts of a construction well adapted to the object. That the War Department accepted this Report, and requested petitioner to provide working drawings, and give such instructions to the Superintendent at Woolwich as would enable him to get up a 70-pounder on the proposed model. That petitioner considered such request in the nature of a command, and did provide the drawings, and attended with his machinist at Woolwich on several occasions to give instructions for getting up the cannon and to examine the execution of the work. That the difficulties which presented themselves at the outset in the construction of breech-loading cannon were, first, a mode of closing the breech; and, second, a mode of preventing the escape of gas upon the discharge, both of which are completely overcome in the cannon produced by your petitioner; the former accomplished by two wedges acting in connection and nearly simultaneously, and the latter by an action to compensate for the stretching or expanding of the iron upon a discharge, in proof of the importance of which your petitioner has a written communication from the late Secretary of War, stating that the two inventions for effecting these objects were considered by the Department valuable. That petitioner has devoted to this invention some portion of valuable time during a period of fourteen years; that he has expended a sum of money which, with interest, amounts to more than £5,000; that he has placed in the possession of Her Majesty's Government most valuable inventions; and that he has had no expectation of profit or recompense from any other than Her Majesty's Government."

The War Department continuing to refuse to make Mr. Goddard any remuneration for the £5,000 he had expended in what might be called the service of the Government, or for the valuable time he had given to perfecting breech-loading cannon, he applied for remuneration for the use of his invention in a gun called the "wedge-gun," which had been got up at Woolwich to supersede the Armstrong "hollow screw gun," whereupon Mr. Goddard was asked to go to Woolwich and examine that gun and point out definitely wherein his invention had been appropriated. Mr. Goddard accordingly did go to Woolwich and examine the wedge-gun, and found that the compensating *bouche,* or gas check, had been adopted without any change, and that the principle of the double wedge had been adopted with modifications. Several of

Mr. Goddard's minor contrivances had also been appropriated. In order not to be deceived by his own judgment in examining the wedge gun Mr. Goddard took with him to Woolwich a machinist of great practical ability to inspect the gun, and to make a report thereon, of which the following is a copy:—

"I, John Huggins, of Birmingham, machinist, at the request of Samuel Aspinwall Goddard, owner and proprietor of the breech-loading gun now lying at Woolwich Arsenal, and known by the name of the Church and Goddard gun, and of the inventions appertaining thereto, went to Woolwich to inspect the 64-pounder wedge-gun, permission having been obtained for that purpose, in order to ascertain in what respect, if any, it embraced the inventions comprised in the said Church and Goddard gun, and having carefully examined the said 64-pounder wedge-gun, make the following report, viz.:—1. I find that the sliding *bouche* or ring in the Goddard gun is adopted in the wedge-gun without any modification, with the exception that the bevil on the front interior of the *bouche* is omitted, which bevil was not necessary to the invention, but was adopted simply as a precautionary measure to insure the more certain action of the *bouche*. This mode of closing the breech, so as to prevent the escape of gas on a discharge of the gun, I consider a most valuable invention, and I know of no other mechanical mode by which this indispensable object can be accomplished. 2. I find that the double wedge of the Goddard gun is applied to the wedge-gun, but in a modified form, and in my opinion in a greatly inferior form, inasmuch as that, among other disadvantages, its manipulation in the act of loading and firing would require double the time occupied by the Goddard gun in that performance; the principle, however, of the double wedge is fully adopted and applied. These two main features of the Church and Goddard gun—viz., the compensating *bouche* and the double wedge—constitute the main features of the wedge-gun."

The remainder of the Report was immaterial. That Report was sent to the Minister of War, who had, however, declined, or rather neglected, to make any compensation to him for the trouble and expense to which he had been put in aiding the Government in their endeavour to perfect a breech-loading cannon. Mr. Goddard said that the grounds for refusal by the War Deparment to make him any compensation were, first, that he had no legal claim; secondly, that much money had been expended over another breech-loading cannon with an unsatisfactory result; thirdly, that there was no immediate necessity for a breech-loading cannon; fourthly, probably that his did not meet every requirement. With respect to the first of these grounds, Mr. Goddard submitted that claims in equity might be as strong as claims in law; with respect to the second and third, that he ought not to suffer because other inventions had failed; that although there might be no immediate occasion for a perfect breech-loading cannon, yet that all the reasons in favour of a breech-loading cannon which induced Her Majesty's Government to spend a large sum of money in producing them still remained in full force, and that the time might come when the want of them might be urgent, perhaps indispensable. While, with respect to the fourth, it might be said that if his gun was not perfect, it was either the first or second best that had been offered to the Government. No doubt the War Department was much troubled with useless inventions; but in the present instance a really valuable invention had been offered to them and had undoubtedly received their approbation. The Government should treat inventors like Mr. Goddard with liberality, in the same way as they had done inventors of small-arms.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON asked the hon. Member how long it was since Mr. Goddard's claim had been preferred at the War Department.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, that it was very likely that the right hon. Gentleman was not in Office when the last application on Mr. Goddard's behalf had been made. Mr. Goddard's services had extended over a period of fourteen years. He (Mr. Sheridan) should be perfectly satisfied if the right hon. Gentleman would read over Mr. Goddard's petition and take the matter into consideration. As the right hon. Gentleman (Sir John Pakington) had intimated to him that he would refer to the matter presently, he (Mr. Sheridan) would not make a formal Motion.

ARMY—ROYAL GUN FACTORIES.

MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE.

MAJOR ANSON, referring to certain complaints he had made about a fortnight ago against the Manufacturing Departments in the War Office, said that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, in replying on that occasion, had stated that his charges were vague and indefinite, whereas, on the contrary, they were specific and even minute in their details. The right hon. Gentleman had further stated that he had received no Notice of the charges he had brought against those Departments; but when the right hon. Gentleman was about to bring forward the Army Estimates in April last he informed him that he had a

Motion on the Paper dealing with those Departments, against which he had very serious charges to bring. He had, however, postponed bringing forward these charges until the officers of those Departments had had time to investigate them. He had then written a letter to the War Department, containing the charges he had referred to, and he held in his hand the reply of the right hon. Gentleman to that communication. It was impossible, after such a communication, it could be said that he had not given fair Notice of the charges he was about to make. It was no pleasure to him to make charges against a public Department, and he did so simply from a sense of duty. It was unnecessary for the right hon. Gentleman to have got up the other evening and spoken of the injured feelings of distinguished officers to whom his charges did not in any respect apply. The right hon. Gentleman, in another part of his speech assumed that he (Major Anson) had been posted up in those charges by some outsider. He had undoubtedly gone to Major Palliser for information; but, at the same time, the right hon. Gentleman was equally inspired by the Royal Gun Factories. Major Palliser had a right to have his case heard in that House, seeing that he was a most distinguished man, and that his inventions had saved the country many hundreds of thousands of pounds. He should conclude by moving for a Committee.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Committee of Five Members be appointed by the Committee of Selection to inquire into the following allegations:—That in 1864 the Royal Gun Factories, on being applied to by the Ordnance Select Committee for Estimates for cheaper 9-inch guns than those that were being made at that time, sent in erroneous comparative Estimates, on the strength of which the Ordnance Select Committee decided in favour of the gun proposed by the Royal Gun Factories; that a sample 9-inch gun was then made by the Royal Gun Factories, the details of the cost of which, on being compared with the details of the cost of similar guns manufactured two years afterwards, show great and apparently inexplicable discrepancies; and that like errors have been made by the Royal Gun Factories with regard to the comparative cost of new wrought-iron and converted guns, thereby entailing a heavy and unnecessary expense upon the country,"—(*Major Anson.*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Major Anson

Captain VIVIAN moved an Amendment to add the words—

"That Sir John Pakington and Major Anson be added to the Committee, for the purpose of examining witnesses, and taking part in the proceedings, but without the power of voting."

He said that he was convinced that his hon. Friend would not have brought forward this matter unless he had been thoroughly convinced of the truth of what he had stated; and it would be very unfair if his hon. Friend, and also the right hon. Baronet, had not the means of cross-examining the witnesses who would appear before the Committee. If the Inquiry were entered upon at all it should be fully and fairly carried out.

Colonel SYKES seconded the Amendment, of which he heartily approved, considering that it was for the interest of the Royal Gun Factories themselves that this investigation should take place, with a view to the removal of the suspicion which, no doubt, at present existed.

Mr. SPEAKER ruled that the original Motion of the hon. and gallant Member (Major Anson) must be carried before the addition could be put to the House.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he regretted the aggrieved tone assumed by the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield (Major Anson), because there was already enough of unpleasantness connected with the subject to make it advisable that in the House at least it should be approached as calmly and deliberately as possible. His hon. and gallant Friend commenced his speech by a complaint which had already been answered by the statement of fact that he had given no Notice of his intention to bring charges against the officers of the Gun Factory. He (Sir John Pakington) was sorry to say he could not retract a word he had uttered in that respect. The proof of Notice now was, that the hon. and gallant Member had some communication with him (Sir John Pakington) in April last, in which he intimated that he had a series of charges to bring against this Department; but the hon. and gallant Member must forgive him if he did not at that time bear in mind a communication made to him in last April. Then he referred to a letter and an answer; but the letter was not directed to him, but to Major Palliser. He thought that a letter written with his (Sir John Pakington's) authority, in April last, to Major Palliser, could hardly be considered a notice of the speech that the hon. and gallant Member was going to make in July. On Monday week his hon. and gallant Friend made a very important Motion consisting of three parts, every one of which deserved serious consideration, but the Notice of Motion contained no intimation of the serious charges adverted to by him in April, nor that he was going to make those charges a portion of his speech in July; and therefore he (Sir John Pakington) adhered to the statement that he had no warning that the hon. and gallant Member was going to advert to the subject. The details of those accusations were exceedingly difficult to follow; but there was no doubt that the speech conveyed serious accusations, not only against the acts done in the Gun Factory, but against the motives of the officers, and the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) said that the charges were so serious that they were bound in fairness to make them the subject of inquiry. Considering what had fallen from the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire, he had certainly expected some definite Notice would have been given; indeed, without wishing to introduce any asperity into the discussion, he was bound to say he had reason to complain of the course his hon. and gallant Friend took. The Notice had first appeared last Wednesday for the following Friday; but its terms were very vague, and his hon. and gallant Friend failed to persevere with it. On Monday, a week after the accusations had been made, another Notice appeared on the Paper; but his hon. and gallant Friend did not persevere with that, and a third Notice stood on the Paper for Tuesday last; again, notwithstanding he was present to meet the charge, his hon. and gallant Friend did not appear. Thus, after no less than three distinct Notices of Motion had passed by, the House was on Thursday called on to consider the accusation made last Monday week. Respecting the substance of the Motion he had no objection to offer; he was quite ready to assent to the appointment of the Committee in whatever shape might appear best to the House. He could not, however, refrain from reminding the House that the terms of the Motion did not touch the gravest point of the accusations made on Monday week; he trusted those allegations would be considered by a Committee, and he felt very confident the officers concerned would be able to give a satisfactory answer to every one of them. The gallant officers concerned now stated that those imputations could be explained in the fullest and most satisfactory manner. What they complained of was the imputation of unworthy motives. His hon. and gallant Friend imputed motives which they considered to be most dishonourable. One of their imputations was understood to be that when the gentlemen referred to found there was a desire to employ the trade they immediately altered their prices. There was another allegation which had reference to a particular gun; but he observed that this allegation was not included in the Motion of his hon. and gallant Friend. His Motion did not touch it, and he hoped he was not going too far when he said that in his opinion his hon. and gallant Friend must allow him to consider those parts of his allegations which were not included in his Motion as practically and intentionally withdrawn. The feelings of honourable men were very much hurt at those imputations. His noble Friend the Member for the East Riding (Lord Hotham), to whom all in that House were so much indebted, thought there was an objection to having the proposed Committee nominated by the Committee of Selection. That being so, he felt it right to inform the House that the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield (Major Anson) was in no way responsible for that mode of nomination. He himself must take that responsibility; and his reason for suggesting that the Committee of Selection should nominate in this case was his strong feeling that as the Inquiry was to be in the nature of a judicial one, there should be no room for the slightest suspicion that there was anything like party or bias in the Committee. However, in respect to the manner in which the Committee should be named, he was in the hands of the House. With respect to the addition to the Committee proposed by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro (Captain Vivian), he must, for himself, beg to decline to be put on the Committee. In the first place, his numerous engagements would interfere with his serving on the Committee; and, in the next place, he should prefer not to do so in consequence of his impressions on the subject itself. Then, he thought, it would be difficult for him to find any Member of that House to conduct the case on the other side who had gone so fully into the subject and was in possession of so many of the details as the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield. That duty might be discharged by Colonel

Campbell; but as that gallant officer was not a Member of the House, he did not know whether he would be competent to propose Colonel Campbell as one of the Committee. His own opinion was that five Members of that House, carefully and impartially selected, would be quite competent to give a satisfactory decision in the case.

Lord HOTHAM begged to be understood as not wishing to offer the slightest opposition to the proposed inquiry when he expressed a hope that the Committee would not be nominated in the way proposed by the hon. and gallant Member (Major Anson). When the Committee of Selection had to nominate a Committee, it was their duty to find Members free from any connection with the subject to be investigated. It might so happen, therefore, that the Members appointed were entirely ignorant of the subject; but it must be their own fault if they remained long so, because, on entering the Committee-room, they found themselves confronted by numerous counsel whose duty it was to bring forward the facts on both sides. But in the case of the Inquiry, as proposed by the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield it would be quite different. If five Gentlemen entirely unconnected with and knowing nothing of the subject were selected there would be no counsel or no agents to bring the matter before them. The hon. and gallant Member for Truro (Captain Vivian) proposed an attempt to remedy that inconvenience by moving that two Gentlemen should be appointed—one to represent one side and the other to represent the other side—who should take part in all the proceedings, but abstain from voting. From his own experience in other cases, he was of opinion that a Committee formed in that way was a Committee of the worst possible kind for investigating a matter requiring examination. He thought that no Member should be placed on a Committee to take part in its proceedings, and at the same time to be relieved from the responsibility of voting. The proposed Committee was to investigate a subject of great public importance, and he could not see why it should not be selected by the House in the usual manner In this way a Committee might be selected to conduct the Inquiry fairly and impartially. Necessarily the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield would be nominated on one side, and he could not but think that his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War would be able to name a Member to whom such information might be supplied from the War Office as would enable him to see justice done. He begged to add that he thought a Committee of seven would be quite large enough, and that the sittings of the Committee ought to be continuous pending the Inquiry.

Lord ELCHO, on the part of the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield, who could not speak again, explained that the hon. and gallant Member had waited for a day or two in order to see whether the Inquiry would be proposed by the Secretary of State for War. The hon. and gallant Member having made the charges thought the investigation ought to be originated by the War Department. As regarded the imputation of motives, the hon. and gallant Member entirely eschewed the accuracy of the view taken by the right hon. Baronet of what he had said; but he was content to leave the question of motives to be decided by the Committee. His hon. and gallant Friend had brought no charges against any individual, but only generally against the system, and he was quite prepared to have his allegations thus tested before a Committee. As regarded the trial of this question he (Lord Elcho) confessed that the course suggested by his noble Friend opposite (Lord Hotham) appeared to be the right one.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON expressed his readiness to act upon the suggestion which had been thrown out by the noble Lord (Lord Hotham).

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Another Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Committee of Seven Members be appointed to inquire into the following allegations:—That in 1864 the Royal Gun Factories, on being applied to by the Ordnance Select Committee for Estimates for cheaper 9-inch guns than those that were being made at that time, sent in erroneous comparative Estimates, on the strength of which the Ordnance Select Committee decided in favour of the gun proposed by the Royal Gun Factories; that a sample 9-inch gun was then made by the Royal Gun Factories, the details of the cost of which, on being compared with the details of the cost of similar guns manufactured two years afterwards, show great and apparently inexplicable discrepancies; and that like errors have been made by the Royal Gun Factories with regard to the comparative cost of new wrought-iron and converted guns, thereby entailing a heavy and unnecessary expense upon the country:"—(*Major Anson.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Ordered, That a Committee of Seven Members be appointed to inquire into the following allegations;—That in 1864 the Royal Gun Factories, on being applied to by the Ordnance Select Committee for Estimates for cheaper 9-inch guns than those that were being made at that time, sent in erroneous comparative Estimates, on the strength of which the Ordnance Select Committee decided in favour of the gun proposed by the Royal Gun Factories; that a sample 9-inch gun was then made by the Royal Gun Factories, the details of the cost of which, on being compared with the details of the cost of similar guns manufactured two years afterwards, show great and apparently inexplicable discrepancies; and that like errors have been made by the Royal Gun Factories with regard to the comparative cost of new wrought-iron and converted guns, thereby entailing a heavy and unnecessary expense upon the country.—(*Major Anson.*)

And, on July 18, Select Committee *nominated* as follows:—Major ANSON, Mr. BAGGALLAY, Mr. HOWES, Mr. SCOURFIELD, Mr. SAMUDA, Mr. BAZLEY, and Mr. LAIRD:—Three to be the quorum.

Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ARMY—SOLDIERS' ORPHANS.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

COLONEL NORTH rose to move an humble Address to Her Majesty—

> "That She will be graciously pleased to direct that an Institution shall be established to receive and educate the Orphan Daughters of Non-commissioned Officers and Soldiers of our Army."

The hon. and gallant Member referred to the Chelsea Asylum, which was established by his Royal Highness the Duke of York in 1801. The rules laid down for the admission of children into that asylum, in accordance with the Royal Warrant of the 26th of April, 1805, were as follows:—

> "In the selection of children preference shall be given in general—first, to orphans; secondly, to those whose fathers have been killed or have died on foreign service; thirdly, to those who have lost their mothers and whose fathers are absent on service abroad; fourthly, to those whose fathers are ordered on foreign service, or whose parents have other children."

The next Warrant was that of 1809, which was to the following effect:—

> "Whereas, from the extent of our army and the great proportion thereof usually employed on foreign service, it is become highly expedient to make a further provision for the maintenance and education of distressed children of non-commissioned officers and soldiers belonging to our regular forces, our will and pleasure is that the number to be admitted into our said asylums shall be extended to 792 boys and 348 girls, making in the whole 1,140 children."

Now, at that time our army numbered 216,179 men, including, however, a large number of foreign subsidies, while our present force amounted to 204,037. The next Warrant was that of 1811, which said—

> "By his Royal Highness the Prince Regent of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, our will and pleasure is, in the name and on behalf of His Majesty, that the number to be admitted into the said asylum shall be extended to 800 boys and 400 girls, making in all 1,200 children, exclusive of the infant establishment in the Isle of Wight."

The question was brought before the House on the 4th of May, 1854, when the late Lord Herbert was Secretary for War. The complaint then made was that 120 orphan boys had been taken from Chelsea Asylum for the purpose of making room for the schoolmasters of the army, and the moment the House of Commons became aware that the fact was so he ordered the schoolmasters to be removed and the 120 boys restored to the asylum. He would read an extract from the speech which was made on that occasion by Lord Herbert. He said—

> "About 350 children were now received within the walls of the asylum; while at a former period, when there was also a similar establishment at Southampton, it had accommodated 1,222. It had, however, been found, both here and at Greenwich, that the experiment of educating a large number of girls together had proved a complete failure, so far as regarded their future course of life. The experiment had consequently been abandoned, and he should feel great hesitation in renewing it. With regard to boys, the case was different."—[3 *Hansard*, cxxxii. 1280.]

The answer which he had returned at the time to that statement was that he was not aware that soldiers' daughters were more likely to turn out ill-conducted in after-life than any other portion of Her Majesty's subjects, and that if they had turned out badly it must be owing to the grossest negligence on the part of those who had charge of them. Now, what he had then said he believed to be perfectly true, and he had himself for many years been a subscriber to an asylum the success of which corroborated that view, although his attention had never been sufficiently directed to the admirable manner in which it worked until this year. The establishment to which he referred was called the Soldiers' Daughters' Home. It was instituted in 1855 by Major the Hon. Powys Keck, at the termination of the Crimean war. General Boileau was Chairman of the Committee. 460 had been admitted; 176 were now in the house, and 146 had been placed in domestic service. A prize was given to girls who remained two years in the same situation; ninety-two entered service prior to 1866, of whom forty-seven, or nearly one in every two, have had prizes. Girls who had left the asylum since 1866 were not yet eligible to receive the prize. Besides the girls placed in service three had been trained as schoolmistresses, and two obtained Queen's Scholarships by competition. It was supported by voluntary contributions, and there were thirteen endowed scholarships—eight of the Royal Artillery Crimean Fund, two of the Crimean Endowment Fund, and three of the Havelock Memorial Fund, for one girl each from the 5th, 64th, and 84th Regiments. The first two were perpetual; the third expired in 1882. Was not the success of the Establishment, as shown by those figures, a proof, he would ask, of the justice of his reply to the statement of Lord Herbert that if the girls had turned out badly under the charge of the Government it was owing to some negligence on the part of those whose duty it was to look after them? He hoped that under these circumstances his right hon. Friend at the head of the War Department would be disposed to view the Motion which he was about to make with favour. Some time must of course elapse before the institution required could be satisfactorily established; but might it not, in the meantime, be possible to grant a sum of money to such an institution as that which he had just mentioned on the understanding that it should receive a certain number of children until another asylum for them could be provided? There were a great number of vacancies in the institution, because its funds did not permit of the admission of more girls. There was an amount of £29,000 of prize money arising from the Crimean War which had not been distributed to the troops owing to the smallness of the sum; but it was as much their right as their pay, and he would suggest that part of this sum might be granted to this institution.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to direct that an Institution shall be established to receive and educate the Orphan Daughters of Non-commissioned Officers and Soldiers of our Army,"—(*Colonel North.*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he fully appreciated the excellent motives which induced the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel North) to make the present proposal; but he appeared to have forgotten the establishment at Wandsworth, in full operation under the Patriotic Fund Commissioners. Past experience threw doubts on the success of such experiments; but he had reason to suppose that the establishment at Hampstead was successful, and he believed also that the one at Wandsworth would prove successful. The Duke of York's School, which was removed to Southampton, was afterwards broken up, in consequence of the girls from it turning out badly; and they had similar experience in reference to a similar establishment in Ireland. In the establishment at Wandsworth 300 orphan daughters of soldiers and sailors were carefully brought up. Of course, the children of those engaged in the Crimean War had the first chance of admission; but their number was being rapidly diminished by the course of time, and he thought that the House, before acceding to the present Motion, had better wait to see whether the hopes entertained with regard to the two establishments he had just mentioned were confirmed before proceeding to further experiments.

COLONEL BARTTELOT said, he thought the Patriotic Fund had the best title to State assistance, and the Commissioners would be glad to extend their operations if possible.

An hon. MEMBER said, that there was a remarkably well-conducted institution for the orphan daughters of soldiers near Dublin, and he thought, if funds were given to such establishments by the Government, it would have a fair claim for assistance.

COLONEL NORTH said, he would withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY—CONTROL DEPARTMENT.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Colonel JERVIS rose to move an Address for—

"Copy of the Draft Regulations for the Control Department originally sent in by the War Office to the Treasury, together with any memoranda thereupon by the Assistant Under Secretary of State for War, together with the reply thereto by the Controller in Chief."

In the discussion the other evening he had observed that it appeared from the Papers on the table as if the Treasury did not desire that Sir Henry Storks should remain at his post as Controller-in-Chief; and the right hon. Baronet the Secretary for War then told him that he laboured under a most extraordinary misapprehension in supposing that the Government, after having selected Sir Henry Storks on account of his high character and distinguished abilities, had now turned round on that distinguished officer and declared that they did not want him. He (Colonel Jervis) was not in the habit of speaking without a knowledge of the facts to which he referred, and he now declared that every word of his statement was correct. The Papers moved for by the hon. and gallant Member for Truro (Captain Vivian) would distinctly prove all the allegations he had made. They would show that the right hon. Baronet, up to a certain period, worked with entire cordiality with Sir Henry Storks, and that suddenly that gallant officer found himself thrown over, the regulations framed by him being cast aside. If he was correctly informed there were, in fact, two Secretaries of State for War—one recognized by the House and the country; but there was another at the War Office, who was more powerful than the Secretary of State for War—who that individual was he did not know. It could not be the Director of Ordnance, nor the Accountant General, nor Sir Edward Lugard; but the Papers asked for would alone tell them who this great power within the Department was. It was right that the House should know who were the ruling powers of the Department. What he now wished to state was that he was not incorrect in his statement on a previous evening; but that the right hon. Baronet was not accurately informed by those whose duty it was to give him proper information.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Draft Regulations for the Control Department originally sent in by the War Office to the Treasury, together with any memoranda thereupon by the Assistant Under Secretary of State for War, together with the reply thereto by the Controller in Chief,"—(*Colonel Jervis,*)

—instead thereof.

Lord ELCHO said, this question of Army Control could not be too often considered. It was not his intention to find fault with his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War, for in all communications with his right hon. Friend he had always found him most anxious to promote the efficiency of the service; and he believed that if the right hon. Baronet could have had his will, and if the Control Department had been established in accordance with the Letter of the 8th of March, there would be no reason for any Member of that House to find fault with what had occurred. There existed an erroneous impression among a portion of the public, who supposed that this controversy was a fight between the civil and military officers of the War Office, the latter endeavouring to place the military element above the civil element. He held in his hand an article which appeared recently in the *Saturday Review*, which clearly showed either that the public mind had been led astray upon this question, or that there was an animus manifested by certain authorities in the War Department which was thoroughly discreditable to all parties concerned. It was said in that article—

"The adverse decision of the Treasury is of course, for all practical purposes, an end of the really great career which was open to Sir Henry Storks and General Balfour at the War Office. They had the chance of distinguishing themselves by the introduction of great reforms into our Army Administration. They have used their opportunity to serve a project for intensifying the already intolerable control which the Horse Guards indirectly exercises over the War Office. If they had been left undisturbed, not a civilian would have remained six months in any position of importance, and the army would have governed the Minister of War through his exclusively military subordinates, and have risen superior to Parliamentary control. What it would have cost under such a system no one can guess; but happily the chief agents in the scheme have defeated themselves by excess of zeal. There is now little more to fear, for, though discussion may be burked in the present Parliament, military domination is the last thing which the new House is likely to endure. Whether Sir Henry Storks and his assistant will retire on the significant hint of the Treasury, or will cling a little longer to the rank and emoluments of a position which they have not known how to fill, is very immaterial."

He was inclined to think that article was inspired by some high authority in the War Department of the Government. From what he had heard from the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the War Office, he believed there existed in its Departments a great jealousy of the new office of Controller-in-Chief, which was to control them all. It appeared that an attempt had been made to set aside the intentions of Lord Strathnairn's Committee in favour of the appointment of one man to control all these Departments under the authority of the Secretary of State for War. Sir Henry Storks, who was selected for the post he now filled as being the most competent man in the country to re-organize these unorganized Departments and to bring them under some system of control, and General Balfour had given evidence before Lord Strathnairn's Committee, and a scheme by which there should be one Controller subject to the Secretary of State for War had been recommended by the Committee, which was approved by some of the most competent authorities on the subject. That scheme had been submitted to the Secretary of State for War, who approved it, and wrote a letter to the Treasury asking them to endorse it, and stating that in the event of their doing so it might be put into immediate operation on the 1st of April in Ireland, where it was proposed to try it in the first instance. This letter from the Secretary of State was met by objections on the part of the Treasury which were accepted by the right hon. Gentleman, and the result was that they had now in operation a system of control accepted by the Government and by the right hon. Gentleman in place of that proposed by Sir Henry Storks and General Balfour. The right hon. Gentleman shook his head at that statement; but he could not say that the present system had received the approval of those gallant gentlemen. He (Lord Elcho) should be glad to hear his explanation on the matter. A great deal of misapprehension appeared to prevail respecting the alleged desire among certain officers at the War Office to place the military element above the civil element; but he believed that the various Departments of the War Office would be much better and more economically administered if the duties were performed by officers and non-commissioned officers of the army, as was the case in every other well-regulated military Department, such as those in Prussia and France. The right hon. Gentleman had advocated the principle of giving higher pay for more work; but, on the contrary, he believed that by the system of employing half-pay officers in the higher classes and non-commissioned officers in the lower grades they would obtain infinitely better work for a less amount of pay, while it would prove a stimulus to enlistment in the army. In fact, he believed that it would prove a most desirable investment of the public money to buy up all the interests of the present clerks, in order to appoint military men in their room, and he thought the scheme one well worthy of the consideration of the right hon. Gentleman. In the event of the various offices being filled by military men, there would be no danger of the military element becoming insubordinate, or of its attempting to become superior to the Secretary of State for War, who would still be the complete autocrat of his Department, and superior to every other authority at the War Office—even to the Horse Guards and the Commander-in-Chief. The Duke of Cambridge, in giving evidence before the Commission of 1860, said, in answer to Question 4,105, that he should recognize the superior authority of the Secretary of State for War in all cases. It was clear that the Secretary of State for War exercised complete control over the Commander-in-Chief, except in matters of discipline, and even in such instance the ultimate appeal was to the Secretary of State for War. Sir Charles Trevelyan, himself a civilian, had said after the Crimean War that military men should be employed to a large extent in the War Office. But, instead of appointing one Controller-in-Chief, it was proposed to establish under the new system practically two Controllers, one of whom might be a financial gentleman, who, though thoroughly competent to administer the monetary affairs of the Department, might be, on the other hand, utterly ignorant of the means of securing military efficiency, or incapable of forming a sound opinion as to the necessity or otherwise of the recommendations of the Controller-in-Chief. He could not see the necessity for the appointment of one Controller General who was to exercise control with regard to military matters, and of another who was to exercise control over financial matters. The Secretary of State who was responsible to Parliament would still have the control of the Controller-in-Chief. The Report was full of passages which pointed to the Controller as the sole officer who, in the opinion of the Committee, should govern the whole Department, being responsible alone to the Secretary of State. The practical result of the recommendations of Lord Strathnairn's Committee was that the Secretary of State for War at home and the general officers commanding abroad would have to deal in all matters relating to the administration of the army with one responsible officer. Last night, meeting Lord Strathnairn, he asked him whether he approved the present position of this question; and he was bound to say, giving the utmost credit to his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War for the excellence of his intentions, he should be very much surprised if, in the discussion which was to come on tonight on this subject in the other House of Parliament, that noble Lord (Lord Strathnairn) did say that he approved this system, or that it did give effect to the Report of his Committee. On the contrary, he believed he would say that he considered the whole scheme of the Controllership they had laid down after the most careful inquiry had been cut out, and that the scheme as originally proposed by his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War had been nullified by the subsequent proceedings. In conclusion, he thought this subject was of an importance that could not be exaggerated, and on which the public were greatly mistaken.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER urged the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir John Pakington), in justice to his Department as well as to himself, to accede to the Motion of his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Jervis), in order that the country might know what were really his views upon the matter at issue.

Captain VIVIAN denied that he had ever contended that the Controller-in-Chief was to be equally powerful with the Secretary of State for War. On the contrary, he had always expressed the opinion that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War should possess entire and supreme control over his own and every other Department connected with the army. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether there was any material difference between the draft regulations that were withdrawn and the regulations which were now being acted upon. He understood that they were substantially the same. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accede to his hon. and gallant Friend's wishes.

Mr. CHILDERS said, that looking forward to a much larger change in the relations of the principal officers of our military Departments, he only regarded the present controversy as relating to a temporary expedient. But even as to that it was undesirable to adopt false principles; and he could not too strongly protest against the doctrine laid down by his noble Friend—that the Accountant General was the only person to whom the Secretary of State should refer as to financial matters involved in proposals by a Controller-in-Chief, or other administrative officer. When his noble Friend referred to Sir Charles Trevelyan, he forgot that that Gentleman had proposed that an Under Secretary of State should be the financial adviser of the War Minister.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, it was impossible for him to remain silent after what had fallen from the noble Lord opposite (Lord Elcho). This conversation had been commenced by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Harwich (Colonel Jervis), and he (Sir John Pakington) presumed that he was not aware he was acting in violation of the rules of the House, or the Speaker would have interrupted him when he was making his statement. It struck him, however, that his hon. and gallant Friend was not acting in accordance with their usual practice in the course he had taken. His hon. and gallant Friend commenced his observations by referring to a speech of his (Sir John Pakington's), made in that House more than a week ago, and then, passing on to a speech made by himself in reply, arrived at the comfortable conclusion that he (Colonel Jervis) was right, and he (Sir John Pakington) was wrong. His hon. and gallant Friend distinctly stated, in reference to the Papers laid before the House, that the Government had turned round upon Sir Henry Storks, and displayed a desire to get rid of him.

Colonel JERVIS: What I said was, that it would appear to be so from the reading of the Papers.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had noticed that in strong language. He said such a statement was wild, unfounded, and unjustifiable. He did not shrink from one of these words, but was rather disposed to reiterate them. The statement was utterly unfounded. He repeated that the most harmonious feeling existed between him and Sir Henry Storks, and he should be base indeed if he had acted in any way inconsistent with that respectful feeling which he had ever evinced towards that distinguished Gentleman. When then, the hon. and gallant Member came down to the House and made a statement to the effect that, finding Sir Henry Storks had served his (Sir John Pakington's) purpose, he was trying to get rid of him, the Member for Harwich was casting upon him (Sir John Pakington) an aspersion which, if he did not at once repudiate in the strongest possible manner, he should be unworthy to hold the Office which he now filled. The hon. and gallant Member went on to allude to another power, which, he said, was equal to that of the Secretary of State within the War Office. It was much to be lamented that his hon. and gallant Friend should have founded such statements upon mere idle gossip picked up here and there. He had never heard such a remarkable departure from anything like an accurate knowledge of what was the real state of the War Office as was shown in the speeches both of the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich (Colonel Jervis) and the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho). There was no such rivalry of opinion going on in the War Office as was supposed from the speeches alluded to. Now, his noble Friend had read an extract from the *Saturday Review*, and all he (Sir John Pakington) could say was, that he had never seen that article. [Lord ELCHO: I did not say so.] He could not help feeling that the course pursued by his noble Friend was an unusual one. He (Sir John Pakington) was sorry to say he had observed in certain letters which appeared lately in the London Press a combination of personality and mis-statement regarding War Office affairs which, in the interest of the public generally, he deeply regretted; because, however erroneous those statements were, they were sure to be accepted as facts by a certain portion of the public. The noble Lord said he believed that the article in the *Saturday Review* was inspired by some person high up in the War Office.

LORD ELCHO: No; what I said was, I do not think it impossible that the article was inspired. I did not say that I had reason to believe it was inspired.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: Well, that was pretty much the same thing. Now, he refused to believe that anyone in the War Office could be so base and disloyal as to publish newspaper attacks upon the Department with which he was connected. He would not deny that he had heard such statements before, that he had been told that these personalities and attacks had proceeded from some one connected with the War Office; but he for one did not believe that statement, and all he could say in reply was that if the man were pointed out he should know how to deal with him. The noble Lord said he believed that some differences had arisen between him and Sir Henry Storks and General Balfour. [Lord ELCHO denied having made such statement.] He could only say there was not the slightest foundation for such an insinuation. He had further to express his regret that those Members of the House who were most desirous to see this system of control carried out should come down to that House and throw difficulties in his way, and do more than any others to endanger the prosperity and success of the working of the scheme. It was idle to suppose that such a large change as was contemplated could be effected without great difficulty and perhaps inconvenience to certain gentlemen of high position in the office, but the difficulty was much increased by the course which was pursued by Gentlemen who ought to give him all the encouragement in their power instead of throwing obstacles in his way. This was the more to be regretted, inasmuch as the objections urged were for the most part futile and unfounded, for he did not believe that any change was ever inaugurated with greater promise of success. The hon. and gallant Member for Harwich (Colonel Jervis) had now asked him, as the hon. and gallant Member for Truro (Captain Vivian) had asked him the other evening, to produce a Copy of the Regulations which were first drawn up, the Correspondence written by Mr. Galton, and the answers of Sir Henry Storks. Personally he should not have slightest objection to their production; indeed, he should be pleased to see them upon the table of the House. But he would ask hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House to remember that if he were to accede to this Motion he would be establishing a precedent of the most dangerous and objectionable character. Whenever any departmental change was introduced Parliament had a right to be informed of the change; but to demand the production of such Correspondence as that now asked—documents which must be looked upon to a great extent as private in their character—would be establishing a precedent which could not but injuriously affect the best interests of the public service of this country. Believing that such would be the result, he could not assent to the Motion made by his hon. and gallant Friend.

COLONEL JERVIS said, that he felt bound not to withdraw his Motion for the production of these Papers.

MR. DISRAELI said, he trusted the House would consider before giving a decision on a point which was of the utmost importance. If the House were to insist upon the production of Papers and Correspondence which concerned the preparation and preliminary consideration of measures, they would thereby put a stop to that freedom of criticism which was always invited on such occasions, and which contributed so much to the perfection of public measures. The moment that it became known that the opinions of those most competent to judge of public measures, and who were invited to express them, were likely to be produced in that House, great disadvantage to the public service would result, because everybody would naturally shrink from the responsibility he would have to encounter. Instead, then, of the Government having the advantage of the suggestions which they were in the habit of receiving, and the information and criticism which better enabled them to carry out any changes which they contemplated in the administration of public affairs, they would find themselves in the position of having to deal with merely mechanical persons, who would afford only information upon points on which they were well up, and they (the Government) would lose the advantage arising from those large spontaneous suggestions, and from that general information which tended greatly to the advantage of the public interests. He trusted then, for the sake of the public service, that the House would not assent to this demand for the production of the Papers called for.

Question "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. DISRAELI, referring to several other Amendments on the Paper, said, it was really of the utmost importance that the House should go into Committee upon the Army Vote. He hoped that the hon. Member for Cashel (Mr. O'Beirne), who had a Motion on the Paper respecting the Shoeburyness experiments, would waive his right, in order to allow the Vote in question to be taken in Committee.

MR. O'BEIRNE said, he would withdraw his Motion, on the understanding that the right hon. Gentleman would give him an opportunity of bringing that most important matter, of which he had given Notice, under the consideration of the House, before the close of the Session.

MR. DISRAELI: The hon. Member can bring on his Motion upon the Report of Supply under any circumstances.

MR. O'BEIRNE expressed his dissatisfaction with such an arrangement.

MR. DISRAELI: The House will sit on Saturday, and I have no doubt the hon. Gentleman will be then afforded the opportunity he desires.

MR. CANDLISH asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would put down the Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill as the first Order of the Day for that evening, it having been fixed for the Morning Sitting? ["No, no!"] That Bill and the Irish Registration Bill must, he presumed, become law before the close of this Session, the Government having pledged themselves to carry them. The Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill might fairly take precedence that evening of the Cattle Market Bill. ["No, no!"]

MR. MILNER GIBSON desired to remind the House that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had declared that all business connected with the question of Reform would be the first to be wound up. The Irish Registration Bill was not only connected with Reform, but its immediate passing was a necessity. There could, therefore, be no reason why it should not have precedence of the Cattle Market Bill. ["No, no!"] He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would adhere to the declarations which he had made, and either proceed with Reform measures or assign some intelligible reasons for deviating from that course.

MR. DISRAELI: I repeat it is the determination of Her Majesty's Government to carry the Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill, and all I can say is this—I will not advise Her Majesty to prorogue Parliament until that measure is definitely decided upon by the House. With that view alone I propose a two o'clock Sitting of the House to morrow in order to go on with that Bill. With regard to the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton-under-Lyne (Mr. Milner Gibson) on the subject of Corrupt Practices, I do not think that I have said anything to justify that phrase as a description of my policy. My wish is to fulfil the engagements I have made with a number of Gentlemen on both sides of the House. I have, therefore, fixed this evening for the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill, and I feel myself bound to adhere to that arrangement. I do not, of course, know how long the discussion upon that subject may take; but perhaps it may terminate before the usual time of adjournment. In that case we shall take the Irish Registration Bill, which is on the Paper. In the new fervour for Reform principles of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Milner Gibson)—of which by the way he gave us very little taste during the general discussions—he seems to throw a doubt upon our sincerity in those questions immediately connected with it. He may, however, rest assured that the Irish Registration Bill will pass this Session, because without it we cannot make the appeal to the country which we are so desirous of expediting. Allowing this arrangement, then, to stand, I propose that on to-morrow at two o'clock we shall proceed with the Corrupt Practices Bill.

BRISTOL ELECTION.—QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, that having given way to the Government on a former occasion on being told that he should have an opportunity of bringing this subject forward, he found that the pledge given by the Government had been fulfilled by his Motion being placed thirty-ninth on the Orders of the Day. Finding he should be out of Order in now bringing forward his Motion, he wished to ask the Solicitor General in the absence of the Attorney General, Whether it was his intention to prosecute those who had been guilty of bribery and other malpractices at the last Bristol election?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he had no doubt, though he had had no communication with the right hon. Gentleman on the subject, that the Attorney General had given consideration to this Question. He apprehended, however, that his learned Friend would think much further inquiry necessary before he could decide upon instituting proceedings, about the result of which it would be impossible to judge.

Mr. NEATE offered his notes on the evidence taken before the Bristol Election Committee to the Attorney General, and assured him that the information they contained would enable him to prosecute a dozen persons without a moment's hesitation.

Mr. Disraeli

NATIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION (IRELAND).—OBSERVATIONS.

Sir JOHN GRAY rose to call attention to the alterations recently made in the Second, Third, and Fourth Lessons issued to the Schools under the charge of the Board of National Education, Ireland; and to move for the Correspondence and Minutes of Evidence of the Proceedings in reference thereto. The hon. Member said it would be in the recollection of the House that at the close of last Session, when the Education Estimates were before the House, he raised a discussion with reference to primary education in Ireland; and he then showed conclusively that the mixed system of education was a mere myth, and the case he had on that occasion to bring under their notice afforded a remarkable illustration of the curious effect of attempting to prop up a rotten system, and of the false position that fraudulent system enforced the Commissioners to take. The illustrative case he had to adduce occurred in the city of Kilkenny, which he had the honour to represent. The Rev. Mr. Porter, a Presbyterian minister, casually visited the model school in that city, and complained that most improper passages were admitted to the lesson books and sanctioned by the Board. The first passage pointed out as improper, was a portion of the most exquisitely beautiful of the national ballads composed by the late Samuel Lover. That ballad, *The Angel's Whisper*, which was to be found on every Protestant drawingroom table in Ireland, and which is not less known or admired in England, gives a most truthful and touching picture of the love and faith which adorn the Irish peasant's home, was deemed improper by the rev. gentleman because it contained these words—

"Her beads while she numbered,
The baby still slumbered,
And smil'd in her face as she bended her knee:
'Oh! bless'd be that warning,
My child, thy sleep adorning,
For I know that the Angels are whispering with thee.

"'And while they are keeping
Bright watch o'er thy sleeping,
Oh! pray to them softly, my baby, with me,
And say thou would'st rather
They'd watch o'er thy father
For I know that the Angels are whispering with thee.'"

That was true to nature, and the Commissioners, recognizing the fact, have ordered a new edition of the second book, from which this improper ballad has been expunged, in conformity with Archbishop Whately's rule of shutting out every allusion to Catholic practices, and by degrees Protestantizing the children. The reverend censor proceeded then to the fourth book, and there he found a passage quoted from the old English chronicles, as translated by John S., descriptive of the death of an English Catholic Queen, Philippa. The dying Catholic Queen is described by the chronicler as making the sign of the Cross on her heart—and Lord Berners translated the passage in the same way—and commending her husband and children to the protection of Heaven. The Rev. Mr. Porter objected to this historical work, because it represented the dying Christian to have made the sign of the Cross, and the Commissioners, true to the ideas of mixed education, have falsified the quotation in a new edition, to please the bigotry of those who abhor the symbol of redemption. The third book came then under his censorship. It contained a description, by a Protestant historian, of one of the most remarkable of the Irish ecclesiastical sees —the old see of Glendalough, known to tourists as the Seven Churches. The historian referred to the monastic ruins, once beautiful, and dedicated to the service of God, but now in desolate decay, and because they were built by Catholics the rev. gentleman objected to its being said that they were dedicated to God's service, and demanded that the description of an Irish ruin should be shut out from schools in which Irish children are taught. He (Sir John Gray) would not dwell on the moral of all this; the Commissioners complied with the demand, and the three books have been cancelled and withdrawn from every school in Ireland, and new editions substituted on the complaint of this most tolerant advocate of the mixed system.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, the Government were not responsible for the alterations made in the books referred to. If the hon. Gentleman would give a list of the Returns he required, he (the Earl of Mayo) would take care to furnish him with all the information he required.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reference to a Question put to him by the hon. Member for Dudley (Mr. Sheridan) at an early part of the day, he had only to say that Mr. Goddard's name was a long time before the War Office. If the hon. Member would communicate with him (Sir John Pakington) privately he would endeavour to satisfy him upon the subject he alluded to.

Main Question "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Question again proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £389,800, be granted to Her Majesty (in addition to the sum of £81,000 already voted on account), towards defraying the Charge for Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, and Half Pay, which will come in course of payment from the first day of April 1868 to the 31st day of March 1869, inclusive."

GENERAL DUNNE called attention to the Report of the Committee on the Military Reserve Funds; and referred to the several schemes suggested for promoting retirement among officers of the Royal Artillery and Engineers, contending that the inducement to be offered to officers to retire should be equal to their hopes if they remained in the corps. The system of purchasing out the officers of the Engineers and of the Artillery with sums from a reserve fund to which they never had contributed was a most objectionable one, and had been condemned by a Committee who had gone very fully into the subject. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War would inform the House that they were going to put an end to this mode of purchasing out officers, and to do something towards carrying out the recommendations of the Committee on the subject.

MR. CHILDERS, while admitting that the subject was a difficult one, and while not blaming the Government, thought at the same time that it was very unfortunate the War Department had not come to a decision in reference to the recommendations of the Committee to which the hon. and gallant General (General Dunne) had just referred. On the other question, nothing could be worse than the system under which the officers of non-purchase corps were now retired. A fixed sum was provided, out of which officers of a certain standing might or might not, according to their rank, receive annuities of £600 or £450 a year; but it was a farce to call this a system of retirement. The Committee recommended that there should be a fixed scale according to length of service, and that officers should be allowed to compound for the payments to which they would be entitled. The only thing the House had got before them in reference to the intentions of the Government was a Paper, drawn up by the actuaries and based upon speculations entirely gratuitous, as far as the Committee were concerned, on the part of gentlemen in the War Department and at the Horse Guards. It was true that some of these gentlemen came before the Committee, and the Committee had heard some of these speculations; but they never even alluded to them in their Report; and the Paper was perfectly useless so far as the House might want it. He must therefore disregard it as an authority in the discussion of the question. Even according to the view of the parties themselves the scheme was so absurd that it was impossible for reasonable men to deal with it. He hoped, seeing what ideas were in vogue in his office, that his right hon. Friend the Secretary for War would not commit Parliament and the country to any change in the present arrangements till next Session.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply to the observations of the hon. and gallant Member (General Dunne), with reference to the reserve fund, said, that as the change involved in the Report of the Committee was a very important one he thought the best course to adopt, looking to the interests of the army was to consider it during the Recess. He had therefore applied to the Treasury and had obtained their sanction to deal with the reserve fund exactly as heretofore up to the time when the Estimates would be introduced next year. By that time the Government would have made up their minds as to the course which they would be prepared to take in reference to the fund. As to the observations which had fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), he could only repeat what he had already stated, that it would be absolutely necessary before long to have a new plan of retirement for the non-purchase corps. The questions involved, however, were very complicated and difficult, and it was far more important that any scheme which was devised should be well done than that it should be done quickly. He would assure his hon. Friend (Mr. Childers) that no premature action would be taken upon the subject to which he referred, and that nothing would be done without the sanction of Parliament. He hoped the House would be content with his assurance that during the Recess he should give further consideration to the subject. There was in the Vote they were about to pass a sum of £5,000, being the second instalment of £10,000 for the Engineers; did the hon. Gentleman wish that that £5,000 should not be expended as was intended.

Mr. CHILDERS: That is distinctly my wish.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had no objection to accept the suggestion.

Colonel JERVIS said, he did not think the right hon. Baronet understood the subject. This £5,000 was part of £10,000 which should have been voted last year for the Engineers.

Mr. PACK-BERESFORD trusted that the Committee would not consent to withdraw this £5,000.

Captain ARCHDALL complained of the consolidation of barrack districts, thereby imposing additional duties on barrack masters for which they were inadequately paid.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolution to be reported *To.morrow,* at Two of the o'clock.

IRELAND—CASE OF MICHAEL O'HANLON.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN GRAY said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Is it the fact that Michael O'Hanlon, formerly a resident in Belfast, and who has a wife and four children totally dependent for their support on his earnings as a working gardener, had been nearly eighteen months in prison; and, if so, if any reason can be assigned for not bringing him to trial or admiting him to bail?

The Earl of MAYO said, that an Order for the discharge of Michael O'Hanlon was made out on the 8th of this month, and he had heard that morning that he had been discharged under that Order.

NATURALIZATION AND EXPATRIATION. QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there has been any recent Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States on the question of naturalization and expatriation; and, if so, whether he is willing to lay such Correspondence upon the Table of the House?

LORD STANLEY: Sir, the House will probably have seen in some English newspapers the Despatch from the United States' Government upon this subject, to which the Question of the hon. Member refers. That Despatch was placed in my hands a few days ago, and it appears to have been made public in America previous to its reaching this country. Before it came into my hands, I had written to the British Minister at Washington upon the subject—a Despatch which must have crossed that of Mr. Seward on its way to this country. In that Despatch I explained the views of Her Majesty's Government upon the question of naturalization as it now stands. In answer to the hon. Member's Question, I may say that I have no objection to lay that Despatch, as well as that of Mr. Seward, upon the table. I may also repeat what I have already stated in answer to a Question put to me in this House, that Her Majesty's Government are quite prepared to accept in principle the views of the naturalization question for which the United States' Government contend, and therefore I do not apprehend that any misunderstanding can arise out of it. We have declined, however, to enter into any treaty upon the subject just at present, for two reasons—firstly, because some legal details have to be arranged, and are now being considered by the Commission appointed for that purpose; and next because, even if we were to act irrespectively of the Report of that Commission, such a treaty would be perfectly useless until an Act of Parliament is passed to bring it into operation. I need not say that in the state of Business—not only as it is now but as it has been for the past month—it would have been useless to attempt to bring in so large and important a measure. If it should be my fortune to have any share in the Government next year, I shall be ready to introduce a Bill upon the subject in the new Parliament.

METROPOLIS—NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE.—QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether notices will be served during the autumn on the owners of houses in Holywell Street, and also on the owners of houses in the line of a new street from the Strand to Lincoln's Inn Fields, on the west side of proposed New Law Courts, in order that a Bill may be brought in, during the next Session of Parliament, to provide approaches to the site of the New Courts of Justice by the removal of Holywell Street and the formation of a new street from the Strand to Lincoln's Inn Fields?

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, in reply, that the Royal Commissioners did not recommend the removal of the property referred to by the hon. Member for the approaches to the New Law Courts. And, however desirable it might be that these houses should be removed for metropolitan improvements, Her Majesty's Government had no intention of giving the notices with a view of bringing in a Bill for the purchase of the property next year.

IRELAND—FENIAN PRISONERS, WARREN AND COSTELLO.—QUESTION.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If Her Majesty's Government will take into favourable consideration the question whether the time is arrived when the very heavy sentences passed on Warren and Costello, the only two persons of the crew of the *Jackmell* who have not been released, may be remitted or mitigated?

THE EARL OF MAYO, in reply, said, he was glad the hon. Member put the Question, because considerable misapprehension seemed to exist upon the subject. The two prisoners referred to were convicted for coming to Ireland in an armed vessel, and cruizing along the coast in order to raise an armed insurrection against the Queen. The only evidence given against them of their proceedings in the United States of America—was that they were members of the Fenian Brotherhood previous to the 5th of March, 1867, the date of overt acts connected with the rising in which their brother conspirators were engaged. That evidence was necessary to connect them with the Fenian society, and in accordance with the terms of the Treason Felony Act that brought them within the jurisdiction of this country, so that in reality their case did not differ in any considerable degree from those of the great mass of the Fenian prisoners tried and convicted in Ireland. He was afraid the time was hardly yet come when it would be possible to enter into anything like a general consideration of the sentences passed upon the Fenian prisoners with a view either to a commutation or a remission of their sentences, and, therefore, he did not see any exception in the case of these two prisoners.

IRELAND—INEQUALITY OF TAXATION.

QUESTION.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to the inequality of taxation between Great Britain and Ireland shown by Return No. 345, printed by Order of this House on the 22nd June last, by which it appears that the amount of Revenue for each £100 of assessed Property and Income Tax paid by Great Britain in the year 1854 was £23 18*s.* 11¼*d.*; while that paid by Ireland was £27 15*s.* 11*d.*: the amount paid by Great Britain in 1861 was £21 9*s.* 5½*d.*; that paid by Ireland was £29 2*s.* 11½*d.*: and that paid by Great Britain in 1866 was £17 14*s.*; while that paid by Ireland was £29 10*s.* 7½*d.* per cent.: and, whether he proposes, during the Recess, to consider this inequality of taxation with a view to its being remedied?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, in reply, that as the Question affected the Treasury, perhaps the House would permit him to answer the hon. Member's Question. The attention of Her Majesty's Government had been drawn to the Return lately moved for by the hon. Member, and an inquiry had been made and was being continued into the causes which appeared to show, on the face of a Return the hon. Member referred to in his Question, what was certainly not in accordance with the common impression, that the taxation of Ireland was in a higher ratio than that of England. One cause probably that tended to that was that the basis of Schedule A in Ireland was notoriously lower than the basis of Schedule A in England.

METROPOLIS—PARK LANE.

QUESTION.

Mr. GREGORY said, he would beg to ask the hon. Member for Bath, Whether the Board of Works are going to pull down the public houses on the eastern side of Park Lane, since the proposal to widen the Lane through Hamilton Place has been rejected?

Mr. TITE said, in reply, that in 1864 an application, which was refused, was made to the Government to make a communication through the Park. The same scheme was submitted to the Government by Mr. Snell, but with no better success. In 1865 the Board of Works introduced a Bill to open Hamilton Place; but it was opposed by Mr. Gore on the part of the Government, and after being referred to a Select Committee, it was rejected. In 1866 the Board of Works brought in a Bill to open up Park Lane by taking down Gloucester House. In 1866-7 there were no means of carrying out the improvement through the Coal and Wine duties, and the Bills of 1866 and 1867 had to be withdrawn. The sanction of the Government having been this year obtained for the continuance of the Coal and Wine duties, a Bill was brought in but the plan of taking down Gloucester House was unfortunately rejected unanimously by the Select Committee. The question was, therefore, still open, and the possibility of widening the other side of Park Lane was under consideration, and also the suggestion of the Committee of 1868. Not a moment would be lost in considering the question by the Board of Works, and he hoped next Session to be able to bring in a Bill by which this desirable improvement might be carried out, but certainly not by the removal of Gloucester House.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN CATTLE.

QUESTION.

Mr. NORWOOD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Commercial Treaty between Sweden and this Country contains the "most favoured nation" Clause; and, if so, whether the Government propose to extend to cattle imported from Sweden—being a country free from cattle plague—similar privileges to those which have been granted to cattle imported from Portugal, Spain, and Normandy: whether it would not be in accordance with our Treaty engagements with Prussia, which embrace the "most favoured nation" Clause, that similar privileges should also be granted to cattle imported from Schleswig Holstein, in case such province be found to be entirely free from cattle plague; and, whether any representations have been made to Her Majesty's Government in reference to the importation of cattle from Denmark, and whether the Government declines to remove the existing restrictions on the importation of cattle from Denmark, although that country is and has been entirely free from cattle plague?

LORD STANLEY said, in reply, that the commercial treaty between Sweden and this country did contain the "most favoured nation" clause, but stipulations of that kind had not been held to apply, and he did not think it reasonable that they should be considered as applying to restrictions temporarily imposed for sanitary purposes only, and not imposed with a view of giving one country a commercial advantage over another. That also answered the second part of the Question of the hon. Gentleman, which related to our treaty engagements with Prussia. With regard to the third part of the Question, many representations had been addressed to Her Majesty's Government on the subject; but although these representations were addressed to the Foreign Office in the first instance, it rested, not with him, but with the Council Office to consider what restrictions should be imposed for sanitary purposes.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, if the restrictions were not necessary for sanitary purposes, he understood the noble Lord to say the "most favoured nation" clause would apply. Therefore, if there was no cattle plague in Sweden and Denmark, those countries had a right to demand that that clause should be carried into effect.

LORD STANLEY said, that that was a matter for argument.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, not as argument, but as a matter of fact, he wished to ask, If it was true that if there was no cattle plague in Sweden and Denmark, the "most favoured nation" clause applied?

LORD STANLEY said, the right hon. Gentleman put a question on a hypothetical case, which he could not answer on an occasion of this kind, inasmuch as he would have to enter on a longer discussion than the rules of the House would permit him. If the right hon. Gentleman wished to raise the question, he had better bring it on in a form in which it might be debated.

MR. NORWOOD said, he wished to ask, Whether, as Denmark was free from the cattle plague, the Government intend to withdraw the restrictions on the importation of cattle from that country?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, the question was not as to the landing of cattle, since that was permitted, but as to what was to be done with the cattle after they were landed. Cattle imported from Spain were allowed to go inland; but there were reasons why the regulations passed respecting cattle from Spain, Portugal, Brittany, and Normandy should not be applied to Denmark. The ships that went to Spain were engaged in the wine trade alone, and did not go to any other country than Spain, so that there was no danger of the cattle contracting any disease on board those ships; but the ships that went to Denmark went also to Revel and the Baltic ports, and cattle might very well contract disease in them. Another reason was that Spain, Portugal, Brittany, and Normandy reared more cattle than they required for their own use, exportingonly, but not importing; so that there was no danger of the cattle contracting disease before their embarkation; but in the case of other countries this did not apply. When the hon. Member spoke of cattle being imported from Denmark, he must mean that they were exported from Schleswig and Holstein because the ports were in those provinces, and cattle from Hungary, Podolia, Galicia, Styria, and other districts where the cattle plague was indigenous, were conveyed to the ports of Schleswig and Holstein, and might be brought to this country. For those reasons it would be imprudent to apply the same regulations to the northern ports, where the same security against cattle plague did not exist.

MR. NORWOOD said, he had confined his question to Denmark proper.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, there was no port of export from Denmark proper.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE CUSTOMS, &c.

QUESTION.

MR. A. RUSSELL said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, considering the recent decision of the House to confer the franchise on the officers of the Customs, Inland Revenue, and Post Office, he is not of opinion that Members of Parliament should be precluded from making application in favour of persons seeking employment in those Departments?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, there was no intention of legislating with the view of precluding Members of Parliament from making application in favour of persons seeking employment in Government Offices, because of the recent Act removing their disabilities.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN SHEEP.

QUESTION.

Mr. GILPIN said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government have any objection to continue to allow Foreign Sheep imported into London to be removed alive to populous inland towns as at present, with the sanction of the Privy Council; and, if so, whether there would be any objection to except Foreign Sheep from the operation of the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, in reply, that there was no intention to prevent foreign sheep from going into the country, as the Order in Council showed; but the evidence adduced against the Bill by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Milner Gibson)—he referred especially to that of Mr. Rudkin, the Chairman of their Market Committee—proved incontestably that there was great danger in the free transit of foreign sheep, and induced the Committee, and the Government also, to come to the conclusion that it was necessary to prevent sheep from infected places from going into the country.

DISTRIBUTION OF TROOPS IN THE NORTH OF IRELAND.—QUESTION.

Sir HERVEY BRUCE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, What were the circumstances which induced the Government to send 50 men and 2 officers of the 28th Regiment to Coleraine on July 13th?

The Earl of MAYO said, in reply, that the removal of men to particular places could not be taken as an indication that any disturbance of the public peace was apprehended. The fact was, that they were placed only in those spots where their services, if they were required, would be most available, and the sending of those troops to Coleraine was due to this circumstance alone.

FIRES FROM RAILWAY ENGINES.

QUESTION.

Mr. READ said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, If his attention has been called to the great and increasing destruction of growing crops and other property by fires caused by sparks from Railway Engines; and why Railway Companies should not be prohibited from using Coals in Locomotive Engines at least till the harvest is ended?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE, in reply, said, the Board of Trade had received no recent communication on this subject. Fires were, no doubt, occasionally caused by sparks from locomotives, and in dry weather, such as that which now prevails, the danger was, of course, much increased. Still, if negligence could be proved against a company, it was liable for damages. It had been suggested that wire caps should be used for the funnels, such as are seen on Italian railways; but these were found materially to impede the draught, and besides had not proved effectually preventive. There was no law prohibiting the use of coals, and the Board of Trade was also powerless in the matter; the objection to the substitution of coke consisted in its much heavier cost. Sparks, like smoke, were formed of particles of imperfectly consumed fuel, and a clause in the Railway Regulation Bill of this Session, which provided for a more perfect consumption of smoke, would, he hoped, tend to prevent the mischief of which his hon. Friend complained.

CATTLE PLAGUE COMPENSATION.

QUESTION.

Mr. READ said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Privy Council, If all the Claims for Cattle Plague Compensation are settled; and when the final Report on the Cattle Plague—a great portion of which has been in type since May, 1867—will be in the hands of Members; and, whether the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council Office is likely to be permanent; and, if so, why Agricultural Statistics, which cost last year £18,000, the Corn Averages, costing annually £2,700, and other Returns connected with Agriculture, should not be collected through this Office?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, in reply, said, although there were still thirty-one outstanding claims for compensation, the delay was not in the Council Office; it arose from the difficulty of getting the necessary information from the clerks of the local authorities. The final Report on the Cattle Plague was now awaiting only the completion of the medical Report and the illustrations. It was true that portions of it were in type in May, 1867, but those portions consisted only of the statistics for 1865 and 1866. The Report, when completed, would contain a full history of the outbreak, from its commencement to its termination. It would be in the hands of Members early in the Recess. The Treasury has appointed a Commission to inquire into the desirability of making the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council permanent, and the Commission will meet in a few days. The remaining portion of the Question of the hon. Gentleman he was unable to answer.

POST OFFICE—VANCOUVER'S ISLAND. QUESTION.

VISCOUNT MILTON said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, a copy of the Despatch of Mr. Cardwell to the Governor of Vancouver's Island, dated 11th October, 1865, No. 57, transmitting Copy of Correspondence with the Treasury and the Post Office relating to the postal communication between that Colony and Great Britain?

MR. ADDERLEY said, in reply, that he could not see the use of giving to the House a despatch from a late Secretary of State to a late Governor of a colony which no longer existed, respecting negotiations which had come to an end. New negotiations were now on foot, which he had recently stated to the House; but, for reasons he then gave, it would not be proper to lay any Papers on the table respecting them until they had come to a conclusion.

TURKEY—EMBASSY HOUSE AT THERAPIA.—QUESTION.

MR. MONK said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Estimate founded upon the plan of Colonel Gordon, which was selected by Her Majesty's Government for the new Embassy House at Therapia; and whether the contract has been entered into for the erection of that house?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said he was unable to lay upon the table the Estimates and plans referred to by the hon. Gentleman, because, although the Estimate would not exceed £10,000, the plan had been materially altered. Colonel Gordon had left Constantinople, and the gentleman now in charge of the building was the British Consul at Constantinople; he believed the interests of economy would be best consulted by leaving the matter in his hands. Everything had been done to insure that the work should be carried out economically.

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. J. B. SMITH said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer—it having been given in evidence before the Select Committee on the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill that the provisions of that measure would have the effect of considerably raising the Government Contracts for the supply of cattle for the Army and Navy, and thus of increasing the Army and Navy Estimates, Whether there would be any objection to providing that foreign cattle, whether imported into London or any other port, may be forwarded alive, on the same conditions as English cattle, to Aldershot, Portsmouth, and Chatham, and other military and naval establishments, with the sanction of the Privy Council?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he thought the Question of the hon. Member rather tended to anticipate the discussion which would probably arise on the first Order of the Day. As he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) understood it, the evidence of the Government contractors was that they would be able to supply dead meat at Aldershot cheaper than live meat. He did not think this was a convenient time for discussing contradictory opinions on the point.

IRELAND—BARRACKS AT MULLINGAR. QUESTION.

MR. MAGUIRE said, in the absence of his hon. and gallant Friend (Captain Greville) he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If he is aware that the large and commodious Barracks at Mullingar have for some time been unoccupied by a Regiment of the Line, and that at the present moment there are only two Companies quartered there; and whether, considering the central situation of Mullingar Barracks, on a line of Railways which connects it with the North and South, as well as the East and West of Ireland, he does not think it desirable that as large a force should be kept there now as formerly?

THE EARL OF MAYO said, in reply, that the Irish Government had nothing to do with the distribution of the troops in Ireland, except in cases of preserving the public peace; all ordinary movements of the Army were directed by the War Office. His own opinion, however, was that there was no necessity to station troops at Mullingar in any considerable force.

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 139.]

(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Hunt*)

COMMITTEE. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [26th June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" and which Amendment was,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the proposal to pass a permanent law, requiring that in order to prevent the introduction of the Cattle Plague into this Country from abroad, all foreign cattle and other animals imported into the Port of London shall be landed at one prescribed spot, and shall not be removed thence alive, ought not to be considered apart from the general policy of imposing legal restrictions on the foreign cattle trade in other ports of the United Kingdom,"—(*Mr. Milner Gibson.*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. MOFFATT said, that the question raised by the Bill itself was one of very great importance, being nothing less than this—whether this country should continue the policy which it had been pursuing for twenty years, or whether it should reverse that policy. Parliament had now to consider whether it would revert to Protection or persevere in the great principles of Free Trade, which had led to results so beneficial, not only to this country, but to all the world. The Government had introduced a Bill of a most protective kind—and how had it been introduced? It had been, at least, as far as regarded the principle involved in it, smuggled into the House in the first instance; but when it came before the Select Committee he and other hon. Members perceived that it was a measure of rank Protection. It would defeat one of the great objects Sir Robert Peel had in view when asking Parliament to adopt the principle of Free Trade in cattle — namely, that of securing to the people of this country meat at prices within their reach. During the investigation conducted by the Select Committee it was admitted on all hands—by the advocates as well as by the opponents of the Bill — that the effect of the measure would be to raise prices very much. Graziers certainly said that its effect would be to bring about Free Trade; but when asked what they meant by Free Trade they said they meant free competition. When the inquiry was carried a little further it appeared that they meant competition among themselves, but a keeping out of the foreigner. Within a few months after the passing of this Bill the importation of foreign cattle would come to an end. Indeed, he might refer to the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council in support of that proposition, for the noble Lord had frequently avowed in that House that foreign dealers would not send their cattle to this country if the animals were to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation. But the Select Committee had heard the evidence of more practical men than the noble Lord—butchers and farmers. The latter said that if this Bill passed prices would be improved; and they added that, in their opinion, prices ought to be improved. The butchers stated that the Bill would have the effect of advancing prices; but their objection to this was that, while prices would be increased the supply would be diminished. Perhaps it had been the desire of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) that some of his party should be educated in Free Trade principles by the right hon. Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson) and other Members of the Committee; but he did not think anything had been effected in that way beyond getting some of the right hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Disraeli's) supporters to admit that if you limited the supply and increased the demand you would raise prices. The pretence for the Bill was the rinderpest, which had visited this country a year or a year and a half ago; but it had not been shown that such a measure was necessary for keeping that disease out in future, or that it would effect that object. Before the Committee, M. Rouher, the chief of the Department in France which had the matter under its charge, attended for the purpose of explaining what arrangements were made for preventing the ravages of rinderpest across the Channel. The position of France was far less favourable than ours, and yet, though they had the disease there eight or ten times, they had never found any difficulty in stamping it out without in any degree giving up the full and free importation of foreign cattle. It was very instructive to see how this information was received by the country Gentlemen on the Committee. One would have thought they would have listened to it with the greatest interest; but it was evident that M. Rouher had had in them a comparatively unwilling audience. In France the rinderpest had been stamped out with a loss of 600 head, whereas it cost us 278,000, besides 54,000 that had been slaughtered on account of the disease. In Austria, too, which was the only country where rinderpest still existed, the plague was confined to one or two provinces, and surely the Government, before they subjected the country to a tax of £2,000,000, or £3,000,000 in the enhanced price of their food, ought to have inquired how the Germans contrived to restrict the malady within a few districts. Depend upon it, the real rinderpest which hon. Gentlemen opposite feared was foreign competition. There was a minor point on which he desired information. Did the Government intend to adhere to their resolution to admit cattle from Spain, Portugal, and Brittany? If they did, it seemed to him hardly consistent with the dignity of this country to attempt thus to evade our obligations under "the most favoured nation" clauses of our treaties. The only effect of this Bill would be to raise seriously the price of meat. This would especially be the case in London, for two reasons—because it would limit the supply, and because the expense of the construction of the foreign market would fall upon the metropolis. It had been estimated that the cost would be nearly £500,000; and it was also believed that it would be four or five years before the market could be opened; so that, during all that time, the meat market would be in a state of confusion and uncertainty. A rise of price in the article of meat touched the comfort of the people. In 1866 the number of foreign cattle in the metropolitan market was 343,000 head, and in 1867 that number was decreased by 56,000, or nearly 15 per cent. It was difficult to measure the amount of privation and suffering caused by that diminution. He trusted that the House would never consent to infringe on the great policy of Free Trade, and that the friends of that policy would by their vigilance and perseverance prevent the adoption of such a law as the one now proposed. It might appear to be harmless; but he believed that it would prove, if it was passed, a most vicious and prejudicial piece of legislation.

SIR J. CLARKE JERVOISE said, that the Medical Officer's Report in 1863 stated that the diseases which figured behind the dead meat market were various. The more important were contagious fevers, parasitic diseases and typhoid; and Mr. Gamgee (who was admitted on all hands to be a great authority on such subjects) stated it to be his belief that one-fifth of the mutton, beef, veal, &c., sold in this country was considerably diseased. He also stated that the epidemic diseases were entirely owing to the importation of diseased meat, and that by the adoption of more strict precautionary measures it might be greatly reduced. It was well-known that pleuro-pneumonia was one of the most fatal kinds of cattle disease, yet up to the year 1845 it was absolutely unknown in this country. The number of cattle imported in 1860 was 104,000, and three times the number imported died of disease. He had another duty to discharge in reference to this matter. In "another place," when the cattle plague was under discussion, all sorts of threats and menaces were held out against every magistrate who neglected his duty by not enforcing these Orders. Now he had often offended in this way, and as he believed that these threats were levelled at him, and as he was not allowed to say what Orders he would enforce, and what he would not, he had thought it his duty to announce at the Quarter Sessions that he had made up his mind to retire from the bench. He did not charge the Government and hon. Gentlemen opposite with having in view the reversal of Free Trade; but he must say such was their tendency. The Notice he had placed on the Paper was put there partly in irony. It was to this effect—

> "That any legal restrictions on the importation of foreign cattle are premature, until the request to the Russian Government to appoint an International Commission to consider the possibility of arresting the cattle plague in its place of origin, the Steppes of Russia, determined by the International Congress held at Zurich in September 1867, to which Professor Simonds was delegated by the President of the Privy Council, shall have received an answer."

The whole course of the Privy Council had been full of mistakes. First of all, they had the stories about pleuro-pneumonia, with the loss of £6,000,000—an exaggerated statement. Then they sent out Mr. Simon, the Officer of Health, to the Continent to trace out the origin of the plague. He went to Holland; but it was not there.

He went farther and farther on with like success, until at last he overtook it in Galicia, where he found four infected beasts that had just come out of the Steppes. But when Mr. Simon was asked whether he went on to the Steppes, he said "No, for if he had he would not have been allowed to come back again." In fact, Mr. Simon made a joke of the whole matter. Then came the Report of the Commissioners, who said that the stamping-out system was only useful when there were a few cases. The right hon. Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) said that the Commissioners derived all their information from the Report of the medical officers, which was a mistake.

Mr. BRUCE said, that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was, that the Commissioners had not consulted the medical officer.

Sir J. CLARKE JERVOISE: The Commissioners said in their Report that they depended upon the excellent judgment, information, and experience of their medical officer, Mr. Simon; but when Mr. Simon came to be examined before a Committee, and was asked what he knew about the cattle plague, he said he could only speak as one of the party, and that he knew nothing about it. In September last, Mr. Simon was again sent into Germany, and on his return home he reported that he had attended a Convention of scientific men from all parts of the world—even Russia and Turkey being included. This Convention had come to a resolution to send to the Emperor of Russia to request him to take steps for the suppression of the cattle plague at the place of its origin on the Steppes. Being curious to know the result of this deputation, he put a question on the subject to the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council (Lord Robert Montagu), but the noble Lord informed him that that subject was not in his Department, he ought to apply to the Foreign Secretary. He accordingly put the same question to the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary (Lord Stanley) and he got from him the same answer as from the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council. It was stated by the officers of the Customs that there was not a word of truth in the statement that the disease was imported from abroad. It seemed to be their opinion that it was spontaneous. It had been stated, and he believed with great truth, that it was the desire of the Government to shake off their responsibility in this matter upon an Act of Parliament, and to make this House responsible for the acts of the Privy Council. That Act was the Contagious Diseases Prevention Act; which was itself a mistake, because it provided that in the case of cattle slaughtered by mistake compensation should be given to the owner. That appeared to him to be a bonus on fraud and ignorance. Now, he thought if there was one thing in which there could be no mistake, it was this, that the cattle plague was capable of originating spontaneously. If it did so in one case it might do so in all, and then down went all the Resolutions of the Privy Council. It had been said that the hardships undergone by the cattle in conveying food across the Russian Steppes would be got rid of by the formation of railways now in progress, and that the diseases consequent upon their hardships would be prevented. If that were so, Russian cattle would arrive in this country in good condition. He hoped the House would hesitate before passing the present Bill.

Mr. T. T. PAGET believed that this question had been introduced under the shield of Protection, carried on by Protection arguments, and he feared that it would close with the cry of Protection. He was not, therefore, surprised that that cry had been so ably met by his right hon. Friend the Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson). If the arguments on the one side, however, savoured too much of Protection those on the other side savoured too much of Free Trade, and to neither side did he feel disposed to give implicit adherence. He thought, however, that it was very desirable that a market should be established where the butchers of Brighton and other towns might enter into competition with the London butchers, instead of all the foreign cattle coming into London being at once killed and consumed in the metropolis. The Bill was, in his opinion, far from faultless, but he should certainly support the going into Committee, in the belief that the principle on which it was founded would be of advantage to the country.

Mr. HADFIELD said, the Bill was a very important one, and it was utterly impossible to give it the consideration it deserved. Where were the Cabinet Ministers? Was the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council the only Member of the Government responsible for the Bill? It was most disrespectful to the House that no Cabinet Minister was present at a discussion of such importance. He regarded freedom of trade as an established principle of legislation, and thought it out of the question to proceed with the Bill. There was no hope or expectation in any quarter that it would pass this Session. There were twenty-one Orders on the Paper, and they had better proceed to them. He begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. GILPIN seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Hadfield.*)

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, he trusted the House would not assent to an adjournment of the debate. The hon. Member (Mr. Hadfield) had given no reason why it should be adjourned. The Bill had been introduced in December, and it was afterwards most carefully considered by a Select Committee. He had yet to learn that it is the practice of Cabinet Ministers to speak at the beginning of a debate. As regarded the absence of the Cabinet Ministers at the present moment, the hon. Member knew that this was the dinner hour. There was ample time to pass this Bill, and it was of the utmost importance that there should be a decision of the House. He had placed the question before the House on the ground of Free Trade, and not of Protection. He believed the majority of the people of this country to be in favour of the Bill. There was ample time to have passed it long ago had it not been for the factious delays that were offered. ["Oh!"] It was introduced on the 5th of December, read a second time on the 12th February, and referred to a Select Committee, where it was under consideration for more than two months. When the Bill came down again the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Milner Gibson) moved that the Report should be sent to the Examiner of Standing Orders, which had no other effect than to lose more time. The right hon. Gentleman attempted to over-ride the opinion of the House by dodges.

MR. AYRTON rose to Order, and said that the word "dodge" ought not to be applied to any action which a Member on the Opposition side of the House might, in his duty, think proper to take.

MR. SPEAKER thought that the noble Lord was scarcely in Order in using the word "dodge" in the remarks which he had made. He had better confine himself to the reasons against the Motion for Adjournment.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, he did not mean anything offensive to the right hon. Gentleman, but the contrary. What he meant to convey was that the forms of the House had been somewhat ingeniously strained to prevent the progress of the Bill. He hoped the debate would not be adjourned until they had had the opportunity of hearing the opinions of the Cabinet, and perhaps of the Prime Minister himself, on the subject.

MR. AYRTON said, that when this Bill was under discussion on another occasion, he took the liberty of pointing out the position in which they were placed, and there might be some misapprehension as to his views. ["Divide!"] We have not yet heard the opinion of one Minister of the Crown, and the Treasury Bench has not now a single occupant. Possibly that may be taken as a type of the mental state of the Government on the subject of this Bill. We have not heard one Minister of the Crown. The only Minister who was brought before the Committee was the President of the Board of Trade, and he distinctly stated that he was not cognizant of the nature of the Bill. ["Divide!"]

MR. FRESHFIELD, as a Member of the Select Committee, wished to say a few words on the subject, although, not being a Minister of the Crown, he did not fulfil the condition laid down by the hon. and learned Gentleman who last addressed the House (Mr. Ayrton). At this time of the evening, however, it was somewhat unreasonable to expect the Members of the Government to be seated on the Treasury Bench. The question placed before the Select Committee was, whether this Bill was a proper one, and one which should become the law of the country. He confessed that he had had great difficulty in sitting on the same Committee with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson), for that right hon. Gentleman seemed to have been animated by two feelings—the one an insuperable hatred to Protection, and the other an almost idolatrous love of Free Trade. His love, however, began abroad and ended abroad. His love for a foreign ox was something touching; his love for a foreign sheep was something beatific; but the centre of his affection seemed to be in a foreign goat; whether the attraction was in its horns, in its aroma, or in its milk, in association with the right hon. Gentleman's infantine days, did not appear. But of this he (Mr. Freshfield) was quite sure, that the right hon. Gentleman had neither sympathy, affection, nor allegiance with the typical John Bull of our own native land. The object of the Committee had been to determine whether the Bill was calculated to meet the purpose of its framers—namely, to make provision for the streams of cattle which converged into the metropolis. It was found that the restrictions with regard to London amounted to a cattle plague in themselves, by the cordon which was drawn around the metropolis, and by the edict that all the cattle within that area must not leave it alive, the result being scarcity of supply and enhanced cost to the consumer. It was most remarkable that a witness summoned to give evidence against the Bill, and who stated that he landed more than half the foreign cattle which came to England, admitted that in the interest of the public the measure was a wise one.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON: The witness had petitioned against the Bill, and he was promised compensation.

Mr. FRESHFIELD: The agent had prepared a very general petition; but the witness declared on his oath that the form of his petition was a mistake, and that he had never any other feeling than that the measure was a right and proper one. Could the right hon. Gentleman deny that? This evidence, although amusing, was at the same time instructive. As to the Members of the Select Committee voting in small majorities, all he (Mr. Freshfield) could say was, that the right hon. Gentleman was a man of such astute mind, that it was exceedingly difficult for persons less sophisticated than himself to understand the mode in which he conducted the case; and he dressed up his objections in so many forms that it was difficult to recognize the staple of them; and no kaleidoscope could give them more varied shape. As far, however, as one could collect them, the right hon. Gentleman's main objections to the Bill were these—First, he complained that they were legislating for contingencies; that the cattle plague might have existed, but that it existed no longer; and that they were imposing a heavy permanent burden on the country. That certainly was rather an extraordinary argument to emanate from the front Opposition Bench, considering that the occupants of that Bench had been endeavouring to pass a Suspensory Bill which should have operation only in the contingency of the passing of another Bill which had not been, and he trusted never would be, passed, for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. The cattle plague was a patent and disastrous fact in our annals; and it was as certain that it would return as that the extent of the evil, when it came, would depend on the legislation of Parliament. Next, the right hon. Gentleman told them that the market would cost £500,000. But let them look at the other side of the account. What was the cost of the cattle plague? Since the ports were opened 2,000,000 head of cattle had died, at a loss of not less than £60,000,000. Since the last outbreak of that plague it was computed that some 300,000 cattle had died, causing a loss of not less than £9,000,000 sterling. What then was £500,000? Barely a year's interest at 5 per cent on the loss they had sustained. Then it was said that the measure was an imperfect one, and that they were legislating for the port of London only. But the case of London was exceptional; the mass of foreign cattle came there; and if foreign cattle were admitted into London it was impossible but that the cattle plague must be bred there, and thence disseminated over the country. The right hon. Gentleman said the way to stop the cattle plague was to close the ports. Admitting that, still there was nothing in the Bill to prevent that course being taken when necessary. The Bill was an additional measure of precaution. It was found that the existing restrictions at the other ports were not sufficient for the metropolis, and also that those restrictions, as regarded the metropolis, became an evil there and involved a loss second only to that caused by the cattle plague itself. Furthermore, the right hon. Gentleman said that this Bill would introduce infected cattle — [Mr. Milner Gibson: Hear, hear!] — whereas it was not intended to make the foreign cattle market a whit less impure than the Copenhagen Fields market. Our duty was to enforce all the existing restrictions, and more; and even to have English Consuls at the foreign ports to see that no infected cattle were exported. Then the right hon. Gentleman said that the butchers would carry the cattle plague in their boots. It was true that it had been proved that the disease was most subtle; but was not the risk of the cattle plague being carried in butchers' boots altogether insignificant in comparison with the danger of cattle being altogether intermixed? He (Mr. Freshfield) would earnestly recommend the House to proceed to pass the Bill this Session. It would be bad enough to commit it to Gentlemen opposite to carry out, and worse for the interests of the country, if it was left to three right hon. Gentlemen opposite, who entertained such peculiar opinions upon the subject.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he was sorry his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Freshfield) had compelled him, contrary to his intention, to take part in the debate and to make a protest on his own behalf. The hon. and learned Gentleman said he saw with great concern the unanimity of counsel that prevailed between himself (Mr. Gladstone) and two Gentlemen sitting on the same Bench with him; and from what he had said he was not in the House when he (Mr. Gladstone) addressed the House on a former debate upon this Bill; and his silence almost amounted to an admission of the fact.

Mr. FRESHFIELD said, he was in the House, and heard the whole of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, and if time had permitted he should have replied to it.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, the hon. and learned Gentleman's discretion was greater than if he had not heard it. On a previous occasion he avoided giving a positive or dogmatic judgment upon the great question of Protection involved in this Bill—the free or restricted supply of food—not because he might not have his own prepossessions with regard to it; but because he knew a number of Gentlemen on the Committee, and others, who were able to give to that evidence a degree of detailed attention he had been unable to give it, that he thought it but fair towards them and respectful to the House to leave the operation of the Bill to be discussed by them. He, however, dwelt on matter entirely distinct from that conveyed by his right hon. Friend the Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson). Not that he was ashamed of being associated with him on any question, and more particularly that of Free Trade, in which, for the last twenty-five years, his right hon. Friend had been the standard-bearer in what was now admitted to be the cause of the nation against not the real but the supposed and imaginary cause of the particular interest of a particular class. Therefore, if he divided himself on that occasion from his right hon. Friend it was from no reluctance to stand in the same rank with him. On a former occasion he dwelt on two points, and he referred to them now because the Government had not yet said one word upon a vital point that must first be disposed of, namely—why they thought the powers already vested in the hands of the Privy Council were insufficient for the whole demands and exigencies that might arise in connection with the importation of foreign cattle? He should have been glad to have heard the hon. and learned Member for Dover's remarks upon that point. They had had retrospective complaints of the conduct of the Privy Council in former times; but it was not a question of what the Privy Council, under other auspices, might have done in former times. They had now a Privy Council in which they reposed confidence, and it became them to show cause for departing from that system which Parliament had deliberately adopted—the system of trusting to that elastic power which was lodged in the hands of the Executive Government, and of persons capable, if they went astray, of being immediately called to account, and set right by Parliament. There had been no attempt to show any cause for the departure from that elastic system, and for the attempt to substitute at the point, where it should best be substituted, a rigid system of law, which it would be difficult to revoke when once adopted, and involving at the outset great pecuniary liability. That subject had received no consideration whatever in any of the speeches of the promoters of the Bill, and certainly it had not received consideration in the detailed address of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Committee of Privy Council (Lord Robert Montagu), and therefore he (Mr. Gladstone) commended it to the consideration of the hon. and learned Member for Dover. Another point which he considered more vital, and which must be explained by the Government before the Speaker left the Chair, was the finance of the market. Not a word had as yet been said about it. He had never known, in the course of a long experience and close observation, when the Government of the day had brought forward a plan involving a large financial liability, when it was not made a capital and primary point—

Lord JOHN MANNERS rose to Order. He understood that when his noble Friend the Vice President of the Council was making objections he was stopped by the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair on the ground that he had already spoken on the merits of the Bill, and that it was not competent to him, on the Motion for Adjournment, to re-open the main question and principles of the Bill, and he wished now to know whether the right hon. Gentleman was in Order in repeating on the same Motion the observations made by him on a former occasion respecting the Bill?

MR. GLADSTONE said, what he wished to point out was that his observations were simply a direct, unequivocal, and necessary reply to the hon. and learned Member for Dover (Mr. Freshfield); and why, he asked, did not his noble Friend (Lord John Manners] rise during the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Dover when he was pointing out what a subtle disease the cattle plague was, and call him to Order? That had no immediate connection with the question of the adjournment of the debate, but the merits of the Bill. He had no wish to stand in the way and, as it was certain that this was a subject that must be fully discussed before going into Committee, he withdrew from making any further comment on his hon. and learned Friend's speech.

COLONEL SYKES said, that this was unquestionably a Protection Bill. It was a Bill for protecting the public against eating diseased meat, and therefore, in the interests of the community, he should support it.

MR. FORDYCE said, that the farmers of Aberdeenshire had a great interest in preventing the introduction of the disease in cattle. Aberdeenshire was the largest cattle breeding county in Scotland, sending to London about 90,000 head of cattle, alive or dead, per annum. His constituents took a very simple view of this Bill. They said they were entitled, as a matter of police regulation, to precautions being adopted for keeping diseased cattle out of the country. Under a system of free and unrestricted importation one disease after another had been imported into this country. The cattle plague prevailed in Aberdeenshire, and the only successful measure was to isolate the county. What his constituents asked was, that the same plan should be applied to the whole country as far as practicable, and this object, so qualified, was carried out by the Bill. If the system foreshadowed in the Bill were carried out the result would be the establishment of dead meat markets in the neighbourhood of all large towns. It was not protection against foreign meat that his constituents wanted, but protection against disease. Hon. Gentlemen said, "Where is the necessity for such a Bill? There is no cattle plague at present." But if they had, like some of the farmers of Aberdeenshire, lost nine-tenths of their cattle by the rinderpest, and had found their present stock depreciated in value by £2 per head, they would hold very different language. Something must be done to establish dead meat markets in all large towns, and he regretted the Select Committee did not examine the gentlemen who came from Aberdeenshire to represent the views of the farmers of that locality, who would have shown that it was possible to supply London with dead meat from Aberdeenshire. There was a strong feeling among the agriculturists of Scotland in favour of the Bill.

MR. GILPIN said, he was in favour of the adjournment, thinking that the House was not at present in a position to come to a conclusion on this important subject, and he doubted whether it would be so during the present Session. It was no doubt the interest of the farmers of Aberdeenshire to obtain the highest price for their beasts, and it was equally the interest of the shoemakers of Northampton and others to get meat as cheap as possible. The Privy Council possessed sufficient powers for preventing the transfer of cattle throughout the country. He objected to the Bill as a return to Protection, and the arguments employed to show that the agriculturists needed protection from foreign cattle reminded him of those formerly used in support of protection from foreign corn.

MR. NEWDEGATE, as an unrepentant Protectionist, thought the proceedings of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite were calculated to further what he desired —namely, the modification of the present system of Free Trade in corn. They claimed a right to import disease ["No!"] unrestricted, except by Orders in Council. They might cry "No!" but that was really the meaning of the Opposition. Now, he had the same objection to that elastic system, so much admired by the right hon. Member for South Lancashire, that his forefathers had to ship-money.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, it did not seem a very satisfactory course to adopt to move the adjournment at that hour; but there were circumstances which sometimes rendered it necessary to take an exceptional course. The subject now under debate had been before the House for three nights; it was a measure of great importance, inasmuch as it affected the food supply of the metropolis; and yet the Ministers of the Crown had not seen fit to express their own opinion upon it. It was proposed by this Bill to exclude all foreign living cattle from this country, and to enact that all such upon their arrival should be slaughtered, whether they were healthy or unhealthy. He himself was an advocate for prohibiting the importation of cattle from unhealthy and affected countries; but he was in favour of admitting healthy cattle which could be brought into this country without danger. He supported the Motion for the Adjournment upon this ground, that no Cabinet Minister had thought it worth his while to condescend even to listen to the debate—much less to speak—in it. Upon one occasion the Government, through their organ in that House, represented this measure as a gigantic scheme of Protection. He (Mr. Milner Gibson) had been charged with faction, and with using dodges; but he denied both. The noble Lord the Vice President of the Privy Council made a speech recently, in which he said—

> "How are we to feed the poor? There are some difficulties in dealing with the subject, but the greatest of all is the feeding of the poor. If the beasts are killed at Harwich only the best joints would be sent up to London, for it would not pay to send up the others. But the working classes do not live upon the best joints, but upon shins of beef; not upon Southdowns, but upon Merino sheep; not upon joints, but upon offal; and that offal will never be brought to London if the animals are slaughtered at their places of landing."

Those were the words of the Government. When, therefore, they had such a remarkable change of opinion—when they found Ministers violating their own opinions so recently expressed, they were entitled to learn from those Cabinet Ministers what was the fresh evidence which had induced that change of sentiment, and what were the excuses for thus placing restrictions upon the food of the people. He was told that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) had excited the suspicions of a certain number of the country Gentlemen below the Gangway on account of his insincerity. Amongst these a round robin had been got up—a threatening communication — and presented to the Premier, striving to coerce him into carrying this Bill. The Prime Minister had evidently departed from all his arrangements with regard to the Public Business. He said some time ago that the Bribery and the Supplementary Reform Bills were to take the precedence; but in came this threatening letter from the country Gentlemen, and this Cattle Market Bill was thrust in between. They were surely entitled to hear the opinion of Ministers themselves on the subject. He should vote for the adjournment of the debate, because he had heard no explanation from any Member of the Cabinet, and because he believed the House was being treated with disrespect. They had been called down at great inconvenience to two Forenoon Sittings in order to debate the Bill, and not a single Member of the Government had deemed it worth while even to peep in and see what they were doing. He should like to know what were the public objects which the Government wished to accomplish. If he received no clear and satisfactory information with respect to the Ministerial policy he should support the Motion for adjournment.

COLONEL JERVIS said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Milner Gibson) would have taken a wider and a broader view of this matter than he had done. No Member of the House knew better than the right hon. Gentleman that the large slaughter in Holland of cattle which took place during the cattle plague had had the effect of greatly reducing the price of meat. Dutch beef was sold in the London market at 6½*d.* per pound, whilst English beef sold at 10*d.* and 11*d.* Quantities of dead meat, amounting to as much as 18,000 tons, during the half year, had been shipped to the metropolis by the Great Eastern Railway. If that could be done in Holland they might expect still more favourable results if the cattle coming from all countries were compelled to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation. The Bill now under discussion was loudly and urgently demanded. The importation of cattle into London from other parts of England had almost been stopped by the cattle plague, and some such measure as the one before the House was required to revive the home trade. He had no hesitation in saying that the sole opposition to this Bill was simply to defend the interests of some twenty cattle salesmen in London. No man knew that better than the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for Ashton-under-Lyne. The first opposition to the Bill rose from the Thames Haven Company. Three cattle salesman, one dead meat salesman, and the Tilbury line were at the bottom of the whole of it. The twenty people to whom he had referred had set the whole of the Opposition going for the last eighteen months. The Veterinary

Department of the Board of Trade had been undoubtedly also opposed to the Bill; but that was because they were afraid of being abolished should the new law come into operation. He was not surprised, therefore, that that Department should receive the support of the right hon. Member for Ashton, who was formerly connected with that Department. The real question to be decided, however, was whether they were or were not to pass the Bill. His own opinion was that no Government in the position of the present could possibly prorogue Parliament without passing the measure, more especially as not a single argument had really been advanced against it. He maintained that no class interest whatever would be injured by it; on the contrary, they would all be benefited, and moreover the whole country was in favour of the Bill. The slaughtering of the cattle at the landing place would have the ultimate effect of relieving Newgate Market of the great pressure and inconvenience which at present prevailed there. District butchers who sent their carts there as early as three or four o'clock in the morning, had often to keep them waiting till nine o'clock under a broiling sun before they could get their meat conveyed away. That, of course, tended very considerably to deteriorate the quality of the beef. He wanted to know why that which had been done by Governments who were most careful not to allow their people to be in want of food should not be done by us? The French Government could not allow their people to grumble for want of food, and they had established this system. He hoped that the next time the right hon. Gentleman opposed the Bill he would do so, not for the mere fun of putting a stop to it, but would make use of sound arguments which might go forth to the country.

Mr. J. B. SMITH supported the Motion of the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) for the adjournment of the debate. He wanted to know what they were to think of the huge trades union formed in that House for the purpose of raising the price of the food of the people. ["Oh, oh!"] What had they seen in the House this evening but a trades union, pursuing the same course as the trades unions they had all heard so much of. ["Oh!"] They had heard that hon. Members were engaged in preparing a missive to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli); in fact, that they were preparing to "ratten" him unless he conformed to their wishes. Under such circumstances he appealed to the House whether the noble Lord opposite (Lord Robert Montagu)—and, by-the-by, the Treasury Bench was entirely empty at the time — was justified with charging Members on that (the Opposition) side with faction? He maintained that they were perfectly justified in the course they had taken.

Mr. DISRAELI: I rise, Sir, to speak on the question of adjournment, and I must say I very much regret to have heard that such a Motion was made. It seems to me to be a most unusual course to adopt on such an occasion. The observations that no Ministers were present on this Bench at eight o'clock, if accurate, have not been made in that spirit of courtesy which generally pervades our debates. Nor is it true, I think, that there has been an absence of Ministers of the Crown generally during this debate. There have been two long Morning Sittings. I have been present at them, and I have been in my place the whole of this day. It is not customary to make such remarks; it would be inconvenient for both sides, and I think it is scarcely justified. It appears to me that it is desirable that the House should come to a division; not, however, upon the question of adjournment, but on the merits of the case. If the House wishes that the debate should be prolonged, I am perfectly ready to take part in it, and there are others of my Colleagues who are prepared to do the same. I think that, under these circumstances, if the House comes to a division upon the question of the adjournment we shall be liable to great misrepresentation, and there will be some ground for the insinuations which have been thrown out that there is a desire on the part of a portion of the Members of this House not to meet the question with that fairness which is desirable. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire has made an inquiry which, though I am speaking on the question of adjournment, I would wish to answer. The right hon. Gentleman says he is anxious to know why we did not meet the necessities of the case by Orders in Council instead of this Bill. I quite admit that that is a very fair inquiry, and one which I think would occur to any one who gives a candid consideration to this question. But the real cause for the introduction of this measure was that Orders in Council did not meet the necessities of the case. We are obliged to have recourse to statutory regulations, because we cannot by Orders in Council meet the necessities of the case. There is a clause in the Bill of last year which provides that the Council shall have powers to establish a special market for foreign cattle. At the time the Bill was under discussion I remember that the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) proposed that this provision should be compulsory, not only on the local authorities, but on the Privy Council. That was opposed, because it is not expedient that compulsory powers should be given unless they are absolutely necessary, and under the Bill we had the power of establishing a market for foreign meat in every town, and also of purchasing land for that purpose. Well, we have succeeded with these powers in every town except London; but when we attempted to carry that legislation into effect in London we utterly failed. We found that we could not deal with the local authorities and with those whose concurrence was necessary in order to effect what we desired. There was no redress for us, therefore, and no means by which to overcome the difficulty unless by coming to this House and asking for legislation. That is my answer to the inquiry of the right hon. Gentleman. I do not want, though I am prepared on a fitting occasion, to go into a discussion on the general policy involved in the Bill. All I wish now is to impress on the House the extreme inexpediency of our going to a division on a question which does not involve any expression of opinion as to the policy of the Bill. That appears to me highly undesirable, and I trust, therefore, that the hon. Gentleman, on reflection, will feel that the best course is to withdraw the Motion for adjournment, and let us proceed with the discussion.

MR. HADFIELD said, he should be sorry to interrupt in any way the course of Business, and would therefore withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. JACOB BRIGHT said, he considered the House had a very important duty to discharge in deciding upon the present question, affecting as it did the supply of food to the people. The question assumed increased importance when they considered the character of the country, which, with perhaps one exception, was more thickly peopled than any other in Europe, and which, without any exception, was the country in all the world which was most dependent upon the importation of food. He was not, as was well known, a metropolitan Member; but the constituency he represented was as much interested in the Bill as the metropolis itself. If, as was generally supposed, the restrictions which this Bill would impose would limit the importation of cattle into the metropolis, the metropolis must necessarily make up its supplies of food by competing with the rest of the country, and therefore the price of meat to the rest of the country would be enhanced. But if there was any necessity to pass this Bill for the metropolis, there was undoubtedly a necessity to pass it for the whole country. And if the argument was not strong enough to extend the Bill to the whole country, then undoubtedly the Bill itself had no legs to stand upon. This was, of course, the thin end of the wedge, and the hon. Member for Aberdeenshire (Mr. Fordyce) had very candidly told them it was a foreshadowing of what would come upon the country. Many things had been said in the course of that debate; and, generally, what one side of the House had asserted the other side had contradicted; but there was one point on which all were agreed. It was admitted that, for a temporary evil, they were about to impose permanent restrictions, and it was admitted and understood that those permanent restrictions would limit the importation of cattle. ["No!"] Well, then, there were some exceptions, and they were not universally agreed upon that point; but it was enough for him that the Government admitted it, and that it was believed to a very great extent on that side of the House. The Government admitted it; for the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council, in the very long speech he delivered in introducing the Bill, began, by telling them that they had a choice of evils. If so, then undoubtedly there must be some evil in the restrictions proposed. If it were the fact that they were going to limit the importation of food, and therefore that they were about to increase permanently the price of meat throughout the country, he called that a most startling proposition. Hardly more than a week ago many Members of that House met together, in a place not far from that spot, to keep alive the memory of a great statesman (Mr. Cobden) and to advocate his opinions. The right hon. Member for Wolverhampton

(Mr. Villiers) presided on that occasion, and his name was as much associated with Free Trade as that of any man in the country. In the face of associations like these, there appeared to him to be something unreal in the business they were now upon, and he could not wonder at the suspicion expressed by many Members, especially by the right hon. Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson). He doubted whether the Government was serious in the matter; certainly the Bill had not been introduced by the most serious Member of the Government. It had been supposed by high authorities that this measure was really introduced for electioneering purposes. It was believed that the Government had treated very badly the great party behind it, and that they had no real desire to pass the Bill; that the party behind them were pressing the Government, and that the Government was not free to act as it desired in this matter. Undoubtedly there was great mystery and perplexity about this question, and the measure was not supported as one of that great importance ought to be. The noble Lord the Vice President of the Council said they had to consider whether they would put up with this evil of restriction in order to avoid a possible recurrence of the cattle plague in this country, and that upon the answer to that question depended the fate of the Bill. Although the noble Lord had discussed every mortal thing in connection with it for upwards of two hours, he did not discuss the question he had himself put. Was it remembered that it was 100 years since this country had been afflicted with the cattle plague? For a quarter of a century at least the importation of cattle had been unrestricted, yet we had been free until recently from the cattle plague. According to the evidence given before the Committee, it was fifty years since France had been afflicted with the cattle plague. He did not mean to say that a period equally long must elapse before this country was again visited by it, but we could only judge of the future by our knowledge of the past. If the question were put to the French whether they would submit to such restrictions in order to ensure themselves against the recurrence of the plague, he was confident their answer would be that the proposal was a monstrous one. For £200 or £300 the French Government had stamped out the cattle plague, and at the present moment they imported from every country, taking no precautions beyond inspecting the cattle at the frontier and at the port of Marseilles. He would say, if the Privy Council had not the authority which the French Government had in the matter, let it be armed with that authority; but he was told that they had power absolutely to prohibit the importation of cattle, if they could make out a case justifying such a measure. Let the House consider that the evils of restriction already experienced at the outports would be visited upon the metropolis. How great the evil was might appear from the experience of Hull, where the importation of foreign cattle had dwindled down from 35,000, at which it stood three years back, to something like 1,300. That was the evil they had to anticipate in order to avoid a possible cattle plague. The hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Horsfall), whose absence from the House on that occasion he regretted, had successfully warded off the attempt made to impose those restrictions upon the great port he represented, but what that port, through its Conservative Member, had repudiated, the Government were now about to saddle on the much larger area of the port of London. The noble Lord the Vice-President of the Council enlarged on the great difficulty of guarding this area, from its irregularity and extent; but in the face of that difficulty, and in the face of the fact of the introduction of foreign sheep, the cattle plague had disappeared from the country. The barrier had been thrown down in the case of France, and he could not conceive why it should be allowed to exist here. If that House had been assembled to discuss the question how more meat could be supplied to this country, it might have been a futile discussion, but it would not have been a dangerous one, and would not have raised unpleasant suspicions. There were millions of people in this country who knew nothing of animal food except what they saw of it in passing through their towns. It rarely touched their lips. If every man and woman were to have one meal of animal food per day, this country would be revolutionized. According to Mr. Caird, who was a high authority upon the subject, if all the meat, home and foreign, consumed in this country were divided among the population, it would only amount to two ounces per head per day; and when they considered the abundance, or rather the superabundance, enjoyed by the rich, it was manifest that a large portion of the people must be wholly deprived of that luxury. Again: Mr. Caird told us that one-eighth part of all the meat consumed in the country came from abroad. One-eighth of the population of this country was 4,000,000 of people, and therefore they were dealing with the meat supply of 4,000,000 of people. Hon. Members who had been severe sufferers by the cattle plague could not be the most dispassionate judges of a question like this. Men who were suffering from great loss or pain no matter of what kind, were not always the best judges of the remedy. If they were to ask men who had been garotted to legislate in respect to garotting, they would probably wish to have one-half of us put in strait-jackets. The noble Lord the Vice President had spoken, in the days of his innocence, before he was corrupted or coerced—he (Mr. Jacob Bright) did not know exactly by what means hon. Gentlemen who sat on the Treasury Bench were violently driven from one extreme of opinion to another — the noble Lord had spoken of the difficulty of feeding the poor, and had characterized the policy of this measure as a scheme of gigantic Protection. If there was any intention of restoring Protection this was a very inopportune time to do it. Bread had been dear, and there had been a yearly increase of taxation, and fears were expressed that we were likely to have a much harder race with the foreigner in regard to our industry. But if this restriction were imposed it would raise the price of food — ["No, no!"] — the cattle which would otherwise have come to this country would be kept away — ["No, no!"] —and the tendency would be to bring about this unfortunate state of things, that the food of our competitors would be lowered while our own food would be increased in cost. This Parliament began its career of legislation by passing what was called the Cattle Plague Bill —a Bill which gave compensation to men engaged in agriculture at the cost of the rest of the country. Now, he did not deny that legislation was necessary at that time, and on that question; but, in common with the great majority of the non-agricultural population of the country, he believed that the legislation that did take place was of a most unjust character. He had not then the honour of a seat in that House. He was simply a spectator. But it appeared to him that at that time there was a great agricultural insurrection in that House, led on by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Government, for the time, he believed, was not able to legislate in the sense in which it desired to legislate. The name of the right hon. Gentleman was at the back of this Bill, which, however, he did not believe would pass. If it did, it would be a fit legislative close of a Parliament which so unjustly began. They had heard a good deal said about the moral competence of the House. Well, seeing that the cattle plague had disappeared from the country under present regulations, and almost entirely from Europe—seeing that neighbouring countries admitted foreign cattle—seeing that those who would be injured by an enhanced price had no voice in that House — he asked whether, under these circumstances, they had the moral competence to deal with this question, which should be remitted to another Parliament? The House had been condemned by the country and by itself, and the Government had over and over again been condemned by the House, and it had been understood that only such questions should come before that House as were necessary for the winding up of Business. He was not credulous with respect to the character of the next Parliament. He had never believed that the mere giving of votes could create a miracle, nor did he believe that a really national assembly would ever sit in that House until the people of this country were protected in giving their votes —["Question!"]— and until the balance of power as between the large and small constituencies were redressed. But a new Parliament would never sanction such a measure as this. And he believed, if they succeeded in passing this Bill, long before they had wrung the £500,000 from the taxpayers, the next House of Commons would have repudiated the measure and given them no thanks for their pains. Whatever came of this Bill, it could not fail to discredit the Government. He had never had much respect for the Government. Its conduct in the year 1866; its peculiar origin, and its still more peculiar history, had made it difficult for him to be one of its admirers. But there were elements in it which had led him to believe that it was impossible it could ever lend itself to a folly like that. He had been compelled to acknowledge with the rest of the world, that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government was a man of commanding intellect. He had believed, and he would not yet abandon the belief, that the great intelligence of the Prime Minister was a guarantee that his Government would not be allowed to commit the extraordinary blunder of once again placing the great Conservative party between the people and their supply of food.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, if his name had not been at the back of the Bill he would have spoken, as the subject of the Bill was one in which he took great interest. He deeply regretted the tone of the debate, which was calculated to create the false impression that this was a question between urban and rural interests. He wholly denied that there was any such conflict. The hobgoblin of Protection had been raised in order to defeat the Bill. Now, since he had had the honour of a seat in that House the question of Free Trade and Protection had been entirely settled, and he had never heard any Member attempt to revive the old Protectionist doctrine. If he thought the present proposal would revive that doctrine in any shape he would never have allowed his name, as it did, to appear on the back of the Bill. The simple question they had then to consider was, what was the best way of keeping our flocks and herds, on which we mainly depended for the food supply of the people, free from the contagion of disease imported from abroad? It must be admitted that town and country were interested in keeping our herds free from contagion. The question was, could that be better done by a system of exceedingly complicated and vexatious regulations than by fixing upon a place where foreign cattle should be landed and slaughtered? That was the only question to be considered; and all that had been said about the towns suffering from the measure was beside the mark. He admitted that the matter was not wholly free from difficulty, that there was much to be said on both sides, and that, if the Bill had come before the House two years ago he should not have supported it. He had sat upon the Committee presided over by the right hon. Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson) on the subject of Trade in Animals; and when the labours of that Committee were concluded they sent in a Report which abstained from recommending the adoption of a measure like the present. But the experience they had since acquired convinced him—as it convinced, he believed, many others who had then shared his opinion—that such a proposal as the present one might be prudently and beneficially adopted. Previous to the cattle plague breaking out the metropolitan market was the great market for the whole of the country as well as for the metropolis and its neighbourhood. But the regulations which had been acquiesced in by the country—and against which, as far as he was aware, no protest had been raised in the House—were so strict as regards the metropolitan market that they prevented an immense number being sent up to London. The supply was consequently very much limited. Previous to the outbreak of the cattle plague the supplies were annually on the increase; but there had been a positive decrease since the new regulations came into force. It was clear, then, that the present system tended to limit the supply of home-bred animals to the metropolitan limits; and it could hardly be denied that the removal of the existing restrictions and the consequent admission of a large number of beasts to the market would be a benefit to the consumer. Every hon. Member, he thought, must wish to see a very large supply sent to the metropolis, so that the price of meat might be reduced. Such a supply was prevented by the rule that when once an animal had come into the metropolitan market it could not be allowed to leave the metropolis. It was formerly the practice that persons in distant towns should come up to London, or should employ agents to purchase cattle in the metropolitan market; but that practice was put a stop to by the regulations now in force. This fact was, in his opinion, an answer to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Jacob Bright). He would pass by the argument, in which there was a certain amount of force, that the insecurity which prevailed in consequence of the apprehension of danger from foreign infection tended to prevent people from investing their money in the breeding of cattle. But, on the other hand, it must be remembered that, under the present arrangement, a large number of young animals born within the metropolitan area had either to be destroyed or furtively, and in evasion of the law, to be sent to be reared in the country. When he reflected upon the number of milch cows kept in London for the supply of milk, it was evident that the number of calves destroyed must be considerable; or, if they were sent into the country it was because people felt that the present regulations were contrary to common sense, and they were therefore disregarded with an easy conscience. The question, therefore, for consideration was whether it would not be advisable to free the metropolitan area from restrictions which tended to limit the supply of food in the metropolis, and to appropriate a market at the waterside for the slaughter and sale of foreign animals. He did not deny that the course the Government recommended was open to some objection; he offered it to the House as the lesser evil of the two; and, in reality, all they had before them was a choice of evils. The hon. Member for Stockport (Mr. J. B. Smith) had said that it would tend to raise the price of the Government contracts for meat; but he believed there was no evidence to support that objection. On the contrary, the evidence went to show that if the contractors were obliged to slaughter the cattle in London they could supply the troops with dead meat at a cheaper rate; because, having a ready market for what was technically called the offal, they would be enabled to sell the prime parts at a lower rate than if they had to convey the whole of the animal to the place where those prime parts were required for consumption.

MR. MILNER GIBSON was understood to say that the contractors were not permitted to slaughter the beasts in London.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he had no doubt that an enlightened Government like the present would find means to make an alteration in that respect. Then it had been objected that it would be exceedingly inconvenient to persons in the trade to have to go to two markets; and he did not deny that the change, like all other changes, might be productive of a certain amount of inconvenience; but that inconvenience would soon cease to be felt, as persons in the trade would in a very short time conduct their business according to the altered state of affairs. It had also been urged that under the system now proposed there would be no real security against infection, because persons after handling the beasts in one market could go and handle the beasts in the other. No doubt contagion might arise in that way; but he was of opinion that the danger of it was very much lessened by the scheme proposed by the Bill; for in 1865 and 1866, when the cattle plague was so rife, it was demonstrated that the chief, though not the sole cause of contagion, was the conveyance of animals along the railways; and during these years the metropolitan market was the chief focus of infection. That was shown by one single fact—that two or three days after the clauses of the Cattle Plague Act became law, which prohibited the carriage of any animal along a line of railway, the disease began sensibly to diminish. He would not further detain the House; but he hoped it would assent to the second reading of the Bill.

MR. CLAY said, the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich (Colonel Jervis) had told them that the opposition to this Bill proceeded from some twenty great cattle salesmen. He should have thought that the length and course of this debate might have assured the hon. and gallant Gentleman that the opposition sprung from much wider and more powerful sources. If he (Mr. Clay) were convinced that the Bill was to be confined to the metropolis alone he would have left the metropolis to the care of her natural guardians; but *proximus ardet Ucalegon.* It was to that source that they must trace the long and determined opposition which the Bill had met. Speaking on behalf of the port which he represented, he did not recollect any legislation which had caused in Hull so much dismay as had this proposal of the Government. The cattle trade of Hull had grown rapidly for some years, and reached its greatest extent in 1865. In that year the importation of cattle to Hull was 41,157 head; but in 1867 that number dwindled down to 16,000 odd; the sheep and lambs imported in 1865 numbered 69,160 head, and only 9,266 in 1867; and the pigs imported into Hull dwindled from 15,000 odd, in 1865, to 3,000 odd in 1867. Those figures showed not a great loss, but the annihilation of the trade. Still it was borne with a most undisturbed patience, because it was felt that the restrictions which caused so much loss were justified by the dire necessity of the case, and because no reasonable man would object to any reasonable means of getting rid of the horrid plague which was inflicted upon us. But it was now proposed that those measures of extreme rigour, which were justified by the temporary cause, should be made permanent, while no one pretended to say that the evil which they were intended to correct was permanent. He believed this Bill was an exceedingly ill-advised one, and much as his constituents had suffered from the restrictions of the Privy Council, he was content that the matter should be left in their hands, feeling confident that they would relax the restrictions whenever it was feasible to do so with perfect safety. He had been asked what reason there could be for the unnatural legislation which was proposed. There had been considerable delicacy shown in this debate as to calling things by their right names, and very great sensitiveness in making any allusion to the old differences of Free Trade and Protection. But he confessed that in his inability to find any other conceivable cause for this legislation he was driven to believe that the unfortunate admission that cattle would be raised £2 a head was at the bottom of the matter; and hon. Gentlemen representing rural constituencies had been unable to resist a prospect so pleasing to those whom they represented. If that were so he should regret it exceedingly. We were now coming to the end of that chapter in our history which would tell the deeds of the Reformed Parliament since 1832. These had given to this country more than thirty-five years of the wisest and most beneficent legislation of which the history of the world afforded any example, no part of its legislation had been so wise or so beneficent as its commercial legislation, and it would be with great regret and dismay that he should see one of the last acts of the last Reformed Parliament exhibiting a return to that policy of Protection the destruction of which had made this country one of the happiest and greatest in the world.

MR. BRUCE said, in the few observations he had to address to the House, he would endeavour to adopt the moderate tone of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and would also try to contribute to the object they all ought to have in view — namely, the prevention of disease with the least possible restrictions in trade. He thought it was admitted on all hands that even if this Bill passed during the present Session its supposed advantages could not be secured for three years. That was an objection to it; but he also objected to the Bill because he thought it an imperfect measure, and one which could not produce the results which it was intended to bring about. The noble Lord who introduced the Bill (Lord Robert Montagu) had applied very hard words to some of the witnesses who had given evidence upon the subject. The noble Lord charged the French gentlemen who gave evidence as to what course the French Government would take to protect cattle from disease with interested motives, in order that the English markets might be opened up to foreign trade, and the noble Lord also applied very strong epithets to others of the witnesses. But he (Mr. Bruce) listened in vain to hear him mete out even-handed justice to the Duke of Richmond and other witnesses who took the other side, and gave evidence in favour of the removal of the restrictions from the London market. There were, however, some witnesses who were altogether free from the imputation of being interested in the matter. The hon. and learned Member for Dover (Mr. Freshfield) had said that the supposed opposition to the Bill on the part of the professional advisers of the Privy Council was to be attributed to a desire to retain their offices. No doubt a desire of that kind sometimes did drive men and Ministers to a very selfish line of policy; but none of the five or six witnesses who gave the strongest evidence as to the utter inadequacy of the measure to prevent the introduction of the disease into this country by means of the present Bill were in any way connected with the Government or with any special interest. Mr. Spooner, a gentleman of so much distinction in his profession that he was appointed a member of the Commission to inquire into the nature of the Cattle Plague, stated his opinion before the Committee that if a separate foreign cattle market were established in or near the metropolis, and the restrictions were taken off, we should be in a much worse condition than we were now, inasmuch as the cattle plague could be readily introduced into the metropolitan market, and communicated thence to the country at large, the infection being easily communicated by means of the clothing of individuals. Mr. Nichols, the senior surgeon of the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital, who had had much experience in the matter, gave the strongest evidence in the same direction to show that no sooner would the disease break out in the foreign cattle market than it would be communicated to the metropolis, and would spread thence throughout the country. Mr. Priestman, Mr. Thomas Wills, and Mr. James, all gentlemen of great experience, also gave evidence as to the utter inadequacy of the Bill. It was said that the effect of this measure would be to enhance the price of meat; but the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that any such result would be balanced by the reduction of the cost of meat at the metropolitan market, and had pointed out that there had already been a great reduction of supply to the metropolitan market, in consequence of the restrictions placed on the removal of cattle. The right hon. Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson) contradicted the right hon. Gentleman across the Table, and it had come out in the evidence that the number of cattle now brought into the metropolitan market, and sold for use in the metropolis, was greater than the number which had been brought into it before the restrictions. The noble Lord denied that such was the fact; but if he were right, and that the restrictions in the metropolitan market diminished the supply from the metropolis, would not the restrictions proposed by this Bill in respect of foreign cattle have a similar effect? It was not alone the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had made a very candid recantation of the opinions he held in 1866; but he found that the Committee, which included among its members not only that right hon. Gentleman, but also the noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland, the present Under Secretary for the Home Department, and the Under Secretary for the Foreign Department, unanimously came to the conclusion that compulsory slaughter at the port, like compulsory slaughter at a market, was very expensive to the butcher, would hamper trade, diminish importation, and raise the price to the consumer, and that therefore the separation of the two markets seemed to them undesirable. Lord Salisbury was also a Member of this Committee, and took an active part in its proceedings. What, then, was his (Mr. Bruce's) proposition? He had already said that this Bill could not come into operation for several years. He would be willing to put up a market in the port of London for the admission of those cattle, and those cattle only, that came from suspected districts. He would admit, as they now admitted into certain of their ports, freely as was now done in France, cattle coming from districts that were not suspected, and treat them in all respects as if they were English cattle. The First Lord of the Treasury had told them that this Bill might have been unnecessary but for the failure of the Privy Council to put the law into operation. He said, with regard to the other parts of the country, there was no difficulty in acting upon the powers of the Privy Council. It rested with the local authorities to set aside a place for the slaughter of cattle imported from the suspected districts; and if he understood the right hon. Gentleman rightly, it was impossible to get the local authorities in London to set aside such a place. His answer was, "Apply to Parliament for the necessary powers to deal with the special difficulties of London, and he was sure that even in the present Session Parliament would give them those powers." [Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: Hear, hear!] The noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) seemed to say by his cheer that is what we are now doing. But they were really doing a great deal more, because they were compelling cattle from every foreign country, whether suspected or not, to come to one market; and if the disease broke out in that market they would no longer have the power to remove the market to another place. Why should they bind themselves by a rigid law to have only one market for foreign cattle, no matter whether those cattle came from a healthy or from an unhealthy place? If they did that he was satisfied that on the very first appearance of the cattle plague in their foreign market the Government would have to come to Parliament for the very power of which they were now depriving themselves. What was the objection to arming the Privy Council with the necessary powers? It was the prevailing belief that those powers would not be exercised with sufficient vigour and determination. His answer was, "So it always would be till they reformed these Departments." It was no more incumbent on the noble Lord as Vice President of the Council to have introduced this measure than any other Member of the Government. At the time that he (Mr. H. A. Bruce) was Under Secretary of the Home Department there was a great agitation in the country respecting the importation of cattle that were suffering from the disease of pleuro-pneumonia, and he remembered that the right hon. Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe), who was then Vice President of the Council, coming to the Home Office and stating that it was clear some measures ought to be taken on the subject, as the disease was committing great ravages; but that it was not for him, as Vice President of the Council on Education, to bring in the

Bill. The Privy Council, he said, had the power of passing certain Orders which the Government might think for the good of the State, but had no administrative means within itself for giving effect to or carrying through Parliament legislation of that kind, which it was clearly the business of the Home Office to introduce. Then he (Mr. Bruce) received directions from the then Home Secretary (Sir George Grey) to bring in a Bill giving increased powers to the Privy Council in regard to the movement of cattle suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; and he might mention that the principal opposition to it came from those Scotch and Irish Members who so highly approved of the present Bill. The language then used was—"What, would you give the Privy Council power to deprive Scotch and Irish cattle from entering England?" And yet only two or three years passed away when the rinderpest broke out, and then the Irish Members held a meeting, and called upon the Government to exercise those very powers they had before opposed to prevent English cattle being carried over to Ireland. He mentioned this to guard the House against the selfishness, he did not say of these Members, but of the districts they represented. So long as they had this large question not under the undivided responsibility of one Department, it could not, in the nature of things, be wisely managed. What ought now to be done was to give the fullest powers with respect to the importation of cattle to one Department, and to make that Department responsible to Parliament, and then there would be no fear that the law would not be put in force as it was in other countries. What was now being done in France, which was exposed to greater risk than we were? Did she insist on stopping all foreign cattle on her frontiers and having them slaughtered there? On the contrary, she admitted them freely; but, at the same time, she kept a vigilant look-out as to the health of the cattle in different parts of Europe, and was prepared at once to arrest the introduction of cattle from any country that was suspected; while, in the meantime, she opened up to the population a supply of food drawn from all quarters of the Continent. Why could not they do the same here? After the experience of the last few years in that matter, there was no fear that the Government would show any want of due vigilance or vigour, which would draw down on them a storm of indignation, that no Ministry would like to face. At the present moment the complaint was not that the regulations of the Privy Council were not effectual for their object, but that they were enforced with greater rigour than was necessary. For these reasons he objected to the Bill. Its objects could be more effectually obtained, and without injury to the consumer, by other means. Besides, the Bill was most imperfect. Why should they deal with one port alone, and not have one law for every port in the kingdom. Before long there might be a change of Government, which would remove the restrictions that now existed; and cattle would be imported freely into the ports of Hull, Newcastle, and Southampton, while the greatest restrictions prevailed in the port of London. What they wanted was one uniform system of legislation. They could not pass any measure elastic enough to suit the necessities of all parts of the country, and therefore they ought to give increased powers to the Privy Council, and see that the Council exercised those powers effectually.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the Bill would affect his constituency in two ways—first, as it attacked a portion of their trade, and one which they carried on to a considerable extent; and next, as it taxed their food. He was therefore desirous to learn what were the views of the Government on it. Though the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been good enough at length to address the House, he had carefully abstained from a single remark upon the two subjects which had been specially urged upon the attention of the Government. These two topics were the principle of public policy raised by the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson), and the question of finance. The Chancellor of the Exchequer did not say one word on those topics. He (Mr. Ayrton) therefore found himself in as much difficulty as before in these respects. He did not approach this Bill in a spirit of hostility; from the first he had contended that the cattle trade should be dealt with by the joint action of town and country, and from the first he had protested against setting up distinctive interests. He had been called the father of the policy contained in the Bill; but if the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) had only acted on the suggestion which he made last Session, the House would not have been troubled with the difficulties in which it was now plunged.

His object had all along been to secure as large a supply as possible of live cattle to the metropolis from the country as well as from abroad. The population of London, as the largest consumers of meat in proportion to their numbers of any population in the kingdom, required supplies of both kinds—home and foreign. The present difficulties and obstructions arose entirely from the course taken by the Vice President and his Colleagues. The Bill had not been properly described as a Bill to establish a foreign cattle market. No doubt the Bill established a market for the supply of the metropolis, yet the market was not to be in the metropolis. It also proposed an establishment for the slaughter of cattle; an establishment for the exclusive landing of all cattle landed within the port of London; so that any vessel coming from between Gravesend and London with cattle would be compelled to go to a particular pier. There were to be also quarantine stations and roads and railways. All the vessels were to go to one port, and all the cattle were to be taken out on one pier and there slaughtered, unless they had undergone the quarantine provided for by the Privy Council, in which case they might be removed. He had never proposed or suggested so large a measure as that. It was the Chancellor of the Exchequer who, two years ago, had first launched the idea embodied in the Bill of slaughtering cattle at a particular spot on the Thames. He had divided the House against the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the House rejected it by a considerable majority. Since last year the Government had tried to embarrass the trade of cattle in the metropolis. Last year he had put a proposal on the Paper suggested to him by his constituents. It was a proposal for a market; but not to restrict the landing of cattle to any particular place. On investigating it, and believing it would act injuriously to trade, he declined to proceed with it. When that restrictive proposal was on the Paper the noble Lord made some comments upon it, and spoke of it as one that would involve the necessity of two markets that would destroy competition, and as a gigantic system of Protection. When the Bill came under consideration he had in the question of dealing with foreign cattle proposed an elastic clause in accordance with the views he had stated, and the language which he had used had been adopted in the Bill which had actually passed. It proposed that the Metropolitan Board of Works, with the sanction of the ratepayers, should erect a market to which such foreign cattle should be taken as the Privy Council by Order might direct. That was the law which was passed last Session, and which was now in force. He argued that, there being power given under the Act of last Session to the Metropolitan Board to construct a market as soon as applied to by the Government, the application was not made as it ought to have been. His complaint was that the noble Lord did not and would not act upon the statute of last Session. Instead of carrying out a proper policy the noble Lord determined to carry out his own policy, that the market should be constructed by the City of London. They said they were willing, but naturally at once the Metropolitan Board said, "Go and get your market made by the City of London." The noble Lord soon found the difficulties that must result. He was embarked in an entirely new policy; a clause was passed that destroyed the rights of his constituents; compensation was claimed for those who had exercised wharfage rights for four years, and then the City of London said, "We will have nothing more to do with the Bill." He wanted to know from the Government in what position they were placed? Here was a Bill which proposed to do great things for the agricultural interest. There was a provision in the Bill to appoint Commissioners; but there was no provision made for paying them. He was surprised that Gentlemen opposite should be so intent on making a profit of their beasts as to become the dupes of a measure which, while professing to give them everything, would really give them nothing. The Commissioners would have to purchase land at an enormous price; but where was the Aladdin's lamp which would procure them the necessary funds? Moreover, the object of the Bill would not be attained within four or five years. The powers of the Corporation of London would lapse after a year if they acquired no lands, or after three years if, having acquired lands, they took no further steps, so that for three years nothing would be done. Then a Commission without funds might be appointed, and after three years more their powers also would lapse. Now, he would put it to the Government and to hon. Gentlemen opposite whether it was worth while to proceed with a Bill of such a character? Hon. Members opposite perhaps imagined that if they got this Government to pass a Bill they would be able to get funds from another Government. Beyond the right of the Privy Council vetoing the incoming of foreign cattle supposed to carry the disease, he denied that restriction should exist. To implicate all the activity of foreign traders was simple stultification, and foreign Governments would be estopped from sanctioning the exportation of cattle. He asked hon. Gentlemen opposite not to send their "round robins" to the Ministry, to induce them to palm off this Bill, which stopped the very springs of commercial activity. He appealed to the opposite side on the grounds of public justice and public policy. ["Oh, oh!"] But his constituents were placed at a disadvantage in order to benefit the agricultural interest, and he altogether denied the justice of the attempt to make the port of London the scape-goat of other ports in the country. Probably, if any metropolitan boroughs returned Conservative Members, they would be able to prevail with the Government, as the Members for Liverpool had prevailed. But it was hopeless for the Government to expect from the intelligence of metropolitan constituencies the return of Conservative Members. This Bill could not pass in the present Session, for the requisite notices had not been given affecting private property. If even the Bill went up to the Lords, there must be a Committee on the subject, to consider the case of wharfingers and others whose rights were affected by the measure. As to the great question, whether the measure would raise the price of meat, Mr. Bloomfield Baker had stated before the Committee that the Government contracts alone would be increased by £1,000 per week if the Bill became law. But if this were so in the case of 30,000 or 40,000 soldiers, what would not be the result of the measure upon the food of the whole metropolis? On the ground of public policy, and in the interest of the general trade of the country, he hoped that the House would reject the measure.

Mr. DISRAELI: I hope the House will come to a division upon this stage of the Bill. We have heard in this debate that this measure is the revival of Protection. Remembering that some of the speakers to whom I have listened are distinguished for their knowledge of political economy and their opposition to all artificial systems of restriction, I am surprised that that accusation should be made so freely. We have heard something also about a hustings' cry, and perhaps in the scarcity of the commodity on the other side this stale sarcasm may do as well as any other. Now this is not a question of protection; it is one of precaution. It is a question really between pestilence and precaution. It is a question whether, after the experience we have had of the fell disease to which our herds and flocks have been so fatally subject, it is necessary or desirable that we should adopt some precautionary policy, and whether, on the whole, the measure proposed by my noble Friend (Lord Robert Montagu) is not the most prudent and the most proper? Now it has been asked frequently in the course of this debate, "Why do you propose to do that for London which you do not propose to do for the other ports?" We do not propose to do it for the other ports because it is already done for them. Land has been purchased in those places, and by the clauses of the existing Act we have been able to bring about a state of things which we have not been able to bring about for London. And why not for London? Simply because you cannot avail yourselves of the penalty which was provided by the existing Act in order to enforce the arrangement. What was the penalty? That if in any of those ports they did not choose to purchase the land that was necessary, and establish separate markets, the Privy Council could prevent the importation of foreign cattle. Now, how could you do that in London when you have failed to establish markets, never mind from what cause. No one for a moment could contend that the Government could take upon itself to stop the importation of foreign cattle into London, which is 92 per cent of the gross amount imported. Therefore we have not under the existing Act the means by which we can bring about in London the same results as in the other ports, and it is because we want to legislate practically for the whole country that we ask you to give us those powers which are necessary. So much for the first question that has been asked me. Then there is the other question as to the financial position of the affair, which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Milner Gibson) has brought forward, and which the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) has adverted to. Now, we must remember that in the Committee on the Bill upstairs, the City of London proposed a tariff of tolls quite satisfactory to the Committee, and that tariff was accepted. Certain clauses were framed to carry the general arrangements into effect, and those clauses were accepted. So much, therefore, for the financial part of the question. But then a misunderstanding arose between the Corporation of the City of London and the Metropolitan Board of Works, and what was that misunderstanding really occasioned by? As far as I can collect it was a quarrel as to who should be entitled to the surplus profits of the scheme. Well, now, if there be a misunderstanding between those two bodies as to the question of surplus profits, I think there is *primâ facie* evidence that the scheme would be a paying one. It is therefore unnecessary to discussion in order to ascertain how the money is to be provided; but what we want to inquire into is whether it is necessary such an arrangement should be carried into effect; and that we shall be better able to discuss in a further stage of the Bill. What we have now to decide is, whether it is necessary for the public health and the general welfare of the country that a scheme of this kind should be adopted or not. And if it be our opinion that it ought to be adopted, there can be no doubt that means will be devised by which a measure absolutely necessary may be carried out. Then we are told that we are acting in a very different way from how they act in France; and the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bruce), who spoke with moderation and authority on the subject, greatly dilated on that topic. But there is very little similarity between France and England on this subject. The importation of foreign cattle into France is very moderate indeed; it is counted only by thousands while in this country it is counted by hundreds of thousands. In fact, France has no ports of importation, except from Algiers to Marseilles, and only two inlets into France for foreign cattle by two railways—the Lille and Sambre. The traffic in France can therefore be regulated with success; for, by the law of that country, everything goes to Paris, and the cattle on arriving there are slaughtered within a very limited period. Therefore the similarity of the circumstances alluded to, and the circumstances urged by the right hon. Gentleman to warn us from pursuing a different course in this country, ought not to have much influence or authority on the opinion of the House. I hope the House, having now discussed the question for some time, is prepared to come to some decision on the subject. The House, when in Committee, will have an opportunity of urging in detail any practical objections, and of then being practically considered. But the great point to be remembered by the House is that the state of affairs upon the subject is most unsatisfactory; that the system of Orders in Council, which I have heard advocated from quarters in which I should not have expected them to find much favour, is one that is attended with great disadvantage to the business of the country; and that not only agricultural pursuits but the commercial interchange of the country are extremely embarrassed and disturbed if the supply to the London market is limited—and considerably limited it is—by the system which exists. I do not think I have collected from any hon. Gentlemen that they are of opinion that the system can go on without considerable modifications. I trust therefore that dismissing from our minds such really idle considerations as that this plan is a revival of Protection; but looking at it as an attempt to establish a system of wise and necessary precaution, the House will now agree to go into Committee. It is absolutely necessary that Parliament should come to some decision upon the subject, and re-assure the public mind; and as the question is precaution against foreign pestilence, I hope the House will no longer delay coming to a vote upon it.

MR. BAZLEY attempted to address the House; but, there being loud cries for a division, said he would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Bazley.*)

MR. DISRAELI: I hope the hon. Gentleman will proceed with what he has got to say. I have myself been often received in that manner; but I found the House listened to me when I went on.

MR. GLADSTONE: I should be very glad if my hon. Friend (Mr. Bazley) were disposed to withdraw his Motion for Adjournment. I am bound to say that in my opinion—especially after listening to the right hon. Gentleman—the financial part of the question has assumed an appearance still more formidable; and it is my intention to raise that question, if no other Member does so, on the Motion that you, Sir, do leave the Chair. With the extensive prospects opened out by the hon. Member for Aberdeenshire (Mr. Fordyce) that this is the beginning of a system of which we have had one or two specimens, in the town of Hull, for example, and that it is intended to go around the country. [Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: We can at present.] The noble Lord did not hear the Member for Aberdeenshire then. The right hon. Gentleman says that this is a measure absolutely necessary for the public welfare, and that consequently the means for defraying the charge must be found—if that be so, why should not the means come from the Consolidated Fund? The whole of this opens up a series of questions so important that a discussion must be had upon them. If my hon. Friend would allow me, as my right hon. Friend has raised the question upon the principle of the Bill to a considerable extent, and as hon. Gentleman opposite are anxious to have an expression of opinion upon it, I would suggest that he would not stand in their way.

MR. HADFIELD said, he was not satisfied with the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. He hoped that the Bill would be left to be dealt with by the new Parliament.

MR. BAZLEY said, he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 191; Noes 82: Majority 109.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. BAZLEY said, that while he disclaimed all intention to annoy Her Majesty's Government he should move that the debate be now adjourned.

MR. DISRAELI: I trust the hon. Gentleman will not make that Motion. It will stop all the Business of the evening.

MR. GLADSTONE rose to ask what course the Government intended to take? He presumed, however, that after the division which had been just taken they would object to the adjournment of the debate. For his own part he should certainly not press the adjournment of the debate; but he wished to refer to a matter that had been hardly touched on by the Government. It had only been very briefly mentioned by the First Minister, and never until that speech was delivered. He should endeavour to set forth briefly what he had to say on that matter, in deference to the wishes of hon. Gentlemen opposite. With regard to the general argument he should say very little, and should touch very briefly on the points that had been brought into view during the present evening. One of those appeared to be that Gentleman opposite had urged in argument that time was of the greatest importance to them in that matter, and that a great advantage was to be gained by pressing forward the present Bill under the circumstances in which they were at present placed. Now, it appeared to him that there was no ground for such a supposition. Under the Bill twelve months were allowed for choosing a site for the new market; but why was twelve months necessary for such a purpose? He ventured to think that if the Bill were discussed six months hence, and if six months only were to be allowed for the choice of a site, no time would really be lost. ["Committee!"] His argument, he might remark, did not refer to any particular clause; but to the expediency of pressing the Bill forward at the present time. He was afraid that the longer the discussion on this Bill was protracted the more it would assume the very invidious, not not to say odious, aspect of a battle of class interests. However much some hon. Gentlemen might exert themselves to divest it of that character, he was sorry to say that the language of others tended very much to give it that character; and when a new Parliament met, it would not be a graceful recollection of the last act of the old one that a measure of that kind was carried into effect that Session. He was persuaded that many hon. Gentlemen were urging forward this Bill under the honest belief that it was a measure of precaution, and he had no doubt that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was perfectly sincere when he said that while there would be temporary inconveniences, the trade would soon be re-organized, and that matters would then go on as well as, if not better, than before. Such a prophecy would have been the more comforting but for the existence of certain facts relative to the effects of a similar system of precaution at Hull. Indeed, he was somewhat astonished that the case of Hull had not been mentioned either by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer or by the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown. He would therefore briefly re-capitulate the facts. In the first place, however, he must express his belief that the right hon. Gentleman at the Head of the Government was entirely wrong when he stated that the foreign cattle trade of the port of London was 92 per cent of the whole foreign cattle trade of the country. Of course he could not at the moment quote the precise figures; but his impression was that the out-port trade—to use the expression of the Customs — was about five-twelfths, and certainly more than four twelfths of the entire cattle trade. The right hon. Gentleman's argument therefore fell to the ground. Hull was a port which had a thriving and rapidly growing cattle trade. In 1864 it imported 30,000 cattle, 38,000 sheep and lambs, and 7,000 swine. The next year the figures were as follows:—41,000 cattle, 69,000 sheep and lambs, and 15,000 swine. In 1866 the precautionary measure came into effect, and the result was that the 41,000 cattle fell to 26,000, the 69,000 sheep and lambs to 48,000, and the 15,000 swine to 8,000. Nor was the effect of the measure of precaution then exhausted, for in 1867 the numbers were—17,000 cattle, 9,000 sheep and lambs, and under 4,000 swine. The figures for 1868 were of course incomplete; but he was told that at the present time the cattle trade of Hull exhibited in a yet more satisfactory manner the extreme efficacy of the precautions which had been taken. It was idle, therefore, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to suppose that by general prophecies and promises, which he would do his best to fulfil, he was to carry to disturbed, mistrustful minds any comfortable assurance that his expectations for London were to stand against the evidence of facts and figures already in their hands with respect to the case of Hull. He had no doubt that hon. Gentlemen were sincere when they said they did not want protection; but he apprehended that until the facts and figures he had quoted had been answered, it was clear that the operation of the measure would be something like the extinction of the foreign cattle trade. Such was the case with respect to the probable effect of the Bill on the supply of food, and his right hon. Friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Bruce) had shown that the scientific evidence of veterinary surgeons proved it to be in a prominent degree worthless as a measure of precaution. Then came the question as to the efficacy of Privy Council regulations *versus* statutory restrictions; and why, he would ask, did the Government not enforce compulsory slaughter in the metropolis on their own responsibility, instead of asking the House to relieve them of that responsibility and put itself in their place? He, for one, contended that the arrangement of proceeding by means of the Executive Government, subject to the control of Parliament, and the consequent revocation of errors that might arise, was one which was infinitely to be preferred to a rigid system of statutory restriction such as that which was urged on the acceptance of the House. Then they had further to consider the financial question, and if that question had had been formidable before they had heard the addresses of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, it was at present far more formidable. The case presented by the First Minister of the Crown was no case at all. The right hon. Gentleman at the Head of the Government invited the House to go into Committee to consider the subject in its financial aspect; but he must be permitted to say that no Government measure involving a large outlay had ever been dealt with in that way. It was the absolute duty of the Government, he maintained, to produce before the Speaker left the Chair their financial plan, to show what charge would be incurred under the operation of the Bill, and how that charge was to be met. The right hon. Gentleman sought to put the House off with generalities; but he felt assured that if the measure was passed in its present shape the question of finance would hereafter arise in one shape or another. What, he would ask, were the funds out of which the proposed market was to be supported? As things now stood, the cattle trade of the metropolis was concentrated in a single market, which represented but one source of expense. On the fund by which that market was supported it was, however, sought to throw a double charge, although it was not a fund which yielded a surplus, but one which, on the contrary, was encumbered with a deficiency of £7,000 a year. If that were so, how was the deficiency to be supplied and provision made for the additional charge which would be imposed if the Bill were to pass into a law? What were the sources from which it was conceivable the new charge could be met? It might, perhaps, be thought that it could be met by means of the dues on foreign cattle; but, so far as he could see, we could not levy one penny more on such cattle than on British cattle admitted to a British market. He was of that opinion because of the faith of treaties. A common stipulation in treaties was what was called the equality treatment, which had reference to dues and charges of all kinds. He recollected very well that in 1860, when the French Treaty was entered into, and it was contemplated to levy certain petty charges in the port of London, a special article had to be introduced to prevent their imposition. The Government, therefore, could not hope to raise the revenue required for the new market by taxing foreign at a higher rate than British cattle. The next source of revenue open to them was, as had been stated, the property of the City of London; but the citizens had, he believed, beyond all doubt, washed their hands of the Bill. He, for one, protested against the idea that the ratepayers of the metropolis were to be looked to to defray the necessary charges, and he did not suppose for a moment that they would willingly submit to any measure which would tend to limit the supply of food. The next source to which recourse might be had was the Consolidated Fund. The meaning of the statement of the Head of the Government that this was necessary for the public welfare, and that some means of getting the requisite money must be devised, was that the public must provide the money; and he wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman contemplated getting those means from the Consolidated Fund? Another mode of getting at the treasure of the public was by way of guarantee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer shook his head, and he was glad to understand from the demeanour of the right hon. Gentleman that when he said there was to be no charge on the Consolidated Fund, he meant to include no direct or contingent charge by way of guarantee; but what was said by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) was strictly true—that Commissioners were to be set up without any money to bless themselves with. They were about to do that which had been done too often before—namely, to delude the farmers by professing to do wonderful things on their behalf, which, when put to the test, proved wholly futile. If it was intended to deal in an open and trustworthy manner with the agricultural interest, the financial part of the Bill must be made a reality. He hoped that the Government would give a clear statement of their intentions.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he regretted that when he before addressed the House he was not aware of the challenge that during his absence had been thrown out to him respecting the financial part of the measure. The points raised by the right hon. Gentleman opposite are no doubt worthy of attention, and he would take them one by one. The right hon. Gentleman had asked why the Bill was pressed with such urgency? Why could it not stand over till next Session? Because, after it was passed, another Bill, founded upon it, would have to be introduced, giving powers for the acquisition of the site of the intended market; a provisional Motion would have to be passed, and notice to be given to the persons interested in the site. The right hon. Gentleman had next instanced the case of Hull, as an answer to the argument that the Bill would occasion a larger supply to the market. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed to the decline in the number of cattle, sheep, and swine imported into Hull as the consequence of the Order in Council, compelling beasts to be slaughtered at the place of landing; but he had apparently forgotten that the Order applied only to cattle, and not to sheep, lambs, or swine, unless imported in the same vessel with cattle; and it was therefore plain that the Order in Council could not be held to be the cause of so serious a decline in the importations of Hull. The fact, he believed, was that the restrictive regulations of the various foreign Governments checked the importation from abroad, and also that the French ports during the period in question offered a better market to breeders; for even in London, where compulsory slaughter in a separate market was not enforced, the importation of cattle had fallen from 147,000 in 1864 to 125,000 in 1867. With regard to the financial part of the question, he observed that the Bill in its present shape was not the Bill as introduced by the Government. When the Bill was first introduced the City of London engaged to carry out its provisions, provided it had the tolls under Schedules of the Bill; but when the Bill went before the Select Committee the old rivalry between the Metropolitan Board of Works and the City of London broke out afresh. The surplus was, under the Bill, to go to the market authority; but in the Committee the Bill was altered so that the surplus should go to the reduction of the tolls. It was therefore no wonder that there should be some reluctance on the part of the City to carry out the Bill. But if the City declined to do so the Metropolitan Board would become the market authority. At the instigation of the right hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen), who was certainly not a supporter of the Bill, the clause relating to the City of London was struck out. That might be a proof of the ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman; but it was certainly no reason why a charge should be brought against the Government with reference to the market authority. The view of his noble Friend (Lord Robert Montagu) who had charge of the Bill was to restore it to the shape in which it was when it went up to the Committee, so as to leave it to the City of London to receive the tolls as the market authority, and appropriate the surplus as they appropriated their other funds. But if they declined, the Metropolitan Board would become the market authority, and the surplus would go to them instead of to the reduction of tolls. Independently, therefore, of the Commissioners, they had here two responsible and important bodies, who, if they restored the Bill to its original shape, would be perfectly willing either of them to become the market authority. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Milner Gibson) very properly observed that they should not put higher tolls on animals imported under the provisions of this Bill than before. But so far from being higher the tolls were considerably lower. The tolls in the Schedule were *2s. 6d.* per head instead of *5s. 11d.*, as in the metropolitan cattle market.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, that was not so. Instead of being *5s. 11d.* in the metropolitan cattle market, cattle under the same circumstances were only charged *3d.* per head.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that was a question of fact which might be very easily settled. All he could say was, that if they passed this Bill as presented by the Government, there would be a perfect security that it would be properly carried out in the fact that the City of London would be willing to undertake it as the market authority. It was therefore idle for the right hon. Gentleman to say that financially the Bill would not hold water.

MR. HENLEY said, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire had advised the House not to delude the farmers, and he made a strong statement with respect to Hull, where what he called the foreign trade had been almost extinguished. But had not the right hon. Gentleman and his Friends, with the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), urged the House to continue the very system of Privy Council Orders which the right hon. Gentleman said had all but extinguished the foreign trade at Hull? Was there not something to delude in that? And then as to the ratepayers of the City of London, were they not also deluded by having the extinction of trade put on them by the Privy Council Orders instead of by statute? Hon. Gentlemen talked of the fettering of trade; but was not trade fettered now? Was the time ever known when the people of the metropolis paid so large a price for their meat as they did now? And why was there such a large margin between the price paid to the producer and the price paid by the consumer? It was all very well for the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets and the Whitechapel butchers to talk upon this subject; but was there no delusion here? The very large difference between the wholesale and retail price of meat was owing to the restrictions which the Privy Council placed on trade. But it was said what was the use of passing this Bill when twelve months' notice was given for purchasing a site for the market? But why should these twelve months not be limited to six? That might be done in Committee. He believed all the financial difficulties might easily be cleared away. If not it would only show what remained to be done by the new Parliament. But the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire said they had no right to deal with such a question, for they were a dying body. The right hon. Gentleman, however, did not seem to consider that when dealing with the Irish Church.

MR. GLADSTONE: I never used the words the right hon. Gentleman is putting into my mouth, nor anything like them.

MR. HENLEY said, that if they had cleared away the difficulties in the path instead of uselessly protracting the debate by pressing the same speeches over and over again, they would either have carried the Bill through Committee by this time, or else have left it in a condition much more accessible to the legislation of the new Parliament.

MR. NORWOOD said, that the Orders of the Privy Council were sent temporarily, while the Bill would be permanent it its operation. With regard to the question of imports, the cause of the decline was the prohibition on importers to send surplus imports into the country, and the impossibility to regulate the supply to the wants of each particular port. If it were intended to erect the necessary buildings for only two years, they were incurring a monstrous outlay for a very small object. He condemned the Bill as one which would occasion great loss without possessing sufficient compensating advantages.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL made an appeal to the First Minister of the Crown. Seeing that the agriculturists of England, Ireland, and Scotland felt so strongly on this question, and seeing that the decision of the House had been marked so emphatically in favour of the Bill, he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to give his consent to postpone the prorogation of Parliament a sufficient time to enable this truly Protectionist measure to be proceeded with.

MR. AYRTON said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would now consent to the adjournment of the debate. The statements which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister, and by the right hon. Gentlemen the Chancellor of the Exchequer with respect to the financial part of the Bill were such as to render a further discussion of the main principle of the Bill absolutely necessary. He was not averse to any reasonable arrangement in favour of the agricultural interest; but he protested against the extravagant clauses contained in the present Bill. He made the suggestion that the debate should be adjourned in order to save another division, and perhaps a long series of divisions.

MR. DISRAELI said, he would have consented to an adjournment of the debate before the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gladstone) spoke. But as that right hon. Gentleman had had an opportunity of which he had availed himself of speaking upon the financial part of the Bill, and as his observations had been answered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, there was really no reason whatever why the main principle of the Bill should be further discussed, and why the House should not at once go into Committee upon that Bill. He should certainly oppose the Motion for Adjournment.

MR. GOSCHEN said, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had replied to his right hon. Friend, but he had certainly not answered him—["Oh, oh!"]. He had given no answer to the question, where the funds were to come from to carry out the Bill, if the City and the Board of Works had no money, and were not empowered to borrow for the purpose. The question was left exactly as it was left when his right hon. Friend sat down.

MR. DE GREY said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) would consider favourably the appeal made to him by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Berkshire (Sir Charles Russell) not to prorogue the Parliament till this measure was passed. Such a step, though it would be a sacrifice of time and trouble, would be appreciated by the country; and if the Bill were passed into a law this codicil to the will of a moribund Parliament would be a legacy gratefully acknowledged by all classes.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Bazley.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 55; Noes 155: Majority 100.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. COWEN said, they had been there for fourteen hours and had to meet again at two o'clock in the afternoon, and he therefore moved the adjournment of the House.

MR. DISRAELI trusted that the House would not embark in these barren and distressing practices which they appeared likely to pursue. He hoped that after the very large majorities which had been in favour of going into Committee, the hon. Gentleman would withdraw his Motion, particularly as those majorities were furnished not from that side of the House alone. He did not desire to say anything by way of menace; but if the hon. Gentleman persisted in these Motions, he should not continue to oppose them in the present jaded state of the House, more particularly as there was to be another Sitting that day. It was the usual practice of minorities to defer to the opinions of the majority, especially when that majority had been so large as it had been that evening; and he trusted, therefore, that the hon. Gentleman would not persevere in the course he was now adopting.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he had understood from the right hon. Gentleman that he would not have objected to the adjournment of the debate if it had been moved before the speech of his right hon.

Friend the Member for South Lancashire had been delivered. [" Oh, oh !"] The right hon. Gentleman had so stated and said so still. [" Oh !"] He trusted therefore that the hon. Gentleman would press his Motion.

COLONEL JERVIS said, he thought that both sides of the House should clearly understand the position in which they now were. The opponents of the measure should understand that those who supported it would go into Committee if they continued dividing till two o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

MR. COWEN said, he could tell the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Colonel Jervis) that he too would sit there, if necessary, till two o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

SIR LAWRENCE PALK pointed out to the opponents of the measure that they would be in no worse position if they permitted the Speaker to leave the Chair than they now were. [An hon. MEMBER : Yes, we shall ; very much.] He trusted that for the sake of the character of the House the present factious proceedings would not be persisted in.

MR. AYRTON said, it was not usual when there were Morning Sittings to discuss opposed Business at that hour. He hoped the First Minister would give some assurance that he would assent to an adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question put, " That this House do now adjourn." — (*Mr. Cowen.*)

The House *divided* :—Ayes 38 ; Noes 131 : Majority 93.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. CHEETHAM moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. FRESHFIELD complained that the Bill had been treated in a most discreditable manner by the Gentlemen opposite.

MR. MONK said, he hoped the House would go into Committee that night. He protested against these continued Motions for Adjournment. There were a great many even on the Liberal side who were in favour of the Bill, and he thought it ought to be proceeded with.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, there were a number of Gentlemen who were determined to oppose the Bill at all hazards.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he had felt strongly opposed to the Bill ; but it had been fairly fought in all its stages, and further opposition to the Speaker's leaving the Chair ought now to be discontinued.

MR. AYRTON called attention to the fact that the First Minister of the Crown had left the House, and asked who was in charge of the Business of the House.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, that the Prime Minister was willing, supposing the House went into Committee, to report Progress at once, and fix the Bill for Monday.

Motion made, and Question put, " That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Cheetham.*)

The House *divided* :—Ayes 30 ; Noes 130 : Majority 100.

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. P. A. TAYLOR moved the adjournment of the House.

MR. LABOUCHERE seconded the Motion.

COLONEL JERVIS asked what were the forms of the House. If necessary, those on the Ministerial side of the House would walk continually into the Lobbies till ten in the morning.

Motion made, and Question put, " That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Peter Taylor.*)

The House *divided* :—Ayes 31 ; Noes 132 : Majority 101.

Original Question again proposed, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. CANDLISH moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Candlish.*)

VISCOUNT GALWAY made an appeal to hon. Members opposite on behalf of the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair. They were hardly treating him fairly by keeping him in the House at that late hour, and he hoped they would not press the Motion for the adjournment.

LORD ELCHO said, he had intended rising to make a similar observation. If hon. Members had no consideration for themselves, they should at least have some consideration for the Speaker, who had, with the exception of the two hours between four and six, been practically in the Chair since twelve o'clock, and it was now twenty minutes to three.

Mr. SPEAKER said, he felt obliged to those Gentlemen who had made that appeal in his behalf. But he wished that hon. Members, without any reference to his convenience, should be guided by what they considered proper and suitable and becoming the dignity of the House.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON asked why the Irish Registration Bill had been placed after the Bill under discussion? The Irish Members had been pressed to wait for it; and why? Because it was known they were generally favourable to the Cattle Bill, and would, of course, support the Government. ["Oh, oh!"]

Mr. NOEL denied the statement.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, he was quite ready to admit the opposition, which had been as industrious as the Government's; but he maintained that indirectly the effect had been as he had stated. He, however, recommended his hon. Friend (Mr. Candlish) not to press his Motion.

Mr. CANDLISH, reminding hon. Members opposite it would have been more consistent if they had consulted the Speaker's comfort hours before, withdrew his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee; House *resumed;* Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Sclater-Booth, Bill to continue various Expiring Laws, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Sclater-Booth and Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 241.]

WOODS AND GAME ASSESSMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Read, Bill to assess Woods and Game to Local Rates, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Read and Mr. Jasper More.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 242.]

House adjourned at Three o'clock in the morning.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 17, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment* (267); Sir Robert Napier's Annuity* (265); Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland)* (268); Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation* (266); Marriages Validity (Blakedown)* (271).

Second Reading—Tain Provisional Order Confirmation* (242); Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation* (241); Larceny and Embezzlement (245); New Zealand Assembly's Powers* (247); Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances* (205); Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment* (252); Vaccination (Ireland)* (254); Militia Pay.*

Committee — Burials (Ireland) (212 - 269); Bankruptcy Act Amendment (208-270); Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment* (229); Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies* (238).

Report — Ecclesiastical Commissioners* (259); Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment* (229); Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit* (237); Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland)* (261); Court of Justiciary (Scotland)* (232); Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland)* (233); Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies* (238).

Third Reading — Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal* (214); Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* (175); West Indies* (249); Entail Amendment (Scotland)* (250); Assignees of Marine Policies* (260); Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland)* (222); Petit Juries (Ireland)* (231); Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Court* (123); District Church Tithes Act Amendment* (251); Indorsing of Warrants* (240), and *passed.*

LONDON, BRIGHTON, AND SOUTH COAST RAILWAY BILL.—OBSERVATIONS.

Lord REDESDALE said, that this Bill had come back from the House of Commons with a clause restored which their Lordships had struck out, and which empowered the company to divide their ordinary paid-up share capital in a manner which he thought was open to the strongest possible objection. If their Lordships conceded that principle, and particularly for the reason given in the other House—namely, that companies had a right to regulate their own capital in the way they deemed most convenient, without the interference of Parliament, he believed it would lead to the greatest possible evil. He therefore desired to call their Lordships' attention to the subject, and he begged to give Notice that he would on Tuesday next move that their Lordships should insist on their Amendment. There was a canvass generally in these cases and he hoped their Lordships would keep their minds free until the subject came on for discussion.

CORONATION OATH.

ADDRESS FOR A PAPER.

LORD REDESDALE * : In moving for a Copy of the Coronation Oath, your Lordships will be aware that I do so in reference to the question relating to the Irish Church, forced upon our consideration by the action of the other House of Parliament. Hitherto, it appears to me that the political aspect of that question has been almost exclusively discussed, and I am very anxious that the far more important consideration of it in its religious aspect shall not be overlooked. The country must be appealed to before it is settled, and as every man may act in relation to it, so will he have to account. I have on a former occasion expressed my opinion to your Lordships, that to take away property which has been devoted for centuries to the service of what we believe to be the true Catholic Church is sacrilege, and therefore sinful. The only answer I have received came from a noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll), who objected to my doctrine, "because money given to the Church was not necessarily given to God." I admit this to a certain extent. Gifts to the Church may be perverted, and cease to be devoted to the service of God. But when the noble Duke went on to say that—

> "Churches are to be judged like other institutions,—that if they produce good-will and peace among men, the money given to them may indeed be held to be given to the service of God ; but if, in the exercise of our reason we judge that they are producing evil effects, we are justified in holding that the money is not spent in the service of God :"

as in this case the "evil effects produced" are that some men are offended, I must ask the noble Duke where he learnt that doctrine in regard to the propagation of true religion? Does he hold that the truth will always be agreeable to all men ; and that it is not to be preached if it offends anyone? Our Lord Himself said, when He first sent forth His Apostles, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth : I came not to send peace, but a sword." But this doctrine is not agreeable to the taste of the present day. Men prefer the teaching of false prophets if their teaching is pleasing, and to see peace when there is no peace. The Irish Church never was so efficient as at present, and in that efficiency she is condemned to serve a political purpose. Her property is to be confiscated and the wrong done to her excused because thereby a majority of the people of Ireland will be gratified. To injure one person to please another is sinful, and such policy can never prosper or bring peace to a nation. Oh, that every man would pray diligently for guidance in this matter before he committed himself to a course which he may hereafter bitterly regret! I assert boldly that in dealing with the temporalities of the Church as property devoted to the service of God, it is our bounden duty to consider exclusively what will be pleasing to God, and to disregard altogether the wishes or prejudices of this or that body of men. The Resolutions on the subject of the Irish Church, lately carried in "another place," were taken up hastily to secure a particular purpose. It was found, to the disappointment of many, that the Government, having succeeded in passing the English Reform Bill last year, were likely to be equally successful with the Scottish and Irish Bills in the present Session. They were pursuing their course with a continuance of support which insured the result now obtained ; and as regards the charge brought by a noble Earl (Earl Russell) against them, that they were holding Office in violation of constitutional principles, without possessing the confidence of the House of Commons, I believe that if the Division Lists on those important measures are examined, it will be found that the Leader of the Opposition has been more frequently in a minority than the Leader of the Government; and so far from the fact being that the Government did not possess the confidence of the House of Commons, I believe that they enjoyed it to a greater extent than any other party there on the questions really at issue before Parliament, whether as to general policy, domestic and foreign, or as to legislative measures actually under consideration. Under these circumstances, so distressing to the Leaders of the Opposition, who had by their mismanagement broken up their party, and knew that they could not carry a Vote of Want of Confidence if they proposed one, a question was to be sought out for making a hostile movement against the Government, on which all the sections of the Liberal party might be got to vote together, in the hope of turning out the Government before they could bring the Session to a successful conclusion. It was necessary that what was to be proposed should be grateful to Cardinal Cullen and to the Liberation Society, in order that all the extreme men might be secured; and for these purposes it was unfortunately determined to attack the Irish Church. Cardinal Cullen was pleased with Resolutions for her disestablishment and disendowment, because they were a grievous injury to Protestantism; and the Liberation Society rejoiced because they inflicted a heavy blow against the principle of all Establishments. And here I wish to say a word or two upon the principles of the Liberation Society, because in the heats engendered by the late discussions not a few have been led partially to accept their doctrine, and to plead in excuse for agreeing to disestablish the Church in Ireland, that thereby its efficiency will be increased. As regards Establishments and Endowments, I find that in the only case in which the polity of a nation was determined by direct order from the Almighty — namely, for the Jews, their Church was both established and endowed. Perhaps the Liberation Society consider that God made a mistake in those ordinances. With more veneration I bow to that decision; and where I find a Church, which I believe to be true, established and endowed, I consider myself bound to support it in the enjoyment of those privileges as being things divinely ordered. So much for the ultra-Protestant section of the alliance. On the Roman Catholic side I say that the agitation on the subject of the Irish Church is mainly an ecclesiastical, not a popular movement, and has been raised within a very few years. None existed at the time of the Emancipation, but, on the contrary, the strongest assurances were then given that no idea of overthrowing the Protestant Establishment was entertained by Roman Catholics. In the Oath taken by them under that Act, each Member thus engaged himself—

> "I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment as settled by law within this realm; and I do solemnly swear that I will never exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant Religion or Protestant Government in the United Kingdom."

This Oath and others have been given up; but their removal, instead of leading to the peace and good-will which was to have been the promised result, has given licence to Roman Catholics to attack the Established Church, of which they have too readily availed themselves, and affords no encouragement for further concessions. Whatever has at any time been given to them has only been used as a stepping-stone to further demands. I cannot part from the consideration of this question, so vitally affecting the Church Establishment of these kingdoms, without calling attention to the manner in which this nation has been evidently blessed and made great since the Reformation. Before that event, we were a respectable European power, but gave no promise of our subsequent advance and influence. Since the foundation of our colonial Empire was first laid in the time of Elizabeth, we have been continually extending our name, our language, and our religion over a very large portion of the globe. To us the heathen have been given for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for our possession. To us, more than to any other European nation, it has been given in our Eastern Empire to fulfil the ancient prophecy, that Japhet shall dwell in the gates of Shem. We have not been without a warning. Notwithstanding the blessings conferred upon his kingdom and people, the Sovereign on one occasion relapsed to Popery. He was immediately judged and found wanting, and was removed from his Throne, to which another family was called, now represented by Her Majesty. The danger which now appears to threaten us comes, not from the Sovereign, but from a political party, and it behoves the people of these realms to reflect that if they fail to maintain the Protestant cause as heretofore, the result may be that the power and position now enjoyed by this country may be taken from it, in like manner as the Crown was taken from the Stuarts. Under these circumstances, and with these reflections before me, I desire to move for a Copy of the Coronation Oath. On a recent occasion, the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville), alluding to some remarks I had made in a former speech on this subject in relation to the personal responsibility of the Sovereign, avoided the discussion of them, saying in his most good-humoured manner—

> "If I am asked to say what I think of certain portions of that speech, I must, with all respect to your Lordships and my noble Friend, acknowledge that I had rather do no such thing."

And then he laid out for a laugh, by quoting some doggrel lines about "a curse, for which nobody seemed one penny the worse," which, as I had not said anything about a curse, were not appropriate; but taken together with what preceded, I accept the whole gratefully as an acknowledgment that he had no satisfactory reply to make to my argument which he thus evaded. Try it how you please, can anything exceed the solemnity of that Oath? It is not the voluntary act of the Sovereign, to which she might afterwards regret that she had engaged herself, and repent the indiscretion which led her to take it. It is imposed upon her by the law of the country, not by her own will. If, indeed, Parliament, before dealing with the Irish Church, were to repeal that Oath, and Her Majesty felt herself justified in assenting to that repeal—for, remember, the Sovereign has an independent legislative power equal to that of either House of Parliament, so far as assent is concerned, and is responsible for the exercise of it—a question might arise whether such a repeal released her from the obligation; but so long as that Oath remains in the statute book, the obligation exists. I have seen in *The Times* a letter from a gentleman who subscribed himself "Historicus," giving a number of reasons why it was not an Oath at all, and holding that it was a matter of indifference how it was observed. His argument appeared summed up in the following sentence:—

> "To contend that the obligation of such a solemnity as the Coronation Oath is due not to the nation but to the Deity, is a position of which the folly can only be equalled by its profanity."

What sense can the mind which conceived such a sentiment have of the place, the manner, and the terms in which that solemnity—for so he has the grace to call it—was performed? If, indeed, the engagement had been entered into by the Sovereign in this Chamber, with the Lords in their places and the Commons at the Bar, and if, laying her hand on the statute book, she had said, What I have here promised I will keep, "so help me Great Britain and Ireland," it would have been indeed due only to the nation. But when we consider that the Oath was taken in the Temple of God, that the Sovereign in taking it placed her hand on the holy Gospels, and, in the words "so help me God," invoked the Divine assistance in performing and keeping what she had promised, I think it impossible to deny that the obligation was not to the nation only, but to God. It has been the constitutional doctrine from the earliest times that the Sovereign of this country is subject to none but to God and the law. Duty to the law compelled the Queen to take that Oath, and to whatever her conscience tells her that it engages her, she is bound by her duty to God.

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for a Copy of the Oath taken by Her Majesty at Her Coronation: *Agreed to.*—(*The Lord Redesdale.*)

ARMY — ORGANIZATION OF THE RESERVED FORCES.—QUESTION.

LORD TRURO, in rising to ask Her Majesty's Government a Question, respecting the Organization of the Reserved Forces, said, there had of late years been a determination, in view of the improved equipment of Continental armies, to increase our forces to any extent which might appear desirable, so as to place the country in a condition to meet any emergency. Successive Governments had considered the subject, and as far back as the time of the late Sir George C. Lewis a scheme was drawn up with a view of organizing a Reserve Force, while the present Administration had wisely set about the organization of such a Reserve. Its numbers were, however, at present only 4,000; it was in a most unhappy condition with regard to officers, and there was very little chance of its numbers being speedily recruited. The Artillery was likewise in a most unfavourable condition, there being only 180 guns available for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Forces, the Militia and Pensioners, amounting in all to 300,000 men. He thought public men had not as yet taken a proper view of the Volunteer Force, which ought in his opinion to be regarded as the great defence Army of the country. If, as some of our statesmen believe, the next war should be "a word and a blow," we could not expect two months' notice; and what would be our position? We should have 40,000 or 50,000 men of the Regular Army, 150,000 Militia, 180 guns of the Artillery, the Yeomanry, Pensioners, and Volunteers. In case of an invasion it might be necessary to divide the Regular Army into two or three bodies, and, excellent as the Militia were, he did not believe they would be comparable to the Volunteers. He believed the result of any alarm would be that we should have our Regular Army increased to 300,000, our Militia to 300,000, and our Volunteers to at least 1,000,000. Now, what was the amount of Artillery with which we should be able to support that force? He knew there was an impression at the Horse Guards that the Volunteers were not a body whom it would be desirable to use as field artillery. Now, without attempting to make too much of the Volunteer Force, he could not help urging the great expediency of seeing whether there was not some mode by which the Volunteers might be instructed in artillery at a comparatively small cost, but in such a manner and with such a sufficient supply of guns as would render them available, in case of need, to give support to the body of men to whom he had alluded. He did not think it desirable to describe what the condition of this country was at the time of the Crimean War; but it was generally known that the number of guns was so inconsiderable as to do no credit to the mode in which the public Departments had been carried on. He would, therefore, venture to press on the Government the extreme necessity of considering whether it might not be desirable to put the Volunteer Force—our national defence Army—though at present they might not be looked upon with, he was going to say, a degree of pride—in such a condition that they might be available, no matter what occasion for their services might arise. He, for one, could not say that he looked back with satisfaction on the administration of the War Department under the present Government. Circulars had been issued by the Department, which showed a want of acquaintance with the present state of things that one would not have expected. For instance, a Circular had been issued to Lords Lieutenant in which unity of action between Volunteers and Militia was recommended; but which showed that the War Department was not aware that in time of war the Volunteers and Militia would come under the control of the Commander-in-Chief. Then another Circular was issued, informing the Volunteers that they were to be brought in aid of the civil power. No greater error was ever committed, nor one which would more seriously interfere with the efficiency and popularity of the Volunteer system. The Circular was afterwards withdrawn and was judiciously emasculated; but was re-issued in a form which he regarded as absolutely nil. He was aware that their Lordships were always averse from any question of a personal character, and he could assure them that he would be the last person indiscreetly to trench upon the rule which was so rigidly maintained. But the question which he now wished to bring forward was not in one sense of a personal character, and though it related to an individual, it was to an individual who had long been engaged in the public service. He referred to Colonel Erskine. Colonel Erskine had served in the Military Train, and on Colonel M'Murdoch being appointed to a higher command he succeeded that officer as Inspector General of Volunteers. While holding that office he had 160,000 Volunteers under his command, and in the discharge of his duties was lauded by almost every Volunteer in the service. Colonel Erskine had performed the duties of Inspector, he believed, to the satisfaction of every Minister of War under whom he served. It was with deep regret that he read that Colonel Erskine had been removed from his position in the War Office, not to a higher position, or one which would have been a due acknowledgment of his valuable services; but, on the contrary, he was, so to speak, put back to the Military Train, from which he had been promoted, and that on a salary less by £400 a year. The pay of military men was not so considerable that a loss of £400 a year would be of no moment to Colonel Erskine. He would venture to ask the noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) who was Colonel Erskine's immediate superior, whether he was cognizant of the removal of Colonel Erskine before it occurred? and he hoped that was a question which the noble Earl would answer. It might be said that Colonel Erskine would have held his situation only two years longer; but the reply to that was that there was a loss to Colonel Erskine of £800 solid money by his removal. Did their Lordships conceive that a Minister of State should have been so indifferent to the interests of his subordinates as to state in his place in Parliament that the position to which Colonel Erskine was removed was an inferior one, and that the salary was lower? He was stating what had appeared in print, and what the Minister was reported to have said in Parliament, and he ventured to say that a more off-hand mode of dealing with a valuable subordinate could not be. And let it be remembered that Colonel Erskine was a man who by the Volunteers and the public was acknowledged to have discharged his duty in a faultless manner; and not only had he discharged it faithfully and zealously, but in a manner the most modest and becoming, while he had never made any remonstrance against the treatment which he had received. He begged to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether any Scheme has yet been prepared for the Organization of the Reserved Forces?

THE MARQUESS OF EXETER said, he should have been well satisfied to leave the question of the organization of our Reserved Forces in the hands of the Secretary for War, and of his noble Relative (the Earl of Longford), and he should not have addressed their Lordships but for an observation which had fallen from the noble Lord who had just sat down. While he (the Marquess of Exeter) had every respect for the Volunteers, he must take exception to certain expressions which the noble Lord had used with regard to the Militia. He understood the noble Lord to say that the Volunteers must be regarded as the national Reserve of this country, and that the Militia were not comparable to the Volunteer Force. No doubt the noble Lord intended to say that in point of numbers they were not comparable.

LORD TRURO: I meant to say that, in consequence of the Militia being out for drill only three weeks during the year and the Volunteers being engaged in shooting and drilling every day of the year—some part of the Volunteers are shooting every day—at all events, they are out on drill—the Militia could not be so good a force as the Volunteers.

THE MARQUESS OF EXETER said, that the Militia had always been regarded as the constitutional Reserve of the country, from which our regular troops were in times of emergency to be recruited. During the Crimean War the Militia gave nearly 40,000 men to the regiments of the Line, besides relieving the Regular Forces by performing garrison duty within the United Kingdom, and sending out twelve regiments to garrison the Mediterranean stations, thus enabling the Line regiments at Gibraltar, Malta, and the Ionian Islands to re-inforce our army in the Crimea at a most critical time. The constitution of the Volunteer Force would not enable them to perform such duty—because if the Volunteers were taken away from their homes to perform garrison duty the trade of the country would suffer. It had often been complained that the Militia was badly officered not only as regarded numbers, but efficiency. Now, as to the alleged non-efficiency of Militia officers, he did not agree with the complaints which were so often urged; for, after long experience, he was of opinion that, considering the short time they were out for training and the few opportunities they had for learning their duties properly, Militia officers as a body did their work very fairly. They would perform it still better if the Government would return to the plan pursued in 1852. At that time Militia officers were allowed to attach themselves to regiments of the Line for an unlimited time. He believed that many of them would be glad to take that opportunity of learning their duty again, and in that case would soon become nearly as efficient as officers of the Line. At present they could only join a Line regiment for a month, and this time was not long enough for them to learn their drill properly. Another point deserving of consideration was whether the Government should not pay the travelling expenses of Militia officers to and from the county town while the regiment was in training. Again, the billeting system required amendment. An enormous amount of billeting money was now spent when the Militia were out for training; and the Government should consider whether it would not be much cheaper to provide barracks or proper accommodation in the county towns, rather than continue a system which was not only costly, but led to great irregularities. It might be worth while to consider also whether the Contagious Diseases Prevention Act might not be applied with advantage in some way in the county towns during the time the Militia were in training. He suggested, too, that the Militia should be formed into divisions; for, in case of war, it would be of the greatest advantage if, instead of the present divided authority, the officer having the military command of the district were able to order out his division of Militia along with his division of his Line.

VISCOUNT HARDINGE said, the noble Lord who had introduced this subject had referred to the resignation of Colonel Erskine, and he (Viscount Hardinge) must agree that this was an event which every Volunteer regretted. With regard to the organization of the Reserve Force, no doubt the question was an important one; but, considering how short a time General Lindsay, who commanded the Force, had held that appointment, it was only fair to that officer to withold any remarks until a sufficient time had elapsed to give the new scheme a fair trial. The whole question of the reorganization of our home defences was considered in 1858 by a Committee of General Officers, who recommended the brigading of the Militia with the Regular Forces. This would be a step in the right direction, and was still more necessary now than it was then, when the large force of 170,000 Volunteers had been added to our home defences. In respect to transport, commissariat, and other arrangements the recommendations made were of a valuable character. He did not concur with the noble Lord (Lord Truro) in putting the Volunteers before the Militia; for, although he belonged to the Volunteers, he believed the Militia was the back-bone of our defensive organization. While the Volunteer had twelve days' drill, the Militiaman had twenty-eight, and was liable to be drilled fifty-six days; and he would urge upon the Government the importance of giving facilities to the Militia to be brigaded with the Line. The experiment had been tried at Aldershot this year, and had proved very successful. Seven regiments of Militia had been encamped with the Regulars, and he was told on high authority that nothing could be better than their conduct on parade. He should like to see this system extended, and other Militia regiments sent to Aldershot, Shorncliffe, and Colchester, where, he believed, contact with the Line would greatly increase their efficiency, while the encampment would save them from contracting the prejudicial habits that were acquired when they were thrown together in the towns. The same plan might to be adopted with regard to the Volunteers. Moreover, he thought that if the Volunteers were brigaded with the Militia during the period the latter were out training, a great improvement might be made in their efficiency. He did not believe it was possible in time of peace to maintain a Staff sufficient for a Reserve Force of 300,000 men, and as to a Volunteer Staff, which some put forward so much, he deemed it a chimera, for Volunteer officers had not time to qualify themselves for the duties of Staff officers. It would be quite premature yet to give any opinion with regard to the success of the Army Reserve, but he would remind the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State that a great number of men had been lost this year because the Circular was issued so late. He knew that this was the case in his own county; and he hoped the War Office had so far improved that a repetition of this mistake could not occur. He wished to draw special attention to the deficiency in the number of Militia officers, which at present amounted to 1,400; and he could not help thinking it was an excellent suggestion that their expenses on joining their regiments should be paid, and that that step would do much towards supplying the deficiency. He would also offer another suggestion, which was that after they had served ten years they should be allowed to take their rank and to wear uniform, which would be a privilege and a boon that they would appreciate.

Lord LYTTELTON desired to confirm what had been said as to the good conduct of the Militia and the difficulty of finding officers. As reference had been made to Colonel Erskine, he might say he was perfectly certain that anything which could be done by the Government to show their sense of the services of Colonel Erskine and of his predecessor, Colonel M'Murdo, would be most acceptable to the whole body of Volunteers.

The Earl of LONGFORD, in reply to the Question of the noble Lord (Lord Truro), had to state that there was no scheme for the organization of the Reserve Forces ready to be promulgated, nor had he been able to find the scheme to which allusion had been made, and which was supposed to have been drawn up at the time Sir George C. Lewis was at the War Office. Two Acts were passed late last Session the object of which was to increase the efficiency of the Reserve Forces, and these Acts were coming slowly into operation. An important step towards the organization of the Reserved Forces had been taken by placing the Militia and Volunteer Forces under the direction of one competent commander who was also an Assistant Inspector of the district. Although it was true the deficiency of Militia officers was to be lamented, yet he must say that those we had were quite as efficient as they could be expected to be. There was no better public servant than Colonel M'Murdo, and the Volunteer service could not have been better inspected than they were by Colonel Erskine; but it was obviously an advantage that these different forces should be brought under uniform direction and placed under one commander, and it was to be hoped that their organization would now be developed. Materials were in the hands of the Inspector General, who, with the Militia authorities, would proceed to make regulations on the subject, and several officers had devoted much valuable time to the elaboration of plans for bringing together bodies of troops with their appendages. He hardly wished to enter into the delicate question involved in a comparison of the Volunteers with the Militia, for the Government accepted the services of both, and believed that each was able to play a competent part in the defence of the country. He had hoped the last had been heard of the unfortunate Circular; but it was not the business of the War Office to make the law on the subject. With regard to the resignation of Colonel Erskine, no good purpose was to be served by reviving a matter which was fully discussed four months ago, when the Secretary of State bore the highest testimony to the value of his services. It was thought that an excellent opportunity had arisen for making certain desirable arrangements with regard to the Reserve Forces, and while they were being considered the intelligence was communicated irregularly and informally to Colonel Erskine by a private friend. He had only to state, in conclusion, that the Government fully recognized the importance of proceeding in the direction of complete organization.

Earl DE GREY and RIPON said, that in his opinion the Militia and the Volunteers were highly creditable to the country, and that there was ample room for both of them. We might fairly expect good service from them at any period of national difficulty that might arise. He was mainly induced to offer a few remarks to the House by a portion of the speech of his noble Friend (Lord Truro) with reference to the services of Colonel Erskine. He had been at the War Office during almost the whole of the time that Colonel Erskine served in that Department, first as Deputy Inspector of Volunteers, and subsequently on his appointment as Inspector General of Volunteers. He felt that he should fail in his duty to Colonel Erskine if he did not bear testimony in the strongest manner to the valuable services of that officer. Colonel Erskine was a man of untiring zeal, of unusually good sense, and of high administrative talent. Now he did not for a moment complain that the Secretary of State for War had deemed it necessary to amalgamate certain offices, and to bring the Reserved Forces into closer union with one another. Indeed, a similar scheme had been previously proposed; but its principal object was to effect economy, whereas the result of carrying out the plan now proposed by the Secretary of State would have the result of somewhat increasing the cost of the Department. But although it was perfectly right that the Secretary of State should introduce into his Department such changes as he might think requisite, yet when an officer had discharged his duties with zeal and ability every possible consideration should be had for the feelings of that officer. From what he had heard that evening, however, he was led to believe that the feelings of Colonel Erskine had not been taken into consideration. He understood that Colonel Erskine did not learn from the Secretary of State, but from a private friend, that it was intended to remove him from the post of Inspector General of Volunteers. Now, if that were really so, he was bound to express his opinion that the Secretary of State had been wanting in courtesy to Colonel Erskine, who had not received such treatment as an officer occupying so high a position had a right to expect. As to the general question, the noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) had truly said that the Act of last year had not been long enough in operation to enable us to judge of its probable results; but he regretted that the regulations for carrying it into effect were not published at an earlier period. The result of that, if he were not mistaken, was to delay for a whole year the bringing of that Act into operation. Such a result was greatly to be regretted. He confessed he had always entertained some doubts as to the effect of the measure; but as Her Majesty's Government had adopted it, he hoped they would exert their influence in order to make it work beneficially.

Lord OVERSTONE said, he thought this was not an unfit opportunity for drawing their Lordships' attention to the fact that when the Volunteer Force was first organized it was distinctly understood that it was not to be in any way a substitute for the regular forces of the country. It was simply intended as a demonstration of moral force which should be felt throughout the whole world, and the worst condemnation that could be pronounced upon it was that it should to any extent—even to the extent of 5,000 men—be a means of reducing the Regular Army. This was a matter of great importance, on which the attention of their Lordships should be carefully fixed. Then the country ought clearly to understand in what manner and to what extent the defence of this country could be efficiently sustained by any military force. This island was small in extent, its dense population were actively engaged in commercial and industrial pursuits, and all its business was carried on by the operation of a vast system of credit, delicate to the last degree, which would be most ruinously affected by the landing upon our shores of an army—he would not say an army which required 200,000 or 300,000 men to repel it—but of an army of even 20,000 or 30,000 men. The mere landing of such a force would act like a universal earthquake, spreading destruction throughout the land, and our power, our prosperity, our happiness, our greatness—everything which made us proud of the name of Englishmen—would be lost. It was upon the waters surrounding this island that our safety must always depend, and he therefore trusted that in the midst of schemes of army organization the attention of the Government and of the country would be always directed to the security of the seas which separated us from the great military Monarchies of the Continent.

THE BLOCKADE OF MAZATLAN.

QUESTION.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH inquired, If it be true that a Frigate is blockading the Port of Mazatlan; and, if so, whether such Blockade has been duly authorized by Her Majesty in Council and published in the *Gazette*? He must first, however, state, that since he had placed his Notice on the Paper, further particulars respecting the alleged blockade had been published in the newspapers. The blockading of a port was a very important operation, and ought to be carried out in a very cautious manner. He might remark that, some years ago, in consequence of a number of English sailors having been mortally injured, the port of Jeddah had been blockaded, and in consequence great difficulties and complications had arisen between the Turkish Government and that of Her Majesty. If the account of what had occurred at Mazatlan were accurate, the British commander appeared to have behaved in an outrageous manner, and to have proved himself unfit to remain in Her Majesty's service. The details were thus narrated in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of last evening—

"The American papers to hand this morning publish the following, dated San Francisco, July 2:—'Advices from Mazatlan to the 22nd of June report that a serious difficulty had occurred between Commander Bridge, of the English war steamer *Chanticleer*, and the Mexican authorities at that place. The *Chanticleer*, it is said, was in a perilous position off the coast, and fired signal guns for assistance. A pilot went out and released the ship from her position of danger, but the commander of the steamer refused to pay the pilot for his services, and proceeded to Mazatlan. The collector of the port at Mazatlan was notified that one of the officers of the British war steamer was engaged in conveying specie on board to avoid the export duty, and caused his arrest. The officer's person was searched and a quantity of gold found upon him. The captain of the *Chanticleer* came ashore, and in a very excited manner declared that his vessel and himself had been insulted by the indgnity offered to his subordinates. High words followed, which culminated in the arrest and search of the person of the British commander by order of the collector, who asserted his suspicion that the commander also was implicated in smuggling specie on board of his vessel. Captain Bridge then went on board of the *Chanticleer* and notified the inhabitants of Mazatlan that he was about to bombard the city for the insult offered to the English flag. The captain's proclamation of hostility caused great excitement, and numerous communications in writing passed between Captain Bridge, General Corona, and the civil authorities. The United States' Consul, Mr. Session, acting as mediator, ultimately induced the British commander to modify his proclamation so as to place the port of Mazatlan under blockade so far as Mexican vessels were concerned, until he could receive orders from the British Admiral commanding on the station. American and other foreign vessels would not be interfered with. It is asserted that the action of General Corona and the Mexican authorities is approved by the foreign residents generally. The United States' war steamer *Suwanee* had left Acapulco for Mazatlan, to protect the American interest in that place. The United States' steamer *Resaca* was at La Paz on June 21. Additional advices from Mexico state that Commander Bridge at first demanded that the officer who searched the person of his subordinate and seized the money should be sent on board the *Chanticleer*, to be dealt with as the commander saw fit. General Corona replied that sooner than submit to such an outrage, he would allow the city to be bombarded, and telling him, in indignant language, that if he had a reclamation to make, he should make it in the manner customary with civilized nations and through the proper channel.'"

He would not take up any more of their Lordships' time, but would simply ask whether the Government had received any authentic information on that matter?

The Earl of MALMESBURY: In reply to the Question of my noble Friend, I have to state that Her Majesty's Government have not received any of those details which he seems to have obtained through the American newspapers. Your Lordships will judge for yourselves—for I cannot pronounce any opinion on the subject—whether those details are likely to be authentic or not. All that Her Majesty's Government have heard is that on the 4th of July the Admiralty learnt by a telegram that, an outrage having been committed on some British seamen or British subjects—I know not exactly which—Captain Bridge, of the *Chanticleer*, took upon himself to stop the entrance to the port of Mazatlan. I quite agree with my noble Friend in stating that an officer has no right on his own responsibility to commit such an act as that. At the same time, there are circumstances which justify breaches of the law, as your Lordships know. But, not being acquainted with those circumstances, no opinion can be pronounced on that point. On the 10th of this month the Admiralty also received a telegraphic despatch from Vice Admiral Hastings, saying that he had sent orders to Captain Bridge to raise the blockade. That is all that we have heard on the subject; and no other authentic intelligence has reached us. I cannot help here noticing what was said by my noble Friend with respect to a very grave event which occurred some years ago at Jeddah. He seemed to think very lightly of that outrage, and talked of some sailors being stopped, or something of that sort. [The Earl of Denbigh: I said "mortally injured."] Not only were they mortally injured, but they were murdered. The Turkish authorities refusing, after negotiation, to take any notice of the subject or to bring the murderers to justice, Captain Pullen, with the full authority of his Government, bombarded the town; and I have never heard before that that act of justice was found fault with either in this country or any other part of Europe.

BURIALS (IRELAND) BILL—[No. 212.]

(*The Earl of Kimberley.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Amendments made.

The Archbishop of ARMAGH moved after the Clause inserted after Clause 2, to insert the following Clause:—

> "And whereas many Parish Churches have of late Years been erected on a new Site, having attached to them small Churchyards given or purchased for the sole Use of Persons attending the Worship of the Church, and in Size proportioned to the Wants of the Congregation, leaving the old Churchyard for the general Use of the Parishioners: And whereas many Perpetual Cures and District Parishes have been erected of late Years and Churches built in them, with small Graveyards intended solely for the Use of the Congregations of such Churches: Be it therefore enacted, That it shall be lawful for the Lord Lieutenant in Council, on Application from the Incumbents of any such Church, to declare the same to be exempt, and which Exemption shall be published in the Dublin Gazette, and thereupon such Churchyards shall be exempted from the Operation of this Act."—(*The Lord Archbishop of Armagh.*)

The Earl of KIMBERLEY objected to the clause, which was likely to create an unpleasant feeling in the minds of those whose relatives might be excluded from burial in the small graveyards to which it referred.

The Archbishop of ARMAGH thought that these burial-grounds should not be in all cases exempted; but that there should be in certain cases a possibility of exemption.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE said a few words in opposition to the clause.

On Question? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 42; Not-Contents 23: Majority 19.

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

CONTENTS.

Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Armagh, Archbp.

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Exeter, M.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Cadogan, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)

Romney, E.
Verulam, E.

De Vesci, V.
Hawarden, V.
Melville, V. [*Teller.*]
Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.

Abinger, L.
Bagot, L.
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Chelmsford, L.
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
Colonsay, L.

Denman, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Fitzwalter, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Northwick, L.
Raglan, L.
Redesdale, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*) [*Teller.*]
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cleveland, D.

Airlie, E.
De Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Denbigh, E.
Kimberley, E. [*Teller.*]
Minto, E.
Morley, E.

Sydney, V.

Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Churchill, L.
Cranworth, L.
Elphinstone, L.
Foley, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Monson, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Romilly, L.
Seaton, L.
Somerhill L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Truro, L.

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Monday* next, and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 269.)

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 208.)

(*The Lord Cranworth.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for the House to be again in Committee on the said Bill, read.

Lord CHELMSFORD said, there was an impression abroad that he was opposed to the Bill, and that he had the other evening endeavoured to obstruct the progress of the Bill by moving that the House should resume; whereas, as their Lordships were quite aware, his reason for moving that the House resume was that, though the understanding had been that only unopposed Amendments should be then agreed to, one was proposed to which opposition was raised. The fact, however, was that a great many Amendments had been given Notice of which he, in common with many of their Lordships, had not seen, and which, therefore, the House was unprepared to discuss. So far from being actuated by hostility to the Bill, he was quite in favour of it; for, though its introduction would have been undesirable had there been any immediate prospect of more comprehensive legislation on the subject, the passing of a general bankruptcy measure appeared more and more distant.

Lord ROMILLY entirely agreed with the noble and learned Lord; for, not having on Tuesday night seen the Amendments of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, he was unable to consider what their effect would be. He now found that many of them were identical with those which he had himself drawn up. He understood that his noble and learned Friend who had charge of the Bill (Lord Cranworth) was prepared to re-print the Bill with the Amendments of the Lord Chancellor, and allow the additional Amendments to be inserted on the Report or third reading. He thought it was much to be regretted that Bills making important changes in the law should be introduced at a period of the Session when it was impossible to avoid blunders which, when exposed in Courts of Law, brought the Legislature into discredit.

House again in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Lord CRANWORTH stated that he proposed to accept all the Amendments of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, leaving it open to any of their Lordships on the Report or third reading to bring forward any further Amendments which might appear desirable.

Amendments made: The Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 270.)

LARCENY AND EMBEZZLEMENT BILL—(No. 245.)

(*The Lord Chelmsford.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord CHELMSFORD, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that its object was to remove an inconsistency in the present law under which embezzlement by a partner was not in general punishable except by the tedious process of filing a bill in Equity. It would be necessary, however, to substitute a new clause instead of the first, and that he proposed to do either in Committee or on the Report. A groundless distinction was made by the present law between the penal character of larceny and of embezzlement by clerks and servants, and that distinction also he proposed to do away with.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chelmsford.*)

The LORD CHANCELLOR approved the general objects of the Bill, and expressed his satisfaction that his noble and learned Friend was prepared to lay on the table a modification of the first clause. The Bill was not carefully worded. It spoke of "wrongfully defrauding." He did not know what kind of defrauding there could be if it was not wrongful.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

MARRIAGES VALIDITY (BLAKEDOWN) BILL. [H.L.]

A Bill to render valid Marriages heretofore solemnized in the Chapel-of-Ease called Saint James-the-Greater Chapel, Blakedown, in the Parish of Hagley, in the County of Worcester—Was *presented* by The Lord LYTTELTON; read 1ª. (No. 271.)

House adjourned at Eight o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 17, 1868.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —*Resolutions* [July 16] *reported*.

WAYS AND MEANS — *Resolutions* [July 16] *reported*.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation).

First Reading — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*.

Second Reading — Expiring Laws Continuance* [241].

Special Report of Select Committee — Married Women's Property [No. 441.]

Committee—Danube Works Loan [227]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4)* [235]; Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-comm.*) [63]—R.P.; Poor Relief [186]—R.P.; Colonial Shipping* [236]; Admiralty Suits* [234]; Railway Companies* [237].

Report—Danube Works Loan* [227]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4)* [235]; Married Women's Property* [36]; Colonial Shipping* [236]; Admiralty Suits* [234]; Railway Companies* [237].

Considered as amended — Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment* [181].

The House met at Two of the clock.

QUEENSLAND — POLYNESIAN ISLANDERS.—QUESTION.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Government is prepared to suggest any measure by which the Act for regulating the Emigration of South Sea Islanders may be supplemented by a safeguard against illicit practices in entrapping those Natives from their homes?

MR. ADDERLEY said, in reply, that the rumours as to abuses existing were very much without foundation, and satisfactory regulations had been passed by the Queensland Legislature as to the emigration, which were much in accordance with the recommendation which had crossed them on the road from the Colonial Office. No Native could be taken on board ship unless he had a certificate from a Consul or Missionary, or some other person of known position, to the effect that he had ascertained, and could vouch for the fact, that the Native was going to emigrate voluntarily; and he thought, therefore, that the regulations as to this matter were complete. Whether it was possible to have any further guarantee against kidnapping Natives was under consideration. The ship, in the next place, must be licensed, and there was an officer on board each ship who must be satisfied before receiving them that the Natives had been properly engaged, and when the ship arrived at Queensland she was overhauled, and if any of these regulations had not been observed the shipowner was liable to a penalty of £20 for each non-observance of the prescribed conditions. His noble Friend (the Duke of Buckingham) was considering whether these provisions might not be made more stringent than they were, and also whether the security for the condition of the Natives on board might not be improved. No doubt there would be further provisions gradually indicated by further experience to guard against abuse.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he wished to know, Whether the officer on board ship who superintended the shipping of the Natives was an officer of the Government?

MR. ADDERLEY said, that he was an officer appointed by the Colonial Government.

SCHOOL INQUIRY COMMITTEE.

QUESTION.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Her Majesty's Government have under consideration the Report and Recommendations of the School Inquiry Committee; and, if so, whether he is prepared to inform the House what steps they intend to take thereupon?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that the Committee had collected a vast deal of information; but it was so voluminous, and some of it had come so recently into the hands of the Government, that he should not be correct in saying that the question was under the consideration of the Government. At the same time, the question was one of so great importance that any Government must deal with it at the earliest opportunity.

COLLECTION OF ASSESSED TAXES IN THE SOUTH OF LONDON.

QUESTION.

Mr. THOMAS HUGHES said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is with the sanction of the Government that the Tax Collectors of the South of London are issuing Notices that unless Assessed Taxes due on the 20th of March last are paid on or before the 20th of July, the person neglecting to pay will be disqualified from voting at the coming Election?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, in reply, that the Government had given no sanction to the proceeding referred to by the hon. Member. His attention being called to the Question on the previous evening by the hon. Member for Greenwich, he caused inquiry to be set on foot, and if the hon. Member would repeat his Question on a subsequent evening, such information as he possessed would be afforded.

Mr. THOMAS HUGHES asked that the answer might be given to him privately, for the date mentioned in the Question was the 20th instant, and the House would not sit again until that day.

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolution [July 16] *reported.*

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, in consequence of a promise which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury on Wednesday that if hon. Members having Notices to move in Supply would allow Supply to be then taken they would be afforded an opportunity of moving their Notices on the Report, he rose to call attention to a Return relative to Staff appointments ordered last year and presented in June, from which it appeared that the Royal Warrant (No. 106) restricting the holding a Staff appointment to five years had been frequently violated. He regretted the absence of the Secretary of State for War; but as the present was his last opportunity, and as his Motion created much interest in military circles, he would, without mentioning names or entering into detail, very shortly occupy the attention of the House on the subject. It was an old saying—"Once on the Staff always on the Staff;" but it had appeared right to Her Majesty that this system should cease, and hence the Warrant to which he called attention. Staff appointments in the army were always regarded as the rewards of the military profession in the same sense that judicial appointments were recognized as the rewards of the Bar. But the Return which had been made to the House, and which no doubt all interested in that subject had read, showed that a very different course had been adopted, and that those appointments had gone in a "vicious circle" among a few favoured officers. A quartermaster general, or a deputy assistant adjutant general, as the case might be, when his five years had expired, was, in distinct violation of the Warrant, shifted to a corresponding position in some other department. This naturally excited great discontent among military men—discontent which he (Sir Patrick O'Brien) had frequently heard expressed—as many officers had been continuously on the Staff for periods varying from ten to fifteen years. Now, it might be said that Staff training was essential, and that those who had served upon it were best fitted for new appointments. If so, let the Warrant be abolished; but he held that as long as Her Majesty's Warrant existed it was the duty of the military authorities to respect it. His observations had reference to what would be done in the future, and it was in that view he had made his statement.

Mr. DISRAELI said, that the hon. Baronet had very courteously, the other evening, not pressed his Notice, in consequence of which the Public Business had been very much convenienced and advanced. He was therefore sorry that his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War was not present to give him the explanation he desired. But his disappointment had arisen from some little inadvertence of his own, not having put a Notice on the Paper that he intended to ask the Question on the Report of Supply. After the short and clear statement now made the hon. Baronet would have no difficulty in eliciting at an early opportunity from his right hon. Friend the information he desired.

Resolution *agreed to.*

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 63.]

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress, 14th July.*]

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 46 (Penalty for employing corrupt Agent.)

MR. LOWE proposed to insert the words "by the Report of an Election Committee or by the report of a judge."

MR. AYRTON said, he objected to the clause altogether, on the ground that it proposed to impose a penalty upon persons who had been indemnified under a former Act.

MR. CARDWELL said, that all they had in view was to prevent the employment by candidates of agents who were notorious bribers. He should therefore cordially support the clause and the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Page 15, line 3, Amendment proposed, after the word "tribunal," to insert the words "or has been reported guilty of any corrupt practice by a Committee of the House of Commons."—(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 74; Noes 63: Majority 11.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he would beg to move the insertion of words making it a misdemeanour for any agent who had been adjudged guilty of bribery to hire himself as an agent or canvasser.

Amendment proposed, in line 6, after the word "fifty-seven," to insert the words "any such canvasser or agent shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and."—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL objected to the Amendment, on the ground that it would lead to the punishment of a man twice for a single offence. He would be imprisoned in the first instance, and then because he accepted a second office he would be imprisoned again, though he had committed no new offence.

MR. GORST said, he must contend that the man would have committed a second offence; he would have engaged himself under false pretences, because no candidate would willingly engage an agent who had been proved guilty of bribery.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 62; Noes 84: Majority 22.

VISCOUNT AMBERLEY said, that in his opinion the man who employed a corrupt agent stood in about the same relation to that corrupt agent as the receiver did to the thief. He thought, therefore, that the penalty of making such a man's election void was not commensurate with the offence. He therefore proposed to move to add the words at the end of the clause—"And he shall be incapable of being elected to and of sitting in the House of Commons during the three years next after such trial."

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Clause, to add the words "and he shall be incapable of being elected to and of sitting in the House of Commons during the three years next after such trial."—(*Viscount Amberley.*)

SIR LAWRENCE PALK said, that it was quite possible a candidate might get into the hands of a corrupt agent without knowing it. In the case of a young man coming into Parliament for the first time this might easily occur. Would it not be too hard to brand such a man with the disgrace which the noble Lord's Amendment would inflict upon him?

MR. J. STUART MILL said, the Amendment would only apply to a candidate who knowingly employed a corrupt agent.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he must, with great respect to the noble Viscount, say that the Amendment appeared to him to be nonsense. The word "trial" referred to the trial in the case of the corrupt agent who had been convicted of corruption within seven years previously to the Election which under the clause would be void. If the words proposed by the noble Viscount were added to the clause, the punishment of the candidate might commence long before he had committed the offence.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he thought the noble Lord had mistaken the object of the clause.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he did not think the Amendment applicable to the clause. In his opinion, making the

Election void would a sufficient punishment.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, that if at this period of the Session hon. Members persevered in moving Amendments the result would be that the Bill would be amended off the face of creation.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, he felt that a person who knowingly employed an agent who had been convicted of corrupt practices ought to be subjected to this penalty at least.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR said, he did not think it would be too great a punishment to inflict upon a man who prostituted the political rights of the country by bribery to disqualify him from sitting in the House of Commons for ever.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 48; Noes 115: Majority 67.

Mr. FAWCETT said, that he wished to ask the hon. Member for York (Mr. Lowther) whether he would bring up a clause on the Report embodying the views which he sought to carry into effect in the Amendment which had shortly before been negatived?

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he intended to do so. Some hon. Members had, he believed, voted against his Amendment in ignorance of the real question at issue.

Mr. WHITBREAD said, that the real question for the Committee to decide was whether they meant to pass the Bill before them this year or not. The Bill was one of great importance, and the Government, he thought, had very fairly done their duty in pushing it forward.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government would postpone the prorogation, if necessary, in order to carry the Bill. The feeling of the House was evidently strongly in its favour.

Mr. DISRAELI said, that the fact that the feeling of the House was in favour was no argument against hon. Members exercising a discretion in dealing with it.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 47 (Disqualification of Persons found guilty of Bribery).

Mr. AYRTON asked for some explanation of the clause. He did not object to all the penalties being placed upon those who had been found guilty; but he should object to penalties being placed upon persons who had not been tried, but had only been incidentally mentioned in a Report of a Commission; and who might have had no opportunity of being heard. He proposed to leave out the words "other than a candidate," in order to raise the question.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the clause was intended to include persons other than the Petitioner and respondent, but no doubt there was difficulty in what was pointed out, and to meet it he should propose to amend the clause so that the penalties should only be inflicted upon persons, other than candidates, who should have been found guilty of bribery in any proceeding at law.

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he thought that what was intended was that the penalty of disqualification should follow a report of the Judge, and should not apply only to those who had been convicted upon a trial. When the inquiry had been conducted by a Judge, who would, of course, be aware of the penalty imposed by the clause, might it not be presumed that he had taken all the necessary steps for arriving at a knowledge of a man's guilt?

Mr. NEATE said, he hoped that the original words would be adhered to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the difficulty was inflicting a penalty upon a person who might possibly not be present; but he thought that there would be no hardship in placing a penalty upon a person who had been reported guilty after he had had an opportunity of being heard. He would, therefore, propose that the clause should be amended by inserting the words, "in any proceeding in which, after notice of the charge, he has had an opportunity of being heard."

Mr. HENLEY said, he wished to know what would be the position of an unfortunate candidate with regard to expenses, if the inquiry before the Judge was to be hung up while notice was being given to all the persons implicated, as well as during the trial of all these collateral issues. Such a delay would cause a very ugly addition to the candidate's expenditure.

Mr. POWELL said, he hoped that words would be introduced to ensure parties accused a fair hearing.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, that the worst delinquents could run away, and no notice could be given to them. They would thus escape the penalty.

Mr. AYRTON'S Amendment *withdrawn*, and that of the SOLICITOR GENERAL *agreed to*.

MR. J. STUART MILL moved, in page 15, line 16, after "voting at any," insert "Parliamentary and municipal," the object being to extend penalties to bribery at municipal Elections.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he thought they had better in this Bill, and at this period of the Session, confine themselves to Parliamentary Elections. No doubt at some future period there must be an inquiry in reference to municipal Elections.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, that his proposition was simply that a person convicted of bribery at a Parliamentary Election should be disqualified from voting at future municipal as well as Parliamentary Elections.

MR. DISRAELI said, he feared that if they accepted the Amendment they would not be allowed to stop there, they would have to go further, and that would only be entering upon a sea of troubles, and they would run great risk of foundering in their legislation. He believed, however, that they would soon have to enter upon the question of bribery at municipal Elections.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Clause *agreed to*.

Clause 48 (Returning Officer may be sued for neglecting to return any Person duly elected).

MR. J. GOLDSMID said, that the clause proposed that in a certain event the returning officer should pay to the Member double the damages which he had sustained. This seemed to be placing a money value upon the position of a Member of Parliament, and he should move that instead of these words there should be others enacting that the returning officer should be liable to a penalty not exceeding £500.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that the clause as proposed was an exact copy of the 123rd clause of the 11th and 12th Vic., c. 98, which had been found inapplicable.

Clause *agreed to*.

Clauses 49 to 53, inclusive, *agreed to*.

Clause 54 (Repeal of Acts).

MR. AYRTON said, the clause would make the punishment for offences under the Bill different in Ireland and Scotland from that in England. It appeared to him that it was now time to consider whether they should extend this Bill to Ireland and Scotland.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he concurred in thinking that the clause required consideration.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that the clauses of the Acts proposed to be repealed were not penal clauses, but merely those which regulated the mode of trial of the Petitions. If he were mistaken on the point he would bring up a clause upon the Report which would settle the question.

MR. DISRAELI said, the Bill would be valuable as an experiment, even if its provisions were not extended to Ireland and Scotland, although he did not mean to say that he had given up the idea of introducing a clause to extend, if possible, the provisions of the Bill to Ireland and Scotland.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he was one of those who had originally contended that they would be placed in a position of great difficulty with regard to this Bill if its provisions were not extended to Ireland and Scotland, but he thought that the question had assumed a new light in consequence of the announcement of Her Majesty's Government that the operation of the Bill was only to endure for a limited period; although he did not mean to say that if Her Majesty's Government could see their way to effect such an extension without loss of time it would not be desirable that the experiment might be equally and simultaneously tried in Ireland and Scotland, as well as in this country, or that it would be well to preserve the jurisdiction of this House in the case of Election Petitions from Ireland and Scotland, and to extinguish it as regarded this country. Under these circumstances he should not press the Government upon the point.

MR. MONSELL said, he must press upon the Government the importance of making the law upon the point apply to the three countries alike.

MR. DISRAELI said, if he did not bring up a satisfactory clause upon the Report the right hon. Gentleman would have the opportunity of doing so himself.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL proposed to amend the clause by inserting the words "as far as regards Elections and Petitions in respect of constituencies in England and Wales."

Amendment *agreed to*; Clause, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Postponed Clause 2 *agreed to.*

Mr. DISRAELI said, he wished to propose a new clause providing for the payment of additional Judges and remuneration of Judges appointed under this Act.

Clause (Provision as to payment of additional judges and remuneration of judges for duties to be performed under this Act,)—(*Mr. Disraeli,*)—*brought up,* and read the first and second time.

Mr. BOUVERIE said, he would remind the House that a Commission had been appointed to inquire into the constitution of our Courts of Judicature. That Commission had been sitting for about a twelvemonth, and would shortly, it was believed, propose some very great changes. He trusted, therefore, that these new appointments would be made subject to any decision at which the House might arrive after seeing the Report. If the right hon. Gentleman would deal with that question, he would leave it in his hands; if not, he should propose a clause himself on bringing up the Report.

Mr. AYRTON said, he trusted that the Government would assent to the following Amendment to the new clause:—Line 1, before "The," insert—

> "No additional Judge shall be appointed under this Act until fourteen days after all the Elections Petitions presented to the Court of Common Pleas respecting the first Elections to the Parliament convened on the dissolution of the present Parliament shall be at issue."

His object was to prevent the public being put to a great expense, unless it had been satisfactorily proved that the assistance of new Judges was absolutely called for.

Mr. DISRAELI said, that the matter referred to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock had been under the consideration of the Government, and there was at present a clear understanding with the Lord Chancellor that the services of the new Judges should be at the disposal of the country. If the right hon. Gentleman brought forward a clause, it should of course receive attentive consideration. As regarded the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) he could only say that he should give it the strongest opposition in his power, because it was in reality an attempt to upset the whole of what they had already done. It was, in fact, an announcement of the hon. and learned Member's opinion that no new Judges were wanted, although Her Majesty's Government had reason to believe, from the representations made to them, that the Judges had more to do than they could satisfactorily perform, and that it was only by the appointment of new Judges that the Bill could be carried into effect.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. MONK said, he would propose to strike out the words in Mr. Disraeli's clause providing that the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions should receive £500 a year in addition to their ordinary salary. He should be sorry if the Judges were not adequately remunerated for the services which they rendered to the country, but he could see no reason why this additional sum should be paid, more especially as the work of the existing Judges would be lightened by the assistance which the new Judges would render them when not engaged on the trial of Election Petitions.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the words "Admiralty Court" to the end of the Clause.—(*Mr. Monk.*)

Mr. GOLDSMID said, he apprehended a good deal of canvassing among the Judges for this £500 a year.

Mr. DISRAELI said, it was desirable to induce the old Judges, if he might use that epithet, to give up their time to the performance of these duties, duties which, it must be remembered, they never expected at the time of their appointments to be called on to perform. The performance of those duties involved considerable inconvenience. The Judges employed in them would, for instance, be separated for some time from their families, and have to reside occasionally in small inns, which, to say the least of it, were not replete with the comforts and advantages to which they were accustomed. It was desirable, if it could be managed, that the new Judges should be engaged at first on the ordinary judicial duties, and that the trial of these Petitions should be carried on by those who had been for some time on the Bench. It was necessary to make the proposal as agreeable as possible, and as the clause had been carefully considered he trusted that it would be adopted in its entirety.

Mr. LOCKE said, that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was extremely kind towards the Judges. It was, of course, a good thing to make matters comfortable; but still, as a Judge once said to a friend who was condoling with him on his having been unexpectedly detained in a small country town from Saturday to Monday, "A man must be somewhere." He remembered that on one occasion Chief Justice Tindal, after having been received in an assize town by the sheriff with a coach and four horses and javelin men in plenty, was taken to the most miserable lodgings he had ever seen; his Lordship, however, simply said, "This is Cinderella, indeed!" Respecting the simple proposition, he did not think it was necessary to bribe the Judges to do the work, especially as they were going to inquire into charges of bribery. His own idea was that if any addition were made to the salaries of the Judges it should be general. The expense of going circuit would be more than those incurred by the Judges under this Act. This seems merely to be a payment to induce the Judges to adopt a new line of business.

MR. M. CHAMBERS said, he was of opinion that if they were to assent to the increase of pay to the Judges in question, they ought to extend that increase to all the Judges of the Superior Courts.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he must ask the Committee to bear in mind the difficulties under which the Bill had been brought in and pressed to its present position. The original objections of the Judges themselves, and the fact that those objections had never been in express terms withdrawn, should not be forgotten. These objections were those of gentlemen who had been appointed to do a certain work, and who had not accepted office on the understanding that this new work should be thrust upon them. Considering, then, that this work would be by far the most unpleasant the Judges, future as well as present, would have to do, he recommended the Committee to consider the question as men of the world, and make the Bill as little unpalatable as possible. Although the Judges themselves had been no parties to any such arrangement as that proposed, he was bound to remind the Committee that the Bill had hitherto been considered on the understanding that it should not be in the nature of an imposition on the Judges. And it would be admitted on all hands that the Judges would have a most onerous duty to discharge in laying down the course of procedure under the Act. All would remember how greatly the general admiration of Sir Cresswell Cresswell's conduct had been increased when it was remembered what immense trouble he had taken to regulate the procedure in the Divorce Court. There was no doubt that immense labour would be imposed on the Judges by the Bill; he therefore hoped the proposal of the Government would be acceded to.

MR. CARDWELL said, he had heard with the greatest pleasure that the proposal under consideration had been made on the sole authority of the Government; it would have been extremely painful to him to think the Judges had been consulted on the subject and had entered into a compromise. He could not agree that the new duties imposed by the Bill would be the most disagreeable the Judge could undertake; it would be infinitely more disagreeable to him to try a man for his life. The question, however, was whether the passing of this provision would tend to elevate or derogate from the position of the Judges. It was true additional duties had been imposed on the Bench, but additional Judges would be appointed to share their work. He had never before heard the principle advocated that Judges should be offered additional payment to induce them to undertake work Parliament thought it right the Bench should discharge. If, then, it were resolved that the Judges should have this additional payment, he feared the result would be greatly to disparage the high estimation in which the Judges were held by the country. The Committee should be slow to create a precedent of this nature; for his part he would prefer voting £500 a year to each of the Judges unconditionally rather than accept the proposition made.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he thought the offer of £500 would make it impossible for the Judges to accept these new duties. The Judges' objection was not on account of the work, but for fear the new duty would destroy the dignity and authority of the Courts in other cases. As the objection of the Judges as stated in the letter of the Lord Chief Justice had not been withdrawn, this proposal of the additional £500 a year would seem like saying, "We will bribe you with £500 a year to withdraw your objection."

MR. WHITBREAD said, the House had taken the matter out of the hands of the Judges by deciding, notwithstanding the objections urged by the Lord Chief

Justice, that the Judges were to do the duty. When additional duty was thrown on public servants, who were already fully occupied, it was customary to give them an addition to their salaries. To do that in this instance, could not be taken as a proposal, the acceptance of which would be derogatory to the dignity of the Judges.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, his hon. Friend who had just sat down had founded his allegiance to the proposal before the House upon the doctrine that when additional duties were imposed on servants of the Crown additional remuneration should be given, and very generally was given. He was sorry to be obliged to differ entirely from his hon. Friend, both as to principle and as to fact. In the first place, he thought that if public servants were already fully occupied, additional duties ought not to be imposed upon them. That was the principle upon which the House had proceeded in appointing additional Judges. It would be very bad policy to accept the principle contended for, because you could not have more than an average amount of service; and if you said, "We will give them more work and a higher salary," the result would generally be that the higher salary would be received, but the additional work would not be done. The homely rule of "a fair day's pay for a fair day's work" was the sound one. He was bound to say likewise that, as far as his experience went, it was not the rule of the public service, when new duties were imposed, to cap those new duties by new salaries. He did not hesitate to say that this was a principle you could apply; and in this case it would be irrelevant, because the difficulty had been met by an increase in the number of Judges. He must say that, whatever might happen with respect to this clause, no suspicion would be entertained within the walls of Parliament that the granting or the withholding of the proposed £500 a year would in any way influence the conduct of the Judges. But outside it might be supposed that the House of Commons had endeavoured to meet the objections of those learned personages by voting an addition of £500 to the salaries of the Judges who had to perform the duties prescribed by this Bill. He concurred with his right hon. Friend the Member for Oxford (Mr. Cardwell) that if the salaries of the Judges were thought to be insufficient, they ought to be considered generally, and a uniform increase ought to be made.

Mr. GORST said, he would beg to remind the Committee that not only new duties but more arduous were to be imposed. As in this country position was in some degree estimated by amount of salary, this addition of £500 to the salaries of the Judges would, to some extent, elevate them in dignity.

Mr. HENLEY said, he could not concur with the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken—that the position of Judges was to be elevated by £500 a year. If the Judges would not be fit to try those cases unless they got another £500 a year, he doubted very much that they would be fit to do so at all. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford that if the Judges were underpaid, there ought to be an increase in their salaries for the discharge of their duties generally; but he considered that, as three new Judges were to be appointed, the work of the Judicial Bench would not be increased by this new jurisdiction.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 96; Noes 123: Majority 27.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

The SOLICITOR GENERAL proposed the following new clause:—

(Commissions of Inquiry into Corrupt Practices.)

"If upon a Petition to the House of Commons, presented within twenty-one days after the return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of a Member to serve in Parliament for any Borough or County, or within fourteen days after the meeting of Parliament, and signed by any two or more electors of such Borough or County, and alleging that Corrupt Practices have extensively prevailed at the then last Election for such Borough or County, or that there is reason to believe that Corrupt Practices have there so prevailed, an Address be presented by both Houses of Parliament, praying that such Allegation may be inquired into, the Crown may appoint Commissioners to inquire into the same, and if such Commissioners in such case be appointed, they shall inquire in the same manner and with the same powers and subject to all the provisions of the Statute of the fifteenth and sixteenth of Victoria, chapter fifty-seven."

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he wished to know who was to present these petitions. Was it to be the Government Whip?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the hon. Gentleman might undertake the duty himself.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he wished to express his acknowledgments to the Government for the great improvement which had been effected in the Bill.

Clause *added.*

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL proposed a new clause—

(Rules as to agents practising in cases of Election Petitions.)

"Any person who at the time of the passing of this Act was entitled to practice as agent according to the principles, practice, and rules of the House of Commons, in cases of Election Petitions and matters relating to Election of Members of the House of Commons, shall be entitled to practice as an attorney or agent in cases of Election Petitions, and all matters relating to Elections before the court and judges prescribed by this Act: Provided, That every such person so practising as aforesaid shall in respect of such practice, and everything relating thereto be subject to the jurisdiction and orders of the court as if he were an attorney of the said court: And further, Provided, That no such person shall practice as aforesaid until his name shall have been entered on a roll to be made and kept, and which is hereby authorized to be made and kept, by the prescribed officer in the prescribed manner."

MR. M. CHAMBERS proposed, as an Amendment, an addition to prevent persons, Members of this House from practising.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the object of the clause was to preserve the status of the class known as Parliamentary agents, who may be neither barristers nor attorneys.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, he had no great admiration for the Bill; but if it was to be tried, the experiment should be fairly made. It would be a singular example of mongrel legislation if they were to give this jurisdiction to the ordinary tribunals, and to allow audience to persons who were not now at liberty to practise there.

Amendment *negatived..*

MR. MAGUIRE proposed to insert after the words "agents" the words "or counsel," in order to do an act of justice to the bar of Ireland.

SIR JOHN GRAY said, the Irish bar were entitled either to some compensation —[*Laughter*]—he wished the House would hear the sentence out—for the loss of the business that would be taken away, or to be allowed to practise in the Court to which the jurisdiction was to be transferred.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

MR. DISRAELI moved a new clause—

(Duration of Act.)

"This Act shall be in force until the dissolution of the next Parliament, or until the expiration of three years from the passing of such Act, whichever event first happens."

MR. LOWE said he thought it might tend to prevent inconvenience to omit the words "until the dissolution of next Parliament," and so fix the definite period of three years for the duration of the Bill. He moved an Amendment to that effect.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. BOUVERIE proposed to omit "three years" and insert "two years."

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. GATHORNE HARDY moved the addition of the words "and to the end of the then next Session of Parliament."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *added* to the Bill.

SIR WILLIAM HUTT proposed, after Clause 53, to insert the following clause—

(Lords Spiritual or Temporal not to interfere in Parliamentary Elections.)

"Any Lord of Parliament, Spiritual or Temporal, who after the passing of this Act shall in any way interfere or concern himself in the Election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanour, and may be prosecuted accordingly: Provided always, That no prosecution for such offence be tried or had before any Court of General or Quarter Sessions of the Peace."

This was a Resolution which the House was accustomed to pass every Session of Parliament, and he could not see any possible objection to it. In fact, the late Lord Campbell used to say that it was a mere declaration of the Common Law of England. He thought they should not only insist on the Resolution, but take care that those who were the objects of it should not treat it with derision and contempt. It was known that Peers did interfere, and that one of them acted as chairman of a Registration Society.

MR. DISRAELI said, the Resolution to which the right hon. Baronet referred was passed in the 17th century; and at that time there was very good reason for passing such a Resolution, because the House of Lords had then the power and privilege of taxing themselves. Their interference with the rights of the House of Commons could not then be justified. But time which brought so many changes had brought a considerable change in the position of the House of Peers in regard to the great subject of taxation. The Members of that House were now taxed by the Votes of the House of Commons, and therefore he could not understand why a Peer of the Realm should not have a right of voting for Members of Parliament and taking part just as another individual in the general business of a free country like this, with the view of protecting his property and guarding his own interests. As to the doctrine laid down by the right hon. Baronet, it might be a version of the British Constitution to be found in De Lolme, or some other author ; but in his (Mr. Disraeli's) judgment it was not a fair reading of the British Constitution. When the House of Commons, at the period of the Long Parliament, came to this Resolution the possession of power as regarded the respective branches of the Legislature was very different to what it was at that moment. It appeared that Peers of the Realm did now take an interest in elections of Members of that House. For example, at the commencement of the Session his attention had been called to the fact that a noble Friend of his—a Peer much respected on both sides of the House—had taken the chair at a registration meeting in his own county ; he was asked a Question on the subject, and he made some constitutional observations upon it. If it was a misdemeanour on the part of a Peer of the Realm to connect himself with the registration of his county, why was it not mentioned in this clause ? This clause would not touch him as it only applied to interference in elections. The omission rather invalidated the position of the right hon. Gentleman. At the last Election for the University of Oxford, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) was a candidate, more than one Peer of the Realm not only took a lively interest in those proceedings, but actually registered a vote. The distinguished Bishop of his (Mr. Disraeli's) diocese was a supporter then of the right hon. Gentleman, and, in the spirit of his constitutional rights and privileges, registered his vote for him. Another Spiritual Peer, the Bishop of Durham, had also the satisfaction to register his vote for the right hon. Gentleman on the same occasion, and a noble Earl, bearing an illustrious name — the descendant and representative of Lord Chancellor Cowper — also supported the right hon. Gentleman. Practically, Peers of the Realms did interfere in Elections and could register their votes. Within the last few days, he might say hours, he had read the advertisement of an election committee to support a candidate for the new constituency of the University of Edinburgh, and the chairman of that committee was the Duke of Argyll, who, he had no doubt, would make a most admirable chairman, and would direct and guide the operations of that committee with the utmost zeal tempered with discretion. He thought that all this showed that the Resolution which was first passed two centuries ago, and which was adapted to circumstances which had now changed, ought rather to be omitted from the Resolutions of the House than set up in a statutory form. Taking a great interest in the success of the Bill, he did not at that moment see that the adoption of this clause would be one of the most conciliatory courses they could take towards securing the concurrence of the Upper House. It would certainly not promote the passing of this Bill to inform the House of Lords that they had sent them up a clause which would inform the Lords Spiritual as well as Temporal, that their interference in the Elections of Members of that House should be considered as misdemeanour, and that they should be prosecuted accordingly. One would almost be led to suppose that the right hon. Baronet was animated by some vindictive feeling were it not that he had taken care to insert a proviso that the Bishops were not to be prosecuted at the Quarter Sessions. Whatever might be the view of the House of Commons as to the conduct of noble Lords interfering in the Elections for Members of that House, he would remind them that they had a right to be tried by their Peers, and that right still existed, independently of the House of Commons. If such a question had been brought forward at a younger period of the Session he thought it would probably have occupied three nights' debate. The practical point before the House was, were they interested in the success of this Bill, and if so, were they to send it up to the House of Peers with this clause ? He thought the subject might reasonably be reserved for the consideration of the New Parliament.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he thought the pith of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (the First Minister of the Crown) was contained in the last sentence. He should be very glad to persuade his right hon. Friend that there was no advantage in proposing a clause of this kind to give a rigid form to that which had not been hitherto the statute law of the country. But if it were deemed right to raise the question, it could not well be raised upon this Bill. He entirely concurred in the conclusion at which the right hon. Gentleman opposite had arrived, but he must make a protest on behalf of the Resolution of this House. The right hon. Gentleman did not give sufficient weight to the fact that they were responsible for it. It had been remarked by Earl Russell—when Leader of that House—that although the Resolution of the House was not law, and was not susceptible of a rigid and uniform application, yet, on the whole, it operated to check and restrain within narrow bounds the interference of Peers in elections, which, if not so restrained, might grow to a great inconvenience. That was sufficient to justify as a practical measure the Resolution of the House of Commons, but he hoped his right hon. Friend would not press his proposal. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the Peers of the Realm in this country, at the time when this Resolution was first passed, possessed a power of separately taxing themselves, but it required the whole weight of the right hon. Gentleman's authority for him to believe such a statement.

MR. BOUVERIE said, that the Resolution had hitherto been enforced by Election Committees, as the law of the House, though not the law of the land. By the law of the land Peers could interfere as well as any other individuals. The practice of that House had always been to vindicate their privileges by striking out the votes of Peers at an election, but that power they had parted with by placing their jurisdiction in the hands of an independent tribunal, which would have no power to strike out such votes. He might observe with reference to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (the First Lord of the Treasury) that Peers had always exercised the right of voting at and taking part in the elections for the Universities. Had the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Gateshead (Sir William Hutt) proposed a clause forbidding Peers taking part in elections—without subjecting them to punishment as being guilty of a misdemeanour—it would have been carried.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, if it should be the wish of the House to pass a Resolution of this kind in a future Parliament they would have the same power to enforce it which they had always had. The privileges of the House were part of the law of the land, and had been always recognised as such; and if it were part of that law that Peers should not vote at elections, it would be the duty of the Judges to disallow such votes. But the real object and purpose of the Resolution was not to strike off this or that vote, but to prevent unconstitutional interference on the part of Members of one House with the independence of the other House. Should the clause be omitted, however, there was nothing in the Bill which would prevent that House from vindicating its privileges in such a case. If they attempted to turn this interference into a crime, they would be doing a different thing from what had ever been done by a Resolution of the House, or intended to be done. He thought, therefore, that the Committee would do well to adhere to the existing state of things, and not to assent to the clause now under consideration.

MR. EYKYN said, that these votes had invariably been rejected by Revising Barristers.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he believed that the Revising Barristers had always expunged the names of Peers from the lists of voters.

MR. HADFIELD supported the clause.

MR. AYRTON said, he would suggest that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Hutt) should bring up the clause in a different form to meet the objection that had been made. He believed the only way to prevent the interference of Peers in elections was to enact that all elections compassed by the unconstitutional interference of Peers should be declared void. If the right hon. Gentleman would bring up a clause to that effect it would find a good deal of support in the Committee. He was rather surprised to hear it asserted that Peers might interfere in elections, and propose and vote for candidates, for if that were so it would go far to demonstrate that there was no necessity for the House of Lords.

SIR ROBERT COLLIER said, he apprehended that Peers had not a right to vote for Members of Parliament. It was so stated by Lord Camden, and it was not a subject on which doubt should be entertained.

Clause *withdrawn*.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH moved the following clause:—

(Payments defined by former Acts to be illegal to be bribery.)

"Any payment of money or any valuable consideration by any candidate, or by any person on his behalf, for or under the head of travelling expenses or conveyance, which has been defined by any former Act to be an illegal payment, shall be deemed to be bribery within the meaning of the second Clause of the 'Corrupt Practices Prevention Act, 1854,' and the receipt by any voter of any such payment for travelling expenses or conveyance shall be deemed to be bribery within the meaning of the third Clause of the same Act, and the vote of any voter who shall pay or receive any money or any valuable consideration for or under the head of travelling expenses or conveyance shall be deemed null and void."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he thought that the punishment attached by this measure to acts of bribery would be far too heavy for the offence to which the hon. Gentleman's clause referred.

Mr. KARSLAKE opposed the clause.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, that though not going to the full extent of the clause, he thought that something clear and definite should be laid down with reference to such expenses.

Clause *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

Mr. MONK asked when the Bill would be again proceeded with?

Mr. DISRAELI said, he proposed to place it on the Paper for To-morrow, but would be able more definitely to inform hon. Members on the subject later in the evening.

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

NAVY—GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, that in rising to move that the House should adjourn to Monday, he would take the opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the very able and lucid Report which had been presented to it by the Committee on Greenwich Hospital, though it was certainly not his intention to criticize one of the cleverest and most interesting documents which had ever been laid before Parliament. The fact of such a Report having appeared was a justification for inquiring fully into the origin of Greenwich Hospital, and how the intentions of the founders had been carried out. What was the state of things prior to 1865, when the Greenwich Hospital Act was passed, and what was the state of things at the present moment? In passing he might remark that the very fact of a Committee having recently reported on the Act was a sufficient proof that that Act had not worked in a beneficial manner. In considering this matter, it was necessary to bear in mind that the word "Hospital" originally meant a shelter and refuge for the destitute, and not merely a receptable for persons suffering from disease. Now, the Act of 1696, under which Greenwich Hospital was founded, said—

"Whereas, the Seamen of this Kingdom have for a long Time distinguished themselves throughout the World by their Industry and Skilfulness in their Employments, and by their Courage and Constancy manifested in Engagements for the Defence and Honour of their Native Country; and for an Encouragement to continue this their ancient Reputation and to invite greater Numbers of His Majesty's Subjects to betake themselves to the Sea, it is fit and reasonable that some competent Provision should be made, that Seamen who by Age, Wounds, or other Accidents shall become disabled for future Service at Sea, and shall not be in a condition to maintain themselves comfortably, may not fall under Hardships and Miseries, may be supported at the public Charge, and that the Children of such disabled Seamen, and also the Widows and Children of such Seamen as shall happen to be slain, killed, or drowned in Sea Service, may in some reasonable Manner be provided for and educated. And also the Widows of such Seamen, Watermen, Fishermen, Lightermen, Bargemen, Keelmen, and Sea-faring Men, who shall be slain, killed, or drowned in the Sea Service, and the Children of such Seamen, Watermen, Fishermen, Lightermen, Bargemen, Keelmen, or Sea-faring Men so slain, killed, or drowned, and not of Ability to maintain or provide comfortably for themselves, shall be received into the said Hospital, and there be provided for."—[7 & 8 *Will* 3, c. 21.]

Such, then, was the spirit of the founders. Not only was the Hospital intended for sailors of the Royal Navy, but the Act distinctly said that it was designed for merchant seamen and for their widows and orphans. The principle on which the institution was founded had, however, been departed from, and great injury had been thereby inflicted upon the seamen of this country. Anyone, indeed, who read the inscriptions on the building would see that it was intended originally to be an asylum, a refuge, and a home for aged and worn-out seamen. Now, what were the regulations affecting the Hospital prior to 1859. It appeared from the very able Report made by the Royal Commissioners in 1859 that—

"In the year 1814 there were 2,710 pensioners in the institution. In 1849 the authorized number of in-pensioners being 2,642, there were but three vacancies in the Hospital. At that time the admissions into Greenwich Hospital were regulated by the following Admiralty Memorandum of the 1st of January, 1852:—'1st. Out-pensioners for life, having served ten years and upwards, and who, on account of age or infirmity, are unable to work. 2d. Out-pensioners for life, with less than ten years' service, who are rendered totally incapable, by reason of wounds, hurts, injuries, or sickness received in and by the service, of assisting in any way to support themselves, reference being had to their age. Men who are not pensioners:—1st. No man shall be considered eligible for admission with less than ten years' service, with a good character. 2d. Unless he has been maimed or disabled by wounds in the service.'"

The Commissioners, in the admission to Greenwich of naval pensioners, recommended—

"That no man be deemed eligible for such admission who does not fall under one of the following descriptions:—Description (A). Seamen and marines, whether in the Royal Navy or the merchant service, who from wounds received in fight, or from bodily injury by accident while engaged in the service of the Crown, or from ill-health contracted in the service of the Crown, and not from want of proper care on their part, are in need of the medical or surgical treatment provided by the Hospital. Description (B). Seamen and marines entitled to an out-pension of not less than £9, who, through age, imbecility, or disease, have become incapable of maintaining themselves, and proper objects for the medical and surgical assistance provided by the Hospital. Description (C). Seamen and marines, of good character, by age unfit for further service at sea, who shall have served in the Royal Navy, at sea or abroad, between the ages of eighteen and forty-eight for twenty-one years; two years in the Naval Reserve to count as one year at sea or abroad, and one year of war service to serve as one and a half years of ordinary service."

Such was the recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1859. It would, no doubt, be hardly believed that at the time that Commission was appointed the members of the Establishment numbered only 452, beginning with the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and ending with the warehouseman. The expense of the establishment was £57,000 a year, and the number of pensioners 1,600. It was proposed by the Commission that there should be 2,300 pensioners, that there should be 173 persons on the establishment, and that the salary and allowances should be only £31,000 per annum. But what was the state of the case now? While there was an establishment of 173 persons the number of pensioners at the present moment was only 410, each of whom cost the country no less than £120 a year. In twenty-eight years the officers' quarters had had £46,000 expended on them. Therefore, instead of an improvement having been effected, things had actually become much worse than they were under the old system. The object of the Bill of 1865 was on a former occasion clearly stated by his hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) who said—

"Greenwich Hospital was intended, so far as the building was concerned, to be for the future an asylum for infirm, helpless, and wounded seamen, and that seamen were not necessarily entitled to be received as inmates merely because they were in receipt of pensions, and because they were unfit for longer service at sea."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxix. 1011.]

But the principle laid down by the founders had been entirely overlooked. It was clear from the Memorandum of the Duke of Somerset that by the Act of 1865 it was proposed to conduct the Hospital on a principle it never had been founded on and never would have been founded on. That Memorandum stated—

"In former years the out-pensions were supplemental to the relief afforded by the Hospital; in later times the out-pensions constituted the chief source of relief, to which the Hospital is a supplement."

In 1865 the men were driven out of the Hospital, each of them getting £36 10*s*. a year. He believed that 900 of them left, and that within fifteen months no fewer than 400 of that number were dead. That was not to be wondered at, because, in point of fact, the men had been driven from their homes. The only object was to get rid of them. One of the regulations then made was this—

"Pensioners can only return with the loss of their pensions, and not in good health; they must be aged or infirm, or under medical treatment. Unless residing at a naval port they must go to Somerset House to be surveyed, married men being only allowed 2*s*. a week for their wives."

Some of the medical evidence as to the difficulty of obtaining admission to the Hospital was very instructive. He should refer to only two or three passages. Sir David Deas, Medical Inspector of Haslar, stated—

"Two or three years ago we were constantly applying to have men admitted into Greenwich Hospital, but we met with so many rebuffs and refusals that we ceased to make them, and the result is that the men themselves have almost forgotten that there is such a place as Greenwich Hospital in existence, and it is only when the medical officers, seeing that a man must be sent to his parish, take action themselves, and make representations to the Admiralty, that they occasionally, but very rarely indeed, succeed in getting them in."

In the evidence of Dr. James Salmon,

Deputy Inspector General of the Infirmary, Woolwich, these passages occurred—

"You are of opinion that it would be of great advantage to the service and to the men if they had the power of coming in here if they chose ?—Yes, I think it would be a very great advantage to the men and also to the service. I think that the service is maligned by these men, and, as I consider, justly, because these men present in their external appearance the marks of disease, and they go about saying, 'I have served my country for so many years ; I have lost my health in the service of my country, and they give me a miserable 6*d.* a day, or they give me a gratuity and have done with me.' I know that they do that.

"Do you think that it would give pleasure to the men throughout the service if it were known, and would it be an inducement to good conduct in some sense if it were known that they had that privilege ; would it render the service, in your opinion, more popular with the men ?—To a certain extent I think it must be so : from what I have observed of the men they look upon this place as their home by right ; that is a sentiment which is very deeply ingrained in the naval mind."

Dr. Armstrong, R.N., was asked—

"What is your opinion as regards increasing the inducement to become out-pensioners as compared with widening the area of admission into the Hospital ?"

His reply was—

"I would prefer to widen the area of admission of men into the Hospital, because I think it would be more beneficial to them and more beneficial to the public service."

In the examination of Dr. Beith there were these passages—

"Would it be of advantage to the service itself (I mean, in the opinion of the men) if they had increased facilities for admission into this place, and if invalids were really attended to here more largely than they are now ?—I think it would be a great advantage to the service, and would give satisfaction to the men in general."

He now came to the recommendations of the Committee, some of which were admirable, though the Committee did not seem to have grappled with the fact that this magnificent institution was founded for the objects to which he had referred. In that summary of recommendations the Committee, referring to the outline of the revision, which they recommended, made this statement—

"In the foregoing outline of the revision we propose in the Hospital establishment we have endeavoured to keep in view the following leading principles :—1. To make Greenwich Hospital that which from its general character we believe it ought to be—a self-contained institution under the Board of Admiralty. 2. To relax as far as may be expedient and practicable the present terms of admission for invalid inmates. 3. To reduce, as far as may be consistent with efficient management, the cost of the Hospital establishment. 4. To secure, while making this reduction, the means of a thorough check and supervision of the Hospital accounts and expenditure, by means of both local and independent audit. 5. While making the Hospital, as formerly, a self-contained institution, to avoid a return either to the old system of double government, or to vesting again in the same individuals the management of the northern estates and the conduct of the Greenwich establishment. Guided by these principles, our leading recommendations are, as regards the inmates —1. To admit all seamen, being of good character, who are discharged from the naval hospitals as no longer capable of service, in consequence of hurts received or diseases contracted in the service rendering them incapable of earning a livelihood and requiring medical treatment, without reference to the possession of a pension or to length of service. 2. That the present payment of £15 per head for every man by which the number of inmates of Greenwich Hospital falls short of 1,400 be henceforth discontinued. 3. That the regulations by which an out-pensioner becoming an inmate of the Hospital is deprived altogether of his out-pension be relaxed. 4. That the warming and ventilation of Queen Mary's and Queen Anne's Quarters be improved, and these Quarters rendered fit for the accommodation of invalid inmates. 5. That the present number of inmates be increased to 1,200 men by such gradual increase as the Admiralty may find that the funds of the Hospital may admit. 6. That admission should be given to men of the Royal Naval Reserve on certain conditions. As regards the Hospital establishment—1. To abolish the Greenwich salaried establishment at the Admiralty. 2. To change the title of the head Executive authority of the Hospital to Deputy Governor. 3. To diminish the Executive staff of the Hospital by one lieutenant, remaining lieutenant to be styled Lieutenant and Adjutant."

He did not think that the recommendations of the Committee went to the extent that the evidence would have warranted. By the Act of William and Mary widows and orphans were to be provided for within the walls of the Hospital, and some years ago a Commission suggested that £70,000 should be laid out on a building for the reception of widows, and £30,000 a year on their maintenance ; but nothing of that kind had been done. No reason existed for the neglect. At this moment there was an available surplus of £24,000 a year, but if these funds were insufficient, Parliament would readily vote £50,000 a year for the purpose of giving effect to the principle on which Greenwich Hospital was founded. In the Estimates, £1,000 he observed was all that was set down to be given in gratuities, and those solely to the widows of seamen and marines, on active service, who might be killed in action, by a fall from aloft, or by drowning. Under the present regulations, widows of out-pensioners received the balance of the quarter in which their husbands died; and widows of in-pensioners received only the balance due on the death of their husbands—rarely more than 2*s*. The Duke of Somerset had recommended that £5,000 a year should be given to widows. It appeared that some fifty seamen's widows who lived around Greenwich were in the greatest distress and that one, the widow Boyles, died a short time ago in the streets of that town from starvation. He now came to the schools. It had been stated that there were difficulties in the way of carrying on a school for girls at Greenwich; but he could not see why with such ample space at their command those difficulties might not be overcome. The Committee stated on this point that they thought the end in view might be more simply and economically obtained by placing girls in existing institutions which, by an arrangement with the managers, might be made available for that purpose; and they recommended that a sum not exceeding £4,000 per annum be applied to the maintenance and education, and in the training for domestic service, of 200 orphan daughters of sailors and marines. Now, this plan would involve the taking of those girls from their families and scattering them over the country, while schools for twice the number might be provided at Greenwich. He now came to the important question of our relations towards merchant seamen in respect of Greenwich Hospital. From the foundation of that institution down to a recent year every seaman had been made to subscribe 6*d*. a month towards it—the Greenwich 6*d*. it was called—and no less than £2,600,000 was contributed towards its funds by the merchant seamen who got nothing at all from it. He asked that the principle of the Act of Parliament, under which the pay of our seamen had been mulcted to the extent of £2,600,000, should be carried out, and that a portion of the Hospital should be given to them. That question had been discussed before; the year before last it created great interest in the country; and he was happy to say that the Earl of Derby and the present Secretary of State for War had fully appreciated the importance of that subject and shown themselves keenly sensible of the position of our merchant seamen. Yet, in spite of all that, not a merchant seaman had been admitted within the walls of the Hospital. He would suggest that they should offer those seamen not a part of the Hospital which it was known they could not accept, but that part of it which was nearest the *Dreadnought* — namely, Queen Anne's Quarters. He understood that in Queen Anne's Quarters there was accommodation for a large number of merchant seamen, and there they could be under perfectly separate management from the rest of the establishment. We boasted of our Naval Reserve of 12,000 seamen, and well we might; but how were we to recruit the navy without our merchant seamen? Therefore, to overlook the claim of those men was wholly unjustifiable. It had been supposed that the occupants of the Hospital were drunken men, dissatisfied men, and that it was no object of ambition with them to enter the institution. Wishing to know how far that impression was well-founded, he had obtained some statistics respecting one point—namely, drunkenness. In 1866 there were only twenty-one cases of drunkenness in the whole year; and in 1867 only nineteen. The men were exceedingly happy there; and although they had been tempted and even bribed to leave the Hospital, he believed they would all come back again if they saw there was a facility for doing so. It was all very well to say they might go through certain forms; but they did not understand those forms, or choose to incur the expense they involved. Greenwich Hospital was an institution of which every Englishman ought to feel proud as he passed it on the river; and to convert it into a mere hospital for the infirm, and exclude from it the merchant seaman—who, he might almost say, had maintained it—was certainly not carrying out the principle on which it was founded. Speaking on that subject, the present Secretary of State for War had well said—

> "You are turning into a mere hospital that magnificent establishment which has always been regarded by the sailors who have served their country long and well as a refuge for their old age."

Without trespassing further on the attention of the House at that hour of the evening, and that advanced period of the Session, he would conclude by quoting the eloquent words of a man who strongly sympathized, as it was to be hoped the House would do, with the objects forwhich that great institution was established. Lord Macaulay's words were these—

> "The gentle Queen sleeps among her illustrious kindred. The affection with which her husband

cherished her memory was soon attested by a monument, the most noble that had ever been erected to any Sovereign. No scheme had been so much her own, none had been so dear to her heart, as that of converting the palace of Greenwich into a retreat for seamen. Few of those who now gaze on the noblest of European institutions are aware that it is a memorial of the virtues of good Queen Mary, of the love and sorrow of William, and of the great victory of La Hogue."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next."—(*Mr. Baillie Cochrane.*)

Mr. CANDLISH said, he thought it was much to be regretted that the hon. Member for Honiton had brought forward a question of so much interest and importance at a period of the Session when it was utterly impossible that any practical result should follow or that the question could receive the attention which it deserved. In the administration of the funds of Greenwich Hospital there was an essential element of injustice. Those who had contributed to its maintenance for a century and a quarter, and who had been instrumental in creating its vast revenues—namely, the merchant seamen of this country—did not now participate, and never had fully and fairly participated, in its advantages. From 100 to 200 aged seamen in his own borough (Sunderland) who had been subjected by an operation of law to an enforced subscription to that institution, without ever having derived a fraction of benefit from it, were now left in a state of pauperism and supported by the rates. To a greater or less degree it was so in every other mercantile community throughout the country. While the just claims of our mercantile marine were thus entirely ignored, though the funds would amply suffice to meet them, the resources of the institution had been wasted and mismanaged, and no inconsiderable portion of them spent in pensions to officers of the navy, contrary to the conditions on which the Hospital was founded, and to the spirit of the legislation under which it had grown. In 1859 £120,000 was paid for annuities for retiring officers. The management of Greenwich Hospital stood pre-eminent for improvidence and injustice. It was said that the seamen of the mercantile marine, if they entered the Royal Navy, would obtain access to the benefits of the institution, but the injustice of the case was this—that whereas those benefits were open to anybody who entered the Royal Navy, although he remained there only a day, whether he had contributed to the funds of the Hospital or not, on the other hand, the merchant seamen, who had long been compelled to contribute towards those funds, was not permitted to enjoy those advantages. As long as that state of things continued unredressed, the sense of injustice must exist among our mercantile marine.

Mr. DU CANE said, as the Chairman of the Committee to which the hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) had referred, he could not but feel gratified at the complimentary terms in which his hon. Friend had spoken of their Report. Whatever the merits or demerits of that Report might be, all he could say was that it was intended that the inquiry should be of the most searching character, and he felt bound to take this, the first, public opportunity presented to him to acknowledge the valuable assistance he received from the other Members of the Committee. As no two men appeared to think alike either in regard to the past or the future of the Hospital, he did not expect that the recommendations of the Committee would command universal assent. But the Committee, as the Report abundantly showed, entered upon their investigation with no predilections in favour of profuse expenditure or useless sinecures. Their desire throughout was to ascertain how they could combine the strictest economy with the fullest efficiency on the part of the establishment of the Hospital. He hoped his hon. Friend (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) would not think him discourteous if he did not follow him to-night through his elaborate history of the birth of the Hospital and first intentions of its founder. The object now was to deal with the future of the Hospital, and upon this subject two broad views might be said to be entertained by different parties. The first was that of his hon. Friend, who would go back to the early days of the Hospital and carry out to the very letter the charter of William and Mary, and would by so doing establish a state of things unsuited to the present time. The second was the view taken last year by the hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), who would offer to the present inmates inducements somewhat similar to those which produced a clearance in 1865, and the ultimate operation of which would be to close the Hospital altogether. The Report of the Committee took a middle course between these two extremes. No doubt it might be considered a retrograde course in some respects, but the Committee had no wish to re-establish the exact state of things which existed before 1865, or anything approaching to it. He thought the Hospital ought to be a self-contained institution under the Admiralty, but he had no wish to revert to the old system of the double government or to see re-established there sinecure offices with nominal duties attached to them. And although the Committee recommended to a considerable extent the re-filling of the Hospital they by no means desired to see the sailors of the Royal Navy compelled *nolentes volentes* to become in-pensioners, to be separated from their wives and families, and to adopt a life which many of the former inmates had indisputably complained of as being one which isolated them from the outside world, and forced them into almost monastic seclusion. His hon. Friend had certainly suggested a remedy for the monastic grievance, for he wanted to see the in-pensioners accompanied by their wives and families, and he argued in favour of a fair provision for the maintenance of their widows. There was something very attractive, no doubt, in the idea of thus parcelling out the Hospital into a number of domestic interiors, but there were limits to the funds of the Hospital. All would agree that the object should be to provide the greatest happiness for the greatest number. The idea of the hon. Member could only be realized by a large augmentation of the funds of the Hospital, which Parliament would not sanction, or else by a great diminution, if not the entire suppression, of those 5,000 out-pensioners who now in a great measure realized outside the Hospital his hon. Friend's ideas of the state of things that ought to exist within it, for they lived among their wives and families, and thus proclaimed in various parts of the country the glories of the naval service and the benefits of Greenwich Hospital. His hon. Friend asserted that widows at present derived no direct benefit from the funds of the Hospital. He would admit that his hon. Friend was justified in stating that widows were in the original charter of the institution, and he should like to see some further provision made for them; but if they were to receive pensions, or if the pensions of the in-pensioners were to be continued to their widows after death, either the number of pensioners must be diminished or else some further grants must be made out of the public purse. At present the widow of every seaman of the Royal Navy killed or drowned in the service received the gratuity of a year's pay out of the funds of the Hospital. In time of peace, of course, the number was not very great; but this payment would require a large fund in the event of a naval war. Another benefit to the widows was that the large staff of hospital nurses was almost entirely recruited from the class of pensioner's widows, and very excellent nurses they were. The widows also had a prior claim to the benefits of the school for the education of their children. Then the hon. Member for Sunderland had resuscitated the old story of the claim that the merchant seamen were supposed to possess to share in the benefits of the Hospital on account of the payment of the "Merchant Seamen's Sixpences." The original intention of the founders of the institution appeared to be to establish a hospital in the first place for seamen of the Royal Navy, and, secondly, for seamen of the merchant service who might be maimed or wounded while serving in the Royal Navy, but not for the large body of merchant seamen who had never served the Crown in any capacity. That payment of 6*d*., so far as he could make out, was an equivalent levied upon the whole body of merchant seamen for the protection afforded to British commerce by the British Navy, for whose benefit the Hospital was established. No doubt, in the early history of the Hospital, merchant seamen who under the Registration Act of the time registered themselves as willing to serve, and who were killed, maimed, or wounded in action against either an enemy, a pirate, or a rebel were admitted to the benefits of the Hospital. The seamen of the Royal Naval Reserve of the present day exactly answered the description of those who were registered under the Registration Act of 100 years ago, and they would reap all the benefit of the Hospital enjoyed by the merchant seamen of that day, without contributing to the maintenance of its revenue as they did. His hon. Friend had referred to the question of the *Dreadnought* hospital ship. That matter was very fully discussed, as the House would recollect, last year, and the case was briefly this — The Admiralty allotted a Quarter of the Hospital, called Queen Mary's Quarter to the *Dreadnought*, while, on the other hand, the *Dreadnought* authorities asked for Queen Anne's Quarter as being the most suitable. Well, the Admiralty then had Queen Mary's and Queen Anne's Quarters inspected, not only by medical officers of the navy but by independent medical authorities, who all reported in favour of Queen Mary's Quarter. The *Dreadnought* authorities, being still dissatisfied, the Admiralty then referred the question to a Committee, which contained an evenly-balanced number of representatives of the Admiralty and the *Dreadnought*, with the medical officers of that ship. The majority of the Committee decided that neither Quarter would be fit for hospital purposes without considerable alteration, but that the one offered by the Admiralty was, for many reasons, more fit than the other. The Admiralty were, therefore, open to no reproach on this head. As to the future of the Hospital, the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Childers) suggested last Session that terms should be offered to the present inmates to leave, that the infirm should be transferred to the naval port hospitals, and that the establishment should be finally closed. This appeared at first sight a simple solution of the question, and in the early part of their inquiry the Committee sought for evidence in support of it, but they ultimately decided both against its practicability and its desirability. The large majority of the inmates being infirm old men who had rejected the terms of leaving offered in 1865, it was unlikely that any great number of them would accept another such offer, in which case the whole scheme would fall to the ground. On the most sanguine view 200 or 250 inmates would be left. Now, the accommodation of Haslar Hospital was only sufficient for the requirements of the service and for emergencies such as might be expected in a large harbour like Portsmouth, with a dockyard and the Channel squadron in close proximity to it. He had visited Haslar Hospital last summer, in company with his noble Friend the Secretary to the Admiralty, and the conclusion was forced on them that it was out of the question that the men could be sent to Haslar. At Plymouth fifty or sixty men might, perhaps, be taken in, but the authorities were strongly of opinion that Greenwich pensioners accustomed to liberty and the absence of restraint could not dwell under the same roof as sailors subject to the strictness of naval discipline, and that a separate building would be necessary. Now this would probably involve a separate establishment and separate staff, and two or three small establishments of this kind at the naval port hospitals would be little less costly than one great establishment. There was, moreover, the absolute necessity, whatever became of the present inmates of Greenwich Hospital, of the whole building being under the immediate control of the Government, for if a naval war broke out, not only would the naval port hospitals be soon filled to overflowing, but there would be in-pensioners enough to re-people the whole range now vacant at Greenwich. If, however, different portions of the building were given over to the *Dreadnought*, to a local hospital, and to other objects, their reclamation would be very difficult. Admitting, therefore, that the present state of things was unsatisfactory, the number of in-pensioners having till recently been rapidly decreasing, while the cost of the establishment was undiminished, the Committee considered whether, avoiding the abandonment of hospitals, the area of admission could be so widened as wisely to extend its benefits, and, while utilizing the present establishment, diminish the cost per head of each man. Now, while under the old system the object was to drive everybody into the Hospital, the Act of 1865 appeared to them to go too far in the opposite direction, the present regulations for in-pensioners excluding, as it seemed to them unfairly, numbers who were fit to enjoy those benefits. Without detailing the evidence on this point he might mention that whereas in 1866 1,468 men were invalided from the port hospitals as incapable of further service, a large proportion of them being incapable of maintaining themselves in any way, only seven of them found their way to Greenwich, though 618 of them received pensions and were therefore eligible. This showed that the in-pension system was heavily weighted, and the fact that 850 received no pensions proved the strict administration by the Pension Board of the pension regulations. He feared that a very large proportion of the men thus discharged without pensions ended their days, to the scandal of the service, in Union houses. The Committee desired to remedy this by a relaxation of the in-pension regulations, so as to admit every man of good character, irrespective of length of service, who was discharged from the naval port hospitals as incapable of further service and of maintaining himself. With regard to the contribution for the education of seamen's daughters, 200, for whom it was proposed to provide from the Hospital revenues, was precisely the number of girls educated in the school, which was given up in 1841, but which the hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) desired to resuscitate. He thought the House would agree that the furnishing out of the funds of the Hospital, annual grants for excellent educational institutions already in existence—the Orphan School at Devonport and other institutions of that character—the Admiralty having the right to nominate a certain number of scholars, would be a better plan than repeating the experiment of a girls' school in so questionable a locality as Greenwich—an experiment which had failed once and might do so again. He did not think the interests of the Hospital would suffer from no precipitate action having been taken, for the carrying out of the Committee's recommendations would require time, and some of them, indeed, legislation. It was the intention of the Admiralty to consider those recommendations during the Recess with a view to the production early next Session of a measure dealing with the whole subject. It would be a source of great satisfaction to the Committee if their labours resulted in leaving a mark on the future history of the Hospital, and, while promoting judicious economy in the administration of its revenues, in advancing also the welfare of those for whom this noble institution was originally founded.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, that the hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) deserved the thanks both of the naval service and the country for having brought forward this question. He was one of those who greatly regretted what he might call the destruction of that noble naval institution, Greenwich Hospital. The office of Governor had been a great naval dignity which Admirals who had served in all parts of the world might look forward to as a great reward. Then the Hospital itself was regarded by the sailors as a post of honour. They considered it an honour to wear its uniform and to be members of the institution. It was very like what the Invalides in France was. But we had now got rid of it, and the same thing would be done, he supposed, by-and-by with Chelsea Hospital, which occupied towards the army much the same position as Greenwich Hospital towards the navy. We should do a great injury to the military service if we lost Chelsea Hospital, and he thought we had done great mischief to the navy by getting rid of Greenwich Hospital instead of retaining it as a refuge for our destitute old seamen. It was said that the men did not like the Hospital. But the fact was the place was made uncomfortable to them. When the whole police of the Hospital was in the hands of the men they used to take charge of it with pride; but when new regulations were introduced and the metropolitan police were brought into the place the sailors looked upon it as a degradation to be under them. [Mr. LOCKE: Like the Temple.] He thought it a great disgrace to the Benchers to have allowed the police to come in there. If a sailor had had a little too much grog he was met by a policeman and taken to the station-house, but under the old system he would fall into the hands of his comrades, who would take care of him and nothing more was said about it. Then, the sailor liked to smoke, but smoking in the wards was prohibited, and no smoking room was provided. That might appear a little thing to hon. Gentlemen, but it was a great thing to the sailor. Again, there was nothing a sailor hated more than to be turned into a soldier. He did not like to be subjected to the strict discipline of the soldier. All these things made the Hospital distasteful to him, and then a small inducement was offered to the men to go away, which a great many of them did. But he was quite sure, if their habits and comforts had been duly considered, they would never have gone away. If the place had been properly managed, there would always have been more candidates for admission than could be accommodated there. If Greenwich Hospital were made pleasant to the sailor, he had no doubt that it would be a real assistance to the navy, by rendering the naval service more popular that it was. He trusted that Her Majesty's Government would never reconcile themselves to the notion of making Greenwich Hospital a mere receptacle for the sick. It was intended by the founder to be an asylum for meritorious seamen who had served their country, and had been wounded in the service. He did not think that the men of the merchant service ought to be altogether excluded, but that one portion of the Hospital ought to be appropriated to those that were qualified. He must say, however, that the man-of-war's man did not like to be mixed up with the merchant seamen, and unless restrictions were placed on the admission of that element into the Hospital it would never be very popular in the navy. Merchant seamen ought to be admitted when they had performed some valorous action or other distinguished service. It was not desirable that there should be too many places for officers of the navy kept up at the Hospital. Those places must to a great extent be sinecures, and the great grievance of the Hospital from time immemorial was that the money which should have been devoted to the comfort of the men had been given in payment to sinecurists. They all remembered the famous speech of Erskine when he denounced the system. It would be desirable, however, to keep up a few honorary offices, such as that of Governor, to which Admirals who had served their country might look forward; and the Hospital would be all the more popular if there were at the head of it naval men whom the old sailors would respect. In conclusion, he would express a hope that what had been done a short time ago to revolutionize the Hospital would not be deemed irrevocable, and that the false step which had been then taken would, if possible, be retraced.

Mr. LIDDELL said, the House had not yet been told whether the recommendations of the Admiralty Committee had received the sanction of the Board. As far as the general tenor of those recommendations went, he was prepared at the proper time to give them a general support, because they were framed in a liberal and kindly spirit towards the infirm and aged seaman. But many parts of those recommendations would require careful consideration, and among other important matters very large questions of a financial character would present themselves. One point which he had before brought under the notice of the House he would venture to recall to their attention now. There were in the North of England a certain number of the survivors of those men who formerly paid 6*d.* from their wages towards Greenwich Hospital. They had no legal claim upon the revenues; but as an act of grace, seeing that the Hospital funds were very flourishing, he hoped that their case would be considered, and that a small sum would be applied to their relief, many of them being in distressed circumstances.

Mr. CHILDERS said, that being responsible for the legislation of 1865 with regard to Greenwich Hospital, he felt sure that his hon. Friends who had spoken in favour of restoring the monastic institution of Greenwich would stand almost alone in that opinion. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) said that the result of discharging the men from the Hospital was that 400 of them died in about eighteen months. Now, fortunately, the official statement was before the House, and from this it appeared that the number discharged in October, 1865, was 977, and the number of those living sixteen months afterwards, in January or February, 1867, was 905. The death of seventy-two out of 977 was, considering the age of the men, a very low average. The hon. Gentleman, in stating that 400 had died, instead of seventy-two, had taken the figures out of a public newspaper. He had seen the statement there himself, but there was not the slightest foundation for it. His hon. Friend (Mr. Du Cane) in the able Report which he had presented, expressed his approval of the general features of the Act, and spoke of the abuses which existed before it was passed. But he made some proposals tending in his (Mr. Childers') opinion to the very evils the Act had removed; and this at a considerable cost to the country. He was not prepared merely to carry out charitable objects, but to adopt measures which would destroy the sound financial basis on which the Greenwich funds were placed. It was, for instance, proposed to increase the number of admissions to the Hospital from 400 to 1,200, to reduce the charge for pensions very considerably, to increase the number of children in the schools from 800 to 1,000, and to carry out further improvements. These charges, however, would entail very considerable expenses. The increase of admissions from 400 men to 1,200 would cost £40,000 a year, which, along with the other alterations, would entail a total expenditure of £172,000. The gross income of the Hospital was £155,000, so that in time of peace, when there ought to be a considerable surplus, there would be a deficiency of £17,000 a year, assuming that £15 a head was still paid to the Consolidated Fund under the Act. The proposal of the late Government to keep a surplus of £10,000 a year in order to put the finances in the condition they were in before 1865 was characterized as extravagant, and it was said that £5,000 a year would be sufficient; but, looking at the large proportion of terminable mineral income, and considering that the building was not insured, as was originally intended, it would be most unwise to have a surplus of less than £10,000 a year. In this case the old saying was quite appropriate, "You can't eat your cake and have it." We must in these matters be prudent; we must not indulge in the pleasure of granting all that every one asks; endless demands might be made, and it was the duty of those who held the purse-strings not to yield. The plan his hon. Friend proposed showed where it was hoped to get the money from; he proposed to bring into the Hospital fund the out-pensions of everyone taken into the Hospital, and thus, and by giving up the £15 a head contribution, to get from the Chancellor of the Exchequer no less a sum than £20,000 a year. His hon. Friend had not got it yet, and he doubted whether, with such a deficit as we had now, and with a falling Revenue, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would spare £20,000 a year to carry out these proposals. There were many good points in the Report. It was distinctly proved that the establishment was too great, and he must say that the Government were a little responsible for not previously themselves watching matters which did not require a Royal Commission. For instance, the late Government had appointed a certain number of medical officers for 600 men, but, for reasons which were not clear, the late First Lord of the Admiralty unnecessarily appointed another medical officer, although the number of men was only 400. The proposals made as to the better management of the school were sound. Two tendencies had been pulling against each other, and nobody had had the courage to say which should prevail; but the proposal made did so. As to the appointment of a Controller, he would say the expenditure in connection with the control of the revenue was unnecessarily large, and economy could be effected. It was, however, doubtful whether we should always have a Civil Lord of the Admiralty who would be competent to do what the hon. Gentleman had undertaken, for Civil Lords were generally appointed, not with reference to the management of estates, but with reference to their fitness for the civil duties in connection with the dockyards and the navy; and it was not often we had a Civil Lord who possessed the knowledge and the aptitude of his hon. Friend. He therefore doubted the wisdom of making the Civil Lord a sort of superior estate manager. He deprecated also the lax and uncertain rules laid down with respect to admission into the Hospital, a matter about which regulations ought to be distinct and intelligible, seeing that vagueness would infallibly end in the abuses of former days, and the filling of the Hospital with men who had no right to be there. Laxity in admission was opposed to the policy of the Act, which was that sailors were better off in the bosoms of their families than collected together in the Hospital, and the only cases for admission should be circumstances of utter helplessness and having no friends; indeed, the very fact that in 1865, for £30 or £40 a year, men who had cost £100 a year preferred returning to their families, justified the policy of the Government. He should be sorry now to see any act taken of a retrogressive character, and he much feared the effect of the proposals would be a considerable retrogression. With respect to the merchant service the case was plain; as a matter of right they had no claim on the Hospital. The 6*d.* paid before 1833 by sailors, whether in the merchant or the Queen's service, was a tax imposed to maintain Greenwich for the purposes of the navy; when it was repealed, in 1834, it was expressly stated by those who moved the repeal that the merchant seamen had no right whatever to any advantages in consideration of it; and it would be absurd now, when they did not pay, that they should be supposed to obtain a right. He had expressed the obligations due to his hon. Friend and the Committee for their able Report; he had pointed out the dangerous proposals that were made in a financial point of view, admitting their excellence from a charitable point of view; and he hoped that when the plan came before the House next year they would insist upon a scheme of management showing a fair balance of income over expenditure.

ADMIRAL SEYMOUR said, he wished to correct the statement that old pensioners when once they had left the Hospital could not return to it. They could return at any time; they had nothing to do but to go to Somerset House and relinquish their pensions and they would be received at once. As to their not being received unless they were "infirm and helpless," if they were that when first admitted, when they returned some years afterwards they were not likely to have become sound again. It had been his duty during the last two years to investigate the claims of these poor fellows, and a very painful duty it was.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he hoped the Government would take into their favourable consideration the claims of the seamen of the merchant service, and offer them a wing of the Hospital which could be put into an efficient state of repair at a moderate cost. This would be but just, and he hoped the Government would consent to the arrangement, instead of handing them over to a charitable society.

CUSTOMS EXTRA CLERKS.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he rose to call attention to the case of the Customs Extra Clerks. These gentlemen had no complaint to make against the chiefs of their Department nor against the Treasury. Their complaint had reference solely to the system or law which was in force, and which inflicted great injustice and hardship upon them. When there had been an unusual pressure of work in the Customs Department it had been the practice to engage a number of Extra Clerks, but as the additional work had invariably increased, instead of diminishing, these clerks were, of course, permanently engaged. Notwithstanding this, they were not attached to any particular class, and received no regular promotion. He could not conceive that any person acquainted with the internal details of the Customs administration could entertain any doubt as to the importance of having those details carried out by a class of men educated and trained to expertness in the duties devolving upon them, in preference to raw and untried labourers. There was, however, an entire want of acknowledgment of the services rendered by them. They could not at any time receive promotion or be draughted on to what was called the establishment. Some fifteen years ago, it appeared, the Treasury published a Minute to the effect that all persons then engaged in the service of the Crown, and who had been so engaged at an age above twenty-five years, should thenceforward have no promotion in the public service, nor be draughted to the regular establishment of the Customs or any of the departments subject to the administration of the Treasury. They were deprived of all the advantages enjoyed by those who belonged to the permanent establishment. This Minute sinned against the elementary principles of justice in legislation, and it was impossible to discover any principle on which it could have been framed. The number of persons thus employed was thirty-eight, of whom twenty had entered the service previously to the promulgation of the Minute. The Treasury Minute appeared to overlook the fact that many of these clerks had been twenty years in the service at the time it was issued, and it was the cause of those that he chiefly advocated on the present occasion. Their salaries amounted for the first five years to only 30*s.* a week, for the next five years to only 35*s.* a week? and for the remaining period of their service to only 40*s.* a week. Anyone would conclude that the Minute was based on the supposition that these gentlemen were the journeymen of their occupation, instead of being, as they were, men eminently fitted to discharge all the duties of the Department. They were liable to be draughted from one branch to another at the discretion of any of the heads of their office, and to be called upon temporarily to fill any situation that might fall vacant, and thus it happened that one so appointed was called upon to discharge, and was expected to be able to discharge, the duties of an office, the regular holder of which would receive a salary of from £500 to 700 a year. If they were absent from sickness, no allowance was made to them on this score, although those who were regularly on the staff were allowed to be absent from this cause for a period of six months without deduction from their incomes. They were entitled to no superannuation allowance; but were expected out of the 40*s.* a week they received, to provide for themselves a fund which should keep them from the workhouse in old age; and though receiving only the remuneration of ordinary workmen, they were obliged to keep up the same appearance and pass the same examinations as gentlemen placed on the establishment. He could not believe that the Government, if they were aware of the circumstances of the case, would allow gentlemen thus employed to work for so wretched a stipend, and to be deprived of the common advantages which belonged to all persons in the service of the Crown. If they were not wanted for the works of the Department they ought to be dismissed; if they were wanted, the dignity of the public service required that they should be properly remunerated. From a printed circular which had been sent to him, as well as to other hon. Members, he learned that they were appointed by the Lords of the

Treasury on the recommendation of a Member of that House, that they were permanently and not temporarily employed, that most of them were married men with families, and entirely dependent upon their salary for their support. If retrenchment was to be the order of the day, it was scarcely fair that it should be applied to a score or so of miserably paid Extra Clerks. He trusted that the case he had endeavoured to explain would receive the favourable attention of the Government, and that he should receive an assurance to that effect from the right hon. Gentleman opposite, though the forms of the House precluded him from making the Motion which stood on the Paper in his name—

> "That the Customs Extra Clerks be either amalgamated with the establishment or established as a separate class, and placed upon a footing with the establishment with regard to pay, prospects of promotion, and sick leave."

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the Government were placed in this difficulty—that the hon. Gentleman was asking them to depart from the conditions and terms under which these Extra Clerks entered the public service. It might be very true that those clerks did a very good day's work for very moderate pay, but if they were tired of the conditions under which they served the public, and chose to vacate their situations, their places could, no doubt, readily be filled, not perhaps by persons with the designation of Extra Clerks, but by persons who, while discharging analogous duties, and engaged in a similar manner by the day or week, would not be on the establishment, and would not enjoy those privileges and advantages which persons who were on the regular establishment did enjoy. The appointment of the Extra Clerks was one of the many attempts which had been made from time to time to limit the unwieldy character of the establishment in the Customs and in other Departments of the State. Any one who had listened to the statement which had been made a few nights ago by his hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) could not failed to have perceived not only how important but how difficult it was to check the tendency which all our public establishments had to become overgrown. It was true that the Extra Clerks were few in number and many of them advanced in years, but it would be impossible to depart from the terms under which they were engaged and to put them on the establishment. No injustice had been done to them, however. For several years no clerk had been appointed to the establishment of the Customs, and it was the hope and intention of the Government, by limiting the number of the establishment clerks, to limit the charge on the public in regard to promotion and superannuation, and to confine the higher positions of the Customs to those specially engaged for the higher class of work, while the lower class of work should be done by persons who could be easily engaged at a lower scale of pay, without having claims for promotion and superannuation. He was extremely sorry to have to make any statement which might be unsatisfactory to those gentlemen whose case the hon. Member had so ably advocated; but their case had over and over again been considered by the Treasury and the Commissioners of Customs, and although their pay was small it was not so small that their places could not be filled up at the same rate should they choose to withdraw from the public service. They had been engaged under certain conditions of temporary employment and pay; and though their employment had gone on from year to year, they had a regular definite increase of pay, although it was only small. But the whole question of the Custom House establishment in London was under the consideration of the Government, and any special ground of grievance which the Extra Clerks might have would be sure to receive fair and attentive consideration. He could not undertake to say, however, that those clerks would be placed on the establishment, and thus made a permanent charge on the public. There was no wish on the part of the Government to press hardly on any individual, or on any class, and if the hon. Gentleman would bring forward any special case of hardship in which an extra clerk had been disappointed in his legitimate expectations, or in which his services had been so considerable as to be out of proportion to the salary he received, such a case would be fairly considered. But he must express a hope that the Government would be supported in its endeavours generally to improve the classification and divide the duties of a great Department such as the Customs, without at the same time allowing the expenditure connected with it continually to grow upon the country.

IRELAND—TENURE OF LAND.

QUESTION.

Mr. O'BEIRNE asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he would give Instructions to the Commission he proposed to appoint with reference to Land Tenure to inquire into and report on the best means, whether by Government aid or otherwise, of encouraging and assisting the creation of an independent proprietary of small freehold estates in Ireland? He was unwilling at so late a period of the Session to enter at any great length into the subject of which he had given Notice, but he would briefly refer to some statements some time since made by the noble Earl (the Earl of Mayo), and upon which he (the noble Earl) seemed to rely in support of his assurance to the House of the advancing prosperity of Ireland. He would refer to two or three broad facts which would be sufficient to sustain his views, and he would support those facts from figures taken from the noble Earl's own statement, or from the Return lately moved for by him (Mr. O'Beirne), and now on the table of the House. The noble Earl, he believed, was simply in error in the assurance he gave of the immense and daily increasing advance of Ireland in wealth and prosperity, as a very few examples would show. Taking for instance the state of the Savings' Banks deposits, in 1847, certainly a year not very famed for its happy recollections, but still a remarkable year in Ireland's history, the deposits amounted to the sum of £2,410,000, while in the year 1866, twenty-one years afterwards, they only reached £1,540,500. Well, what said the emigration Returns? In 1850 there were 80,000 emigrants, in 1863 there were 117,000, and the average of the four years up to 1867 was over 100,000 in each year. If they turned to the state of the population they found that at the Union the people numbered over 5,000,000. The population steadily increased up to 1846, until within the period of forty-five years it had reached 8,287,848. But when they looked at the Census of 1865 they found that plague and famine had fearfully done their sad work, and the population had fallen to 5,641,000; and he deeply regretted to add that it continued to decrease, the last Return showing that in 1867 it had fallen to 5,557,000. Now, it did seem to him strange that with three such striking facts before him the noble Earl could find any ground for his statement that prosperity was making such advances throughout Ireland. Suppose they looked to neighbouring nations as a test. They saw in Germany an increase, during a less period, of 90 per cent; in Russia 90 per cent; in Austria 80 per cent; in France 50 per cent; and in England 120 per cent. Would it be contended that decrease in population was to be accepted in Ireland as a proof of improvement? If so, they should be informed upon what principle of argument so singular a doctrine could be sustained. He next came to the subject of the condition and relief of the poor, and he found that in 1856, twelve years since, the sum expended in the relief of that class was £576,300. The amount decreased in 1857 and 1858, but in 1861 it began to increase; in 1862 it was £578,789; in 1863, £605,981; in 1864, £596,465; and in 1866, £611,891. Now, in connection with this branch of the question, this very remarkable fact appeared—that the population in 1857 amounted to 6,047,492, while in 1866 it had fallen to 5,582,625; so that a smaller population in 1866 required a much larger outlay to relieve them than the population in 1857 required, and certainly, so far as he (Mr. O'Beirne) could read such figures, there was no evidence of advancement to be found in them. But although he differed so widely from the noble Earl in his conclusions, he was not unwilling to admit the fact—and there was some hope of the future to be found in it—that the country was not losing ground. What he complained of was that remarks which had the effect of producing erroneous impressions upon the minds of hon. Members should be made. He (Mr. O'Beirne) for his part contended, and he believed it was beyond doubt, that Ireland had not kept pace with England, Scotland, and Wales; and, therefore, there must be something wrong — some reason for her backward state. That reason he desired to discover, and, so far as his humble efforts would admit, to apply a remedy. But before he came to the remedy which he advocated, he would allude to the valuation of the surface of land under crops, and used as a productive medium. The noble Earl had told the House that in 1841, the date of the first valuation, there were 13,461,000 acres productive, which were valued at £13,215,000. He also stated that in 1856 the acreage had increased to 15,000,000, or nearly 2,000,000 in excess of 1841.

But the noble Earl stopped there; he did not inform the House what the valuation of this 15,000,000 acres in 1856 amounted to. That figure could, however, be found in his (Mr. O'Beirne's) late Return, and, singular to say, it did not exceed £12,989,000, and in that sum should be included the value of some £26,000,000 of railway property which did not exist in 1841, and which could not amount to much less than £500,000 a year. This was, he submitted, rather a startling result; 2,000,000 acres in 1856 in excess of those in 1841; and yet with the addition of the railway property, valued at upwards of £200,000 a year, less than the 13,461,000 acres in 1841. Did this show a great advance in prosperity in agriculture or commerce? He would not go further into the figures he had prepared, as he thought the House would agree with him in considering that the picture drawn by the noble Earl of the immense advances which had been for the last twenty years made in Ireland was not borne out by the real facts. But that the condition of the land tenure and relations between landlord and tenant were eminently unsatisfactory had been admitted by the noble Earl, and indeed he had himself proposed and promised to issue a Commission to inquire into the whole question. As that point of the subject was that to which his Motion pointed most directly, he must say that he rejoiced at the prospect of that inquiry, and for his part he should accept it at the hands of the Government most willingly. He had no reason to doubt that the Commission would be well and efficiently composed, and that its inquiries would be large, searching, and satisfactory. The result would, in that case, he felt assured, produce results to all of a very useful and beneficial character. It was so many years since the last Commission, under the able presidency of the Earl of Devon, took its evidence and made its valuable Report, that its recommendations and findings could scarcely now be considered as very applicable, so large had been the change in the interim. Therefore, it did seem that the time was come when much valuable information might be obtained by a new and well-conducted inquiry. Then the subject of ejectments was one which required attention and inquiry, and well-considered legislation as the result of that inquiry. The right hon. Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) had stated, on a previous occasion, that he had never yet heard a well-authenticated case of injustice and cruelty on the part of landlord to his tenant, and that in point of fact the complaints so often made and repeated in that House were, if not fictitious, little more than imaginary. Now, besides the indignant language of the late Master of the Rolls, in giving judgment on a case before him, the Return recently moved for by Lord Belmore showed that for the last ten years the average of ejectments was 6,000 a year, giving a total of at least 30,000 persons turned on the roadside annually. These facts showed the absolute necessity of dealing with this important question. He would not trouble the House by making these extracts from the voluminous authorities to whom he could refer in support of the particular system of small freehold proprietors, which he so earnestly advocated. But he would refer to one circumstance which was on the Records of the House, and upon which he thought he might rely in support of his position. It was this—that some years since Sir Matthew Barrington, a member—and a most distinguished member—of the legal profession in Ireland, being impressed with the unsatisfactory state of the tenure of land in that country, associated himself with Lord Devon and several other influential persons, amongst whom was the late Sir Robert Peel, and they introduced a Bill in that House giving authority for the promotion of a private company to carry the principle of establishing small proprietors into operation, believing, as it appeared from their evidence before the Committee to which that Bill was referred, that such a measure was eminently calculated to elevate and improve the people, and to foster loyalty and a closer union with Great Britain. The Chairman of that Committee was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone), and he was requested by the Committee to make a special Report to the House in the following words:—

> "That on account of the important consideration of public policy which this Bill appeared to involve, they have directed him to move the House that the Bill be re-committed to the Whole House and be printed, with the evidence upon it, for the use of Members."

The Bill was re-committed and passed through that House and the other House unanimously, and on the 31st of August, 1848, it became law. He would read what the Preamble of that Bill said, and hon.

Members would bear in mind that it was now upon the statute book of the kingdom as the expression of the united opinion of the Legislature and the Crown.

> "Whereas, the formation and the establishment of a permanent body of independent yeomen, consisting of resident proprietors, holding farms in fee simple, containing respectively not less than thirty acres, would materially improve the social condition of Ireland by promoting the better cultivation of land, the reclamation of waste lands, and by personally interesting a large proportion of the population in the preservation of peace and order; and whereas there are many persons in Ireland possessing a limited amount of capital which they would gladly employ in the purchase of land if facilities were given for the transfer of estates or portions thereof, be it enacted," &c.

Now, that Preamble, both in spirit and in language, expressed his full meaning. He did not desire to add anything more. That was the entire of his case. He believed it was admitted by many that the measure would largely facilitate the transfer of land, and tend to unite the people in feelings and in sympathy with this country. He would not quote any further; he would merely allude to the opinions of some intelligent and practical men who had lately published their views on the subject, and to whom he was indebted for much information. Amongst them he would mention Mr. Butler, a gentleman living in Tipperary, who lately examined this question himself, and found the plan working admirably in our possessions, the Channel Islands; Mr. Hutton also, a gentleman who had written a very able pamphlet on the subject, giving an excellent description of the Prussian system; Mr. Fisher, and many others. The unqualified conclusion of those gentlemen was that the introduction of such a class of owners into the country would be of the greatest possible importance in every respect—socially, politically, and in an agricultural sense. Last year the noble Earl the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in opposing a Motion which he (Mr. O'Beirne) made of a different character, but on the same subject, took several objections to the principle. The first was that under the Landed Estates Court means at present existed for purchasing small estates where there was any desire to do so. He had since then carefully examined the *Landed Estates Court Advertiser*, and had made sufficient inquiries. The result justified him in stating that the noble Earl was entirely misinformed, and that no such facilities in fact existed. Another of the noble Earl's

objections was that this principle did not succeed in European countries where it existed. To this he could only reply that he had sought for information from the registries of countries where this principle was in large operation, and that he was assured it acted most beneficially. In fact, the result of the information he had gathered justified him in differing altogether from the noble Earl in the opinions he had expressed. But all he asked was a careful and honest inquiry. He asked that Instructions might be given to the Commission to examine this large and, in his estimate, this most important question. He had no wish to thrust it down the throat of Parliament. He merely demanded a fair hearing for a principle advocated—warmly supported, he would say—by so many able, intelligent, and practical men—men who had applied their minds earnestly to the tenure of land in Ireland, and whose opinions on that subject were entitled to respect and consideration. The noble Earl might be right in his view, and he might be entirely and completely wrong. He accepted the issue—he invited the inquiry. If there were no merit in the principle let it be so decided, and then let it be cast aside, and the House no longer troubled with the consideration of it. But if the proposal were found to justify the views of those who advocated it — if the Commission should come to the conclusion that it would be a useful measure, and was likely to work out the beneficial effects ascribed to it, he asked for an assurance that then it would be promptly accepted and taken up, that the Government would aid in carrying it out, that the Irish people might at length hope to see a remedy within their reach which, without outraging any of the known principles of political economy, would confer upon them a great and lasting benefit.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, the hon. Gentleman had entered upon a very large question, and had brought forward matters which required much more extensive discussion than could be given to them that night. He had not been aware from the Notice on the Paper that the hon. Gentleman meant to do more than ask a Question. Had he known that it was intended to impugn the statements he made on a former occasion, he would have been fully prepared to vindicate them. The facts and figures he had then stated had been before the country for a considerable time; and on no one substantial point had they been disputed. He had given no glowing or exaggerated description of Ireland; but he had shown what, if the hon. Gentleman had resided as much in the country as he had done he would have known—that the country had been steadily improving for the last thirty years. He was not prepared to say that at many times during that period there had not been causes which tended to create much uneasiness and alarm, and that still in many respects the state of things was not satisfactory. But what he proved was this, that for a certain number of years there had been a steady, gradual, and wholesome improvement in the state of every industry and of every class, all indicative of a really healthy condition; and he believed the more the subject was studied the more that improvement would become manifest. He did not say that any miracles had been wrought—he did not believe that; or that there was not enormous room for great improvement for the future. The Poor Law Commissioners in their last Report said that the rags of the people had disappeared; that they were healthy and well dressed, and that when coming from church on Sunday they looked clean and comfortable. They also said that the character of the houses had improved—that the dwellings were more healthy than those of the labourers in this country. The dreadful epidemic diseases that so frequently ravaged Ireland twenty years ago had entirely disappeared, while the general health of the people had greatly improved. They did not require statistics; everybody who lived in the country was aware of the fact that the condition of the poorer classes of Ireland had been for a considerable time gradually improving; and he believed that the improvement would continue. With regard to the particular question of the hon. Gentleman, he had to state that the Instructions to that Commission would be identical with those given to the Devon Commission—namely, to inquire into the whole system of tenure in Ireland; and therefore they would be at liberty to inquire into the vexed question whether small or large holdings were the most suitable for the wants of the people; and he had every reason to believe that the Commission he proposed to appoint would devote considerable attention to the point. He did not personally anticipate that any peculiarly satisfactory results would be obtained from creating a large class of small landholders; but still the subject was a fair one for further inquiry. He believed that the notion that very small holdings contributed to the prosperity of a country had been long exploded, and that it was now felt that if a man was to hold land at all he ought to be in the position of a farmer holding a sufficient quantity of land to sustain himself and his family. He thought that the proper policy for Parliament to pursue with reference to the question was to remove all obstructions to the purchase of land by small capitalists who might desire to invest their money in such property, but not to undertake any special legislation like that asked for by the hon. Member. He believed that the difficulties that now existed in Ireland in the way of small capitalists investing in land had been greatly exaggerated, and that by combining together, and by other means, purchasers could obtain small quantities of land at a reasonable rate. The Incumbered Estates Court were bound to sell the land to the best advantage; and if small capitalists could give a good price for small lots, they would easily become its purchasers. He must, however, admit that the working of the Incumbered Estates Courts had not been entirely successful, as it had enabled some persons to buy up the estates at low prices for the purpose of re-selling them. At the same time he felt that these were all subjects for inquiry, and he thought that the result of the Report of the Commission he proposed to appoint would be to remove a great deal of misapprehension from the public mind upon this subject.

SIR JOHN GRAY said, it would be in the memory of the House that, shortly after the General Election, amongst the first steps taken by the Irish Secretary of the then Government (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) was the introduction of a Bill dealing with the question of landlord and tenant in Ireland, proposing to give some approach to secure tenure to the people. That Bill was energetically opposed by the party with whom the noble Earl acts in this House, and by none more energetically than by the noble Earl himself. [The Earl of MAYO: I only opposed one clause in the Bill.] The noble Earl not only objected to one particular clause, but he opposed the second reading in a very long and most energetic speech, and if he (Sir John Gray) rightly remembered he described it to the House as a confiscation Bill designed to spoliate the property of the landlords, and the noble Earl succeeded in his opposition, and prevented the Bill from being read the second time. Then when the noble Earl himself came into Office, he brought in a Bill which was heralded by his friends as the perfection of legislative wisdom. But he never proceeded with that Bill, and let the question drop, though he pledged himself to the House that he and his party were fully informed upon the subject, and quite capable of settling it without further delay. Now, however, at the expiration of the Parliament, he and his party tell us they must have more delay, they must have another Commission, and must have more knowledge before they can deal with this great question. They were to have another Land Commission issued, based on the model of the Devon Commission, which was issued four-and-twenty years ago, and which ended in nothing. They were now to have another based on a precisely similar model, which would, no doubt, terminate in the same way. The noble Earl spoke of the advisability of inquiry into the extent of land on which a peasant-farmer might live, and said that would constitute a feature of the promised Commission. The Irish people wanted no such inquiry—they could determine that for themselves. Each man could best ascertain how much or how little land suited his requirements. The adjustment they wanted was an adjustment as to tenure, and not as to extent of the holding. The tenant-farmers ask you not for inquiry, but for security. They want secure tenure—they want a firm foothold in the land they occupy and till—they want that neither political malice, nor religious rancour, nor personal caprice shall have the power to thrust them, their wives and children, out on the road-side; and to do this no inquiry is needed, and no delay should be countenanced or encouraged. He (Sir John Gray) then protested altogether against this Commission—it was a delusion, and would end in postponement and disappointment.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Mr. DILLWYN desired to say a word or two upon the question of the adjournment. He had no objection to attending the House on a Saturday for the purpose of advancing Bills which had already been progressed with, and the passing of which was necessary, but he thought it undesirable that a "jaded House," to use the Prime Minister's own words, should be called upon to discuss new Business on a Saturday in the middle of July. He referred to the Inland Revenue Bill, the provisions of which would excite a good deal of discussion. The right hon. Gentleman, he felt certain, did not intend to take the House by surprise, and he would not, therefore, he trusted, proceed with any new measure which would give rise to discussion.

Mr. FAWCETT feared that, owing to the shortness of the Notice, there would not be so large an attendance as there otherwise would have been to discuss the new clauses of the Corrupt Practices Bill, several of which were very important.

Mr. DISRAELI said, he always endeavoured to arrange the Business in accordance with the convenience of Members. There were certain measures the passing of which it was necessary to secure. There would be, he supposed, little if any doubt as to the propriety of proceeding with the Appropriation Bill. With regard to the Corrupt Practices Bill, he had certainly notified to hon. Members the possibility of its being proceeded with on Saturday, but he had stated that the matter would be definitely settled that evening. They had made considerable progress with the Bill that day having got through all the original clauses, the postponed clauses, and a great many of the new clauses; and but for the constitutional discussion which had arisen they would probably have succeeded in passing it through Committee. The remaining clauses would probably be dealt with in about an hour to-morrow so that the Bill might be read a third time on Monday. The Inland Revenue Bill was, he believed, a good one and ought to pass, but if it was likely to give rise to serious discussion he certainly should not think of pressing it on a Saturday morning. If there were any other measures which could be advanced a stage, and on which no discussion was expected, they would of course also be put down.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he had heard that considerable objection was entertained on the part of several Members to going forward with the Indian Bills to-morrow. He mentioned this matter in order that the Government might not be unprepared for objection.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he would be glad if hon. Gentlemen who objected to any of these measures would communicate with him, so that those Bills likely to lead to discussions might not be put on the Paper only to be withdrawn after hon. Members had taken the trouble to come down to the House.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he hoped that the Appropriation Bill, about which a good deal might be said, would be placed on the Paper after the Corrupt Practices Bill.

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he would withdraw his Motion for the adjournment of the House.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

POOR RELIEF BILL—[BILL 186.]

[*Lords*]—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 3 (Poor Law Board may appoint Officers when Guardians make Default).

MR. KNIGHT said, that nothing could be more objectionable than giving the Board the power of taxing the country.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR moved an Amendment to the effect that the Board should not insist on the appointment of a chaplain, when the duties of that officer were efficiently performed without payment.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause, to add the words "Provided always, That the Poor Law Board shall not insist upon the appointment of a chaplain wherever the duties of that officer shall be efficiently performed without payment." — (*Mr. P. A. Taylor.*)

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the Amendment would deprive the Board of a power it possessed already. The clause did not design so much to invest the Board with new power as to give it the means of enforcing the power it was already intrusted with. If the guardians failed to appoint any necessary officer the Board could apply for a *mandamus* to compel them to do so. That might be argued, and a return made that the guardians could not find a proper person, and the thing might go on for a year or two, so that practically the law could not be carried out. Last Session a power similar to that sought to be conferred by the clause was given to the Board within the metropolis, and therefore the Board was only asking for that power in the provinces which it already possessed in London. He could not understand why a chaplain should be the only officer who should be expected to perform his duties without security that his salary would be paid.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR said, that at Leicester the duties of chaplain were duly performed by voluntary officers; and the question was whether in such a case the Board should have the power of appointing an officer who must be paid?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, the Board had the power already, although they had been compelled to resort to it in only one instance, in which the guardians refused to appoint a chaplain; and even the language of the proposed Amendment would leave the Board judges of the necessity just as much as they were now.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, these remarks seemed to show that it was unnecessary that the clause should apply to chaplains at all, although there might be strong arguments for passing it as regarded other officers, such as schoolmaster, schoolmistress, medical officers, and nurses. The office of chaplain was of a different nature, and it would have been well to have raised the question separately. On the Report he should propose to define the offices to which the clause applied.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, so far from there being no difficulty with regard to the appointment of chaplains, it happened there was at present a London case before the Board. A chaplain was absolutely necessary, and but for the power already possessed by the Board in London the case could not be dealt with.

MR. SYNAN said, he did not see why the discretion sought should not be vested in the Commissioners, and why they should be under the necessity of applying for a *mandamus.*

MR. T. CHAMBERS said, he wondered that gentlemen could be got to undertake the duties of guardians if all the discretionary power was to be exercised by the Board.

COLONEL GREVILLE-NUGENT said, there was a workhouse in Ireland in which, though there was only one Protestant pauper inmate, a Protestant chaplain attended, and was paid a salary.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he did not require the example of Ireland. After the description given of that country by a distinguished Member of the House of Commons, and after what they had heard of it that night from an Irish Gentleman, he had no desire to see England assimilated to Ireland. He remembered to have heard a Chief Secretary for Ireland state that the power of appointing chaplains was given to the Irish Poor Law Commissioners because it was necessary, owing to the circumstances of the country, that they should have a veto in the matter. It required the power of the Government to cope with that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland; and there had been instances in which vacancies had been created in chaplaincies against the will of the Government, owing to the opposition of that hierarchy.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he thought the Secretary to the Poor Law Board ought to give the Committee some information as to whether the question of the appointment of chaplains was really involved in this clause.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, it was agreed that the appointment of paid nurses was desirable in country workhouses. He thought, also, that where the great majority of the inmates of a workhouse were of one religious persuasion, a chaplain of that persuasion ought to be appointed to attend them and be paid for the discharge of that duty. There was a Liverpool workhouse in which, he believed, the great majority were Roman Catholics, and a Roman Catholic chaplain was paid £300 a year for attending that institution. If the majority of the inmates of a workhouse were members of the Established Church, and the guardians should refuse to appoint a chaplain for them, he believed it would be the feeling of the House that the Poor Law Board ought to have the right to interfere, in order that the inmates might be provided with the consolations which the visit of a clergyman of the Established Church would afford them.

Mr. KINNAIRD asked whether red tapeism was to step in where religious consolation was afforded by voluntary efforts?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: In such a case the Poor Law Board would not for a moment think of interfering.

Mr. KNIGHT said, that propositions to alter our Poor Law arrangements proceeded year after year from the permanent staff of the Poor Law Board.

Colonel W. STUART said, that in an omnibus Bill like the one now before the Committee, one found it difficult to discover in which of the clauses the important principle of the measure was really contained.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 27; Noes 77: Majority 50.

Mr. Newdegate

Colonel W. STUART then proposed at the end of the clause to add these words —"Provided always, That nothing herein contained shall relate to the appointment of chaplains."

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Clause, to add the words "Provided always, That nothing herein contained shall relate to the appointment of chaplain."—(*Colonel Stuart.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 25; Noes 73: Majority 48.

Mr. REARDEN stated that he had by mistake given his vote in the last division in the opposite way to that which he intended, and he was proceeding to explain how the mistake occurred, when—

The CHAIRMAN, interposing, informed him that the rule of the House was that if an hon. Member went into a Lobby his vote was counted with that Lobby. The hon. Member might set himself right by stating that he had made a mistake, but beyond that the House could not enter into the consideration of the matter.

On Question, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill,"

Mr. KNIGHT said, he would divide the Committee against the clause, which contained a principle against which the country was now in arms—namely, a great increase of the rates. The House had of late years been too ready in increasing the rates. When a question of increasing the general taxation was raised the House took alarm, but when the local rates were concerned the case was quite different. When hon. Gentlemen went to the elections he believed they would be asked whether they had voted for or against clauses in Bills largely increasing the rates.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that the country objected to giving the Central Board power over the rates, because the rate-payers had not the opportunity locally of being heard on the subject. He should oppose the clause.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, that the grand principle of improvement in Poor Law administration was not to strengthen the power of the guardians but of the Poor Law Board. The guardians frequently refused to perform their obvious local duties, to the injury of the sick, the poor, and the lunatics, and to the oppression of the medical profession, which performed the most important duties to these suffering and unprotected persons. In all these matters the central authority was more to be depended upon than the local Boards. He preferred the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. P. A. Taylor), but, as the Committee had negatived it, he should give his strong support to the clause.

Mr. HENLEY said, that, as he did not wish to see a national poor rate, he should vote against this clause, because local administration was the only ground on which a national rate could be resisted. Every step they were taking in setting up and strengthening a central administration was breaking down the local rate. What had occurred this Session? There had been Motion after Motion to bring different species of property into assessment which now paid nothing, and how much longer would the House be able to resist these Motions if the pressure of local burdens went on every day increasing? This clause authorized medical men to correspond with the Poor Law Board in London, but not through the guardians. A wholly independent management would thus be set up. After a very short time he believed the new system would break down, and then the poor would be worse cared for by the central authority in London than by the local Board of Guardians.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM said, he should support the clause on the ground of economy, because there was no economy like employing properly-qualified and properly-paid persons. The system of employing pauper nurses and pauper assistants had let to great abuses and great peculation.

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 71; Noes 29: Majority 42.

Clause added to the Bill.

House *resumed*.

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

House adjourned at half past Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, July 18, 1868.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee—Royal Gun Factories *nominated.*

Public Bills — *Ordered* —Tenure and Improvement of Land, &c. (Ireland)*; Schools and Training Factories (Ireland).*

First Reading — Tenure and Improvement of Land, &c. (Ireland)* [244]; Schools and Training Factories (Ireland)* [245].

Second Reading — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation*; Hudson's Bay Company* [240]; St. Mary Somerset's Church, London* [228].

Referred to Select Committee—St. Mary Somerset's Church, London* [228].

Committee — Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-comm.*) [63].

Report—Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (*re-comm.*) [63-243.]

Third Reading — Danube Works Loan* [227]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4)* [235]; Colonial Shipping* [236]; Admiralty Suits* [234]; Railway Companies* [237].

Withdrawn — Probate of Wills, &c. (Ireland)* [129].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

CUSTOM-HOUSE OFFICERS' GRIEVANCES.—QUESTION.

Mr. GRAVES said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Commission appointed by the Treasury to inquire into the grievances of Customs' Officers in London has made its Report; and, if it is intended to extend the investigation to the outports, when the inquiry may be expected to commence?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH replied that when a similar Question was put to him a few days ago he stated that the Commission would probably report before the close of the Session, and he had still reason to believe that this would be so. With regard to the outports, that was a matter which the Treasury would have to decide. Certainly the Commission in its present form would not continue the inquiry, but it was intended that the whole subject should be investigated.

ARMY—EXPERIMENTS AT SHOEBURYNESS.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. O'BEIRNE rose, pursuant to Notice, to call attention to the recent experiments at Shoeburyness with reference to the proposed Plymouth fortifications.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH expressed a hope that the hon. Gentleman would postpone his Notice and allow the Appropriation Bill to pass its present stage, so that the House might at once proceed with the discussion on the Corrupt Practices Bill. This Bill was one that the Government had done everything they could to carry, and it was necessary that it should be carried to complete the Reform scheme. Some thought should be bestowed upon what would be the position of hon. Members if they had to go before the new constituencies without the protection that this measure would afford; and it should also be borne in mind that, while some Members were staying in the House and doing their duty in reference to this Bill, other Members were surreptitiously canvassing behind their backs, and thus obtaining an advantage over them. The hon. Member might very well delay his Question, which would not lose by waiting.

Mr. O'BEIRNE: I think, if the hon. Member had recollected for a moment, he would have scarcely made that request. This Motion stood in a fair position on Thursday last for discussion. It is one which has been watched with considerable interest by many Members of this House, and also by a large number of persons outside; and, at the instance of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, I at once postponed it, in order that the other Public Business then on the Paper might be proceeded with. The right hon. Gentleman at that time informed me that I should have an opportunity of bringing the matter under the notice of the House to-day, and therefore I am prepared to do so. I may state that I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at any great length. I therefore hope I may be permitted to call attention to the Motion. Although I agree with the hon. Gentleman the Member for Devizes, that the Corrupt Practices Prevention Bill is one of great importance, yet I think the House will scarcely say that the question I desire to discuss is one of less importance to the country generally, inasmuch as it affects the safety of the kingdom, and also the interests of the ratepayers, involving as it does an enormous amount of expenditure. Before entering on the question of which I have given Notice, I wish first to say one word to clear away a misconception which has arisen. I never entertained the opinion, much less expressed it, that the policy already decided upon—that a certain amount of expenditure for shore fortifications should be incurred—was an erroneous policy. I believe that a system of fixed fortifications is a necessary and proper expenditure. What I did object to was the principle on which the fortifications were being constructed, and not the policy which dictated their construction. I also wish distinctly to state—and I hope the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for War will give me his attention—that he was under some misapprehension when he answered a Question which I put to him some time ago. He then intimated that I ought to be in a position to satisfy myself on the information and figures for which I asked, because I was in connection with one of the contracting firms. This is a personal matter; and I now assure him that the statement was entirely without foundation; that I had no connection with any company, or any firm of contractors; and that I had no interest in the matter beyond that which I take as a private Member of this House and as one of the general public. Sir, in February, 1867, a Report was issued from the War Office giving us a very lengthened and precise account of the several fortifications which it was proposed to construct for the purpose of defending our arsenals and dockyards, and describing, with a considerable amount of detail, the principles and plans on which these fortifications were to be erected. As soon as the information given in that Report came to the hands of hon. Members, and reached the public out-of-doors, very many Gentlemen who had given great consideration to this question were struck with the insufficient character and faulty principle of the fortifications as proposed. The subject was much canvassed, and when the right hon. Gentleman last Session introduced the Appropriation Bill, asking for a further Vote of £800,000 to be applied to this purpose, I took the liberty of placing on the Records of this House a Motion to the effect that no further expenditure should be incurred on account of fortifications until sufficient experiments had been made for the purpose of testing the principles upon which it was proposed to construct them. In that Motion I was ably supported by my noble Friend below me (Lord Elcho), who moved an Amendment to my Resolution of a more moderate effect, that experiments should be undertaken to test the efficiency of the War Office plans. The result was an assurance from the right hon. Baronet that sufficient experiments should be made, and that the principles of the fortifications and shields should be fully tried. I am bound to say that these experiments have been largely and satisfactorily undertaken and carried out. And I now wish to deal with the results, and I think the House will agree with me that they are of a very remarkable character. The first experiment was to prove the power of the shields. The House is already aware of the result of that experiment, as it has formed the subject of a Report by the Committee which was appointed by the right hon. Baronet at the end of last year. That Report was delivered in the beginning of this Session. It contains an unqualified condemnation of the shields, thirty-five of which had been most unfortunately and prematurely sent to Gibraltar and Malta for the protection of those colonies. The experiments with reference to the Plymouth and Bermuda forts took place on the 16th of last month. There was on that occasion a large and influential attendance of gentlemen, many of whom were Members of this and of the other House of Parliament; the Commander-in-Chief was present, and many other distinguished persons who are interested in the subject. The firing on that day, although it was by no means of a satisfactory character, so far as any real test was in question, was quite sufficient to show that the Plymouth fortification which has been so much relied upon was an exceedingly inefficient mode of defence. But on the second day of the firing the result was still more disastrous to the target. As I have promised the House to be brief, I shall not enter into details as to the effects of the firing on the several days. Nor shall I attempt to describe the extraordinary damage done by each shot; it will be sufficient for my purpose to state that the effect of the three days' firing was to completely destroy the fabric, and to leave the impression on the minds of all present that it was a most ill-adapted, and, I may say, a most useless structure. In order to give the House some idea of the general result of the firing, I will read a short extract from *The Times*, describing the effect of the shells, which penetrated completely the targets on the third day. *The Times* on the 9th of July states—

> "The next round, also a 10-inch shell with charge for 1,000 yards, was more successful, striking a little above the left-hand corner of the porthole. It did great damage, carrying away the whole of the shield above the embrasure up to the level of the under side of the roof. An enormous mass of iron, weighing about a ton and a quarter, was projected into the gun chamber, and two short pieces of iron planks, each weighing about 2 cwt., were hurled, one nearly 150 feet, and the other nearly 100 feet to the rear. The shell burst inside the casemate, setting fire slightly to the rope mantlet, and sending fragments of iron flying in all directions. This was the most formidable result yet produced. Had it occurred in action it would have disabled the gun, and made a clean sweep of all the defenders in that part of the building."

Such is the account, given by *The Times*' reporter, of the third day's firing. But the Committee were not entirely satisfied, and on the 8th of the present month they decided to fire what is called a salvo of guns at the structure. Four guns were laid in position,—one of them missed fire, but the shots from the other three struck the target. As soon as the smoke from the discharge had cleared away, the first object which met the view of those on the ground was the active effort of a gallant general to get through the breach which had been made in the face of the target—an effort in which he succeeded without much trouble, his purpose being to examine the damage sustained by the interior. This fact, I think, is sufficiently conclusive as to the target's inefficiency for defensive purposes. But before I leave this part of the question I am anxious to call the attention of the right hon. Baronet to the fact that that target was not a true representation by any means of the fort contracted for and to be constructed at Plymouth. The fort as contracted for was less than the target erected at Shoeburyness by 5 inches of iron in the interior supports, on which such structures mainly depend. The fort to be constructed at Plymouth presents also on its surface 15 inches of iron in three thicknesses, while the target shot at at Shoeburyness consisted of a thickness of twenty inches. The Shoeburyness target was strengthened materially on the inner side, and, in point of fact, as I am assured by those who examined both, was a very different structure to that which was contracted for in 1867. But this is not the most remarkable circumstance connected with this matter. The fort which was contracted for in February, 1867, and that which is being completed under a modification of that contract at this moment, are completely different in their characters. The alterations in the contract have added a great amount of strengthening, in fact, many changes have been made, but at great expense, which have altogether altered and increased the resisting power of the fort. I think it is perfectly right, wherever any improvement presents itself to the minds of those who have charge of the construction of these fortifications, that those improvements should be at once adopted; but I think these alterations fully and completely justify my noble Friend and myself in the course we adopted last year, when we urged upon the House the entire inefficiency of the proposed structure, and endeavoured to stop further expenditure upon it, the more particularly as many of the points of weakness to which I then referred have been since rectified by orders from the War Office. What has recently taken place has abundantly shown that, at the time we interfered last year, no experiments which could be relied upon had then been undertaken, and also proved that the experiments which have since been carried on have not been nearly sufficient to tell us what is the true system which ought to be adopted. The target representing the Plymouth and Bermuda forts has now been proved to be utterly useless for the purposes for which these forts were intended, and if this be the case it will scarcely require much argument to show that the forts which are now being contracted for in the North of England and on the Thames are utterly useless, and that the money which has been expended upon them up to the present time, amounting to little short of £35,000 for each fort, has been totally lost to the country. Now this, I say, is a serious question, which the House would do well to consider, and which requires that we should receive from the right hon. Baronet who has charge of this Department some assurance that the present system should be discarded, and that no further outlay should be permitted until the question shall be fully inquired into. I must also call the attention of the House to another remarkable circumstance. Two years ago, before the Plymouth contract was entered into, a casemate, called the War Office casemate, had been erected at Shoeburyness. That casemate was built upon a very peculiar system, with great care and after mature deliberation, I think after the plan of Colonel Jervois, one of the officers of the War Department, and I think that the principle of that casemate does that officer very great credit. It was designed at a time when the 12-inch guns had not been tried against any of our armour plates, and was simply intended for the purpose of resisting the artillery then known—the 7-inch and the 9-inch guns — and I am bound to say that it completely succeeded in throwing off the shot and shell fired from those guns. The casemate now offers the fullest evidence of its own success at Shoeburyness, where it stands perforated in many places by the 11-inch and 12-inch guns, having perfectly resisted the smaller class of artillery brought against it, which entirely failed to do it any mischief, although forty-two rounds were fired against it, or nearly double the number fired at the Plymouth target. It certainly does appear somewhat singular that such a structure, which stood ready at the hand of the authorities to be tried as a test of the resisting power of forts so constructed, should have been left undisturbed on the sands of Shoeburyness for so long a period, and that, notwithstanding the opportunity of learning something of the subject was thus offered to the War Office they should not have availed themselves of it, but should have entered obstinately and without trial into the large, and as I believe useless, contracts which I have described. I believe the right hon. Baronet the Secretary for War is now pretty well aware that the experiments asked for last year were very necessary and very desirable, and that a great amount of advantage will be gained by the country from the result of those experiments. Probably the right hon. Baronet will consider it within the line of his duty to tell us, in the observations he will doubtless make in reply to me, whether he does not think that the advice given to him, even by amateur Members, as he chose to call my noble Friend and myself last year, was not sound and good advice. I regret that the right hon. Baronet did not accept the caution which we then offered to him. I am sure it was offered in the very best spirit, and without the slightest feeling of hostility to the War Office. I have only one or two words to add. I desire to call attention to the last experiment which was made the day before yesterday, and I do so because it refers specially to the question of shields. The House will remember that the shields to which I have alluded as being sent to Bermuda and Gibraltar turned out to be failures. The question was then raised whether a shield could be constructed which would resist the heavy ordnance which could now be brought against it. Almost coeval with the War Office casemate was the shield constructed by Mr. Hughes, of the Millwall Iron Works on a principle he had long advocated. This shield was constructed and finished in 1865; but the War Office authorities did not believe in it, as the principle on which it was constructed was not their principle, and in consequence found no more favour in their eyes than the casemate, and therefore it was never tried. The contract for the construction of shields for our foreign colonies was entered into although this shield remained within the control of the War Department, to be experimented upon when they pleased, and, singular to say, it was not shot at until the day before yesterday—nearly two years and a half or three years from the date of its construction. The Committee appointed to superintend the experiments very properly and very fairly submitted this shield to precisely the same ordeal that was applied to the Gibraltar shield. The guns were the same, the distance was the same—seventy yards—the charges were the same, the shot the same, and, if I remember rightly, the number of rounds was the same; and the result was that the artillery entirely failed in producing any effect whatever upon it; as may be seen from the morning papers of to-day, it absolutely resisted without any injury the effects of the heavy firing against it. In fact, it was completely successful in beating the guns, as I believe the right hon. Baronet will admit when he receives the detailed Reports, which will no doubt be presented to him on the subject. I think, therefore, it is also very much to be regretted that this shield was not tried before the contracts which have cost the country so much money were entered into. It appears to me, Sir, that those who advised the right hon. Baronet to hesitate about having that shield and casemate tried, did not offer that sound, good and unprejudiced advice which they ought to have given. If the shield had been tried this time last year, when it was quite ready, a large amount of perfectly useless expenditure must have been saved, and we should by this time, if they were to be used at all, have had structures that would repel any shot that could be fired against them, so far, at least, as the ordnance at present known could be brought to bear upon them.

Notice taken that forty Members are not present; House counted, and forty Members being found present,

MR. O'BEIRNE resumed, I much regret that so much time has been lost by so useless a proceeding as has just been adopted by the hon. Gentleman behind me (Mr. Monk). It will of course be a question between the hon. Gentleman and his constituents whether the latter will approve of this attempt of his to keep back what I have stated is a grave public question, involving the expenditure of millions of money which, as I have asserted, has so far been uselessly expended, and with reference to which I have been earnestly, and I hope briefly, endeavouring to explain to the House the grounds upon which I have formed these opinions. The immediate object which led me to draw attention to the subject at this late period of the Session was this—I desired to impress on the right hon. Baronet the Secretary for War the necessity of giving to the House some assurance as to what his future policy will be with regard to this matter. I wished to recall the attention of hon. Members before the close of the present Session—before this House had sat for the last time—to a subject which I believe to be of serious moment, which has frequently and for a long period occupied public consideration, and which I believe to be second to no other in the general interest it has excited throughout the country. I have now only to ask the right hon. Baronet, whether after the various experiments to which I have alluded, and the results which I have stated, he will give the House some hope that he will stop further expenditure on fortifications and shields until we shall have attained, either by the Report of the Committee which he has himself appointed, or by further experiments, should they be considered necessary, such a degree of certainty as our present scientific knowledge will enable us to reach with reference to this most intricate and difficult question? I ask the right hon. Baronet whether he means to stay his hand and to prevent further outlay, or whether he means to accept before the House and before the country the grave responsibility which will fall upon him and his Colleagues should he persevere in the wasteful application of the public money to a system of fortifications which all the information we now possess emphatically and beyond all question declares to be entirely unsuited to the purposes of defence of our arsenals and dockyards for which they were intended?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had no reason to complain of the course taken by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. O'Beirne) in bringing this matter under the consideration of the House; and he thought the practical reason assigned by the hon. Gentleman at the close of his speech for submitting this question was fair, just, and reasonable. He (Sir John Pakington), however, regretted, under the peculiar circumstances of the Session, that the hon. Gentleman should have felt himself compelled at that moment to raise such a question, because he confessed that he was not in a position to give so distinct and decided an answer to the hon. Gentleman's inquiry as he should be able to do if the matter were mentioned a few days later. The important experiments which took place at Shoeburyness upon the Plymouth target were carried on under the superintendence of the Committee especially appointed for the purpose. From that Committee he expected a full Report of their judgment of the result of those experiments, and until he had received that Report he thought the hon. Gentleman himself would admit it was impossible for him to come to a conclusion upon the course he should think it his duty to take. He could not, however, help remarking he thought the hon. Gentleman had a little exaggerated the effect of the firing on the Plymouth target. The Plymouth fort was no doubt designed to resist most powerful artillery, but not precisely the guns of that day. The hon. Gentleman had indeed pointed out the distinction between the guns in favour some few years ago and those at the present period; but he did not apply that distinction as he ought to have done to the experiments which were tried the other day at Shoeburyness. Those experiments of firing to which the target was exposed were of extraordinary force. The order which he (Sir John Pakington) had given upon this subject was that the fort to be fired at should be placed at the nearest possible distance at which an enemy's ship could approach in a time of war—namely, about 200 yards, and that it should be exposed to the fire of a 22-ton gun, with a full charge like the Armstrong gun. The hon. Gentleman must, however, candidly admit that the fort was not originally designed to bear the firing of a gun of that kind, such a gun not having been known at the time the fort was designed, and he was sure that he would also admit that an enemy's ship could hardly approach to within 200 yards of the fort, considering the ordinary chances of war. The hon. Gentleman said that the target on that occasion was knocked to pieces after a few days' battering. He (Sir John Pakington) indeed believed that the target was in a very infirm condition; but it must not be forgotten that it had been exposed to a trial of most extraordinary severity, and competent judges were disposed to think that the resisting power of the target was very considerable. There existed no defect in the principle on which the fort was constructed, and there was nothing to prevent its being made a very valuable and efficient one by taking advantage of the experience derived from the trial, and adding to the strength of the structure. He did not think that the hon. Gentleman was justified in his remark that the result of the trial showed that the fort was entirely inefficient for the purpose it was designed for. The old complaint had been revived that some alteration had been made in the construction of the fort; but on questioning some persons concerned in its construction he was informed that, though in one part there was an additional layer of iron, in other parts the alteration was very trifling. He did not admit that it was right to refuse permission to individuals who had the responsibility of building such structures to avail themselves from time to time of fresh inventions and discoveries, so that the fortifications might be as fit for their purpose as it was possible to make them. In reference to the trial of the Millwall shield, which took place within the last few days, it would, he thought, be premature to express any opinion upon those experiments. Judging, however, from the newspaper reports he had seen he had reason to believe that that shield had stood the firing to which it was exposed extremely well. He should be the last person to refuse the credit that was justly due to the contriver of that shield; but still, he repeated, it would be premature to pronounce an opinion upon its merits merely from the statements they read in newspaper reports. He would remind the hon. Gentleman, when he said that the Millwall shield the day before yesterday was exposed to the same kind of trial as was the Gibraltar shield last autumn, that it was not exposed to the same trial to which the Plymouth fort was exposed with the 22-ton gun. If he (Sir John Pakington) were not mistaken he had seen a further statement in the newspaper accounts of the Millwall experiments, which strongly contrasted with the complete success reported to have been achieved — namely, a statement to the effect that great pains had been taken to give support to the Millwall shield by certain artificial erections behind it. If that were the case it must necessarily deduct from the value of the construction ; but he should very shortly receive a Report of the experiments from the same Committee that had superintended the experiments with the Plymouth target. In reply to the inquiry put to him by the hon. Gentleman, he should certainly exercise what appeared to him to be necessary caution under such circumstances. He could not give a definite answer to the hon. Gentleman until he had in his hand those interesting and important Reports referred to. Whilst, on the one hand, he was unwilling to interpose any unnecessary delay in this matter, on the other hand he felt that the result of those experiments imposed a heavy responsibility upon the Government not to proceed further in this direction without the fullest consideration of the Reports which were yet to be presented.

LORD ELCHO said, he thought that the hon. Gentleman who brought this subject forward deserved the thanks of the House, for his observation led him to the conclusion that the most ungrateful task which could fall to the lot of any Member on his side of the House was to submit for discussion any question relating to mal-administration in a great public Department, or to endeavour to bring about a reduction of expenditure. On such occasions the financial Reformers were generally absent, or, if present, cheered anything which fell from a Government official with a view to throwing a shield over mal-administration. No sooner did an hon. Gentleman propose to bring forward an important question like that under consideration than he was asked not to take up the time of the House, and thereupon the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) cheered. Immediately afterwards another great financial Reformer, the hon. Member for Gloucester, got up and moved that the House be counted. The subject under discussion was one which concerned the national safety, and the due and proper expenditure of a vast amount of public money, and the hon. Member for Cashel (Mr. O'Beirne) had brought it forward that day upon a clear understanding with the Leader of the House. What he complained of was that these forts had been contracted for without the system upon which they were constructed having been previously adequately tested, and the result had been that a large sum of money had been expended upon forts which were totally inefficient. On entering the railway carriage to go down to witness the trial of the Plymouth shield a paper was put into their hands which informed them that the trial was to be inductive only and not actual; that the guns were to be fired with reduced charges, at 200 yards, in order to ascertain the exact effect that would be produced were the guns fired at 1,000 yards with full battering charges. They were informed by that paper that no ship could come within 500 yards of a fort, whereas Admiral Dacres, Admiral Milne, and Sir John Hay told them that vessels could easily be taken within 200 yards of the forts, and that if a vessel was to be sunk a captain would sooner have her sunk in shoal water than in deep water. On the matter being pointed out to the right hon. Gentleman, he at once, on arriving at Shoeburyness, directed that the experiments should be conducted with full battering charges, an alteration in the programme that greatly astonished the Committee. The Plymouth fort was designed and tendered for to meet the gun of the period, but instead of that it was tested with the 22-ton gun, which was now said to be invented after the fort was designed. That was the whole point at issue. The Gibraltar shield and Plymouth fort were never tested before they were designed and constructed, and the consequence was that they went to pieces. If the subject had not been brought before the House the Bermuda and Gibraltar shields would have been put up at all the important ports. The fact was that they were designed by a Gentleman in the War Office on his own hook, without taking any account of the valuable information on the point possessed by the Admiralty. That Department had conducted a series of experiments, and had laid down certain data, which, if followed, would have prevented these continual complaints; but in spite of that they went on constructing Department shields at a great expense, which were proved defective, happily under fire of our own guns; whereas, if the course of these financial

Reformers had been adopted on this point, which involved national safety, honour, and economy, the first notice the public would have had would have been the crumbling of these forts under the fire of the enemy's gun.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he was under the impression that the 22-ton gun was invented when the Plymouth forts were invented.

Mr. HENLEY said, that owing to the assistance which the Government received from amateurs or from some other cause, the expenditure upon the army and navy had been enormously increased of late years. He protested against the time of the House being occupied by a discussion of this kind when they had met for the purpose of considering a specific measure.

Mr. MONK, in reply to the taunt of the noble Lord (Lord Elcho) denied that hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House were anxious to obstruct measures for the reduction of expenditure. Few Members were more regular in their attendance than he (Mr. Monk) was when Supply was taken, and he invariably voted for reduction of expenditure; but he was unaware that any practical good would result from the discussion which had been raised to-day. The noble Lord (Lord Elcho) and the hon. Member (Mr. O'Beirne), however, had doubtless accomplished their object, which was to "air their oratory."

Mr. FAWCETT protested against the unnecessary attack which the noble Lord (Lord Elcho) had made upon him in accusing him of not being a sincere financial reformer. He expressed disapproval at this Motion having been brought forward at a time when they were brought down to consider a most important Bill for the prevention of bribery and corruption at Parliamentary Elections. So far as he (Mr. Fawcett) knew the noble Lord had never yet voted in favour of a Motion for the reduction of expenditure.

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS (*re-committed*) BILL—[Bill 63.]

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 17th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir FRANCIS GOLDSMID moved the following clause:—

"Whenever any person who shall have been a candidate at any Election (whether he shall or shall not have been returned at such Election) shall be reported by the Judge who tries a Petition complaining of such Election, to have been, by himself or his agents, guilty of bribery or treating at such Election, all votes which shall have been given for such candidate at such Election shall be deemed to have been thrown away, in like manner as if he had, at the time of such Election been incapable of being elected, and as if notice of such incapacity had been given to every elector immediately previous to his voting: Provided always, That no other person who shall have been a candidate at such Election shall be deemed to have been duly elected thereat, in consequence of the votes given for the candidate who shall be reported guilty of bribery or treating being deemed to have been thrown away, unless at least one-third of the registered electors entitled to vote at such Election shall have voted thereat for such other candidate."

The hon. Baronet said his proposition was founded upon the principle, not of inflicting penal consequences upon those guilty of bribery, but of removing all temptation to commit the offence, and making bribery defeat its own object by leaving the briber outside that House instead of bringing him into it.

Clause (Votes for candidates guilty of bribery thrown away,) — (*Sir Francis Goldsmid,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he had done everything he could and adopted every suggestion that appeared likely to put an end to bribery and corruption, unless the proposal were carried to an extent that seemed to him unjust. It was once said that a Judge put an end to a practice which during his time was very rife, of captains ill-treating their seamen, by hanging an innocent captain. The practice might have been put an end to by hanging that captain, but he objected to the means by which the end was accomplished. He objected to this clause because he believed it to be unjust to the constituency. The question was not how it would work in one but in every instance. He would take the case of a constituency of 3,000 electors, one candidate polling 1,000 and the other 2,000. If four or five cases of corruption among the majority were proved, the effect of this clause would be practically to disfranchise the great majority of the constituency, against whom there was no imputation. That seemed to him unjust. Besides, the successful candidate would be exposed to great danger. What a temptation would be held out to any four or five persons to come forward and say they had voted for the successful candidate and were improperly dealt with. It would be impossible to meet such a case. The minority would be represented during the Parliament, the successful candidate would be disqualified, and the great bulk of the constituency practically disfranchised.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, the House was on its trial. The principle of the plan proposed by the hon. Baronet (Sir Francis Goldsmid) was introduced by the present Government in the Reform Bill. They had paltered with electioneering corruption till the money question had become the disgrace of English electioneering, and they must apply a drastic remedy by the establishment of a pure tribunal. He should support the clause.

Colonel WILSON-PATTEN said, the clause would lay candidates open to all kinds of tricks and snares; and any Member's seat could be taken from him if it were passed. A couple of clever lawyers could put upon it any interpretation they liked.

Mr. HENLEY said, he did not think they would succeed in stopping corruption by attempting to do so by means of such gross injustice as formed the basis of this clause. It would admit to the House Members who had polled only one-third of the number of electors. The good feeling of every man must revolt against it.

Mr. LOWE maintained that the argument of the Solicitor General was put too high when he placed it on justice and the rights of the majority. How did they respect the rights of the majority now? In cases of bribery the votes of the majority actually went for nothing; but the question, which was one not of justice but expediency, was this—given, a case of bribery proved against the successful candidate; given, another candidate petitioning who had polled one-third of the votes; was it most for the good of the public and for the cause of purity—which they all had at heart—that the minority should be represented during the then Parliament, or that those who had had their pockets filled should at a new election have an opportunity of reaping a double harvest? As the votes have been thrown away so far as the return of one candidate is concerned, they should be equally thrown away as against his opponent. He thought the clause offered a great encouragement to purity. There was no injustice or iniquity in it of any kind.

Mr. KINGLAKE explained that he had on the Paper a Motion to add to the clause a provision that any candidate petitioned against shall be able to present a counter Petition, and the defeated candidate must clear himself of imputation before his Petition against the elected candidate shall be heard. The question was whether the House would not merely constitute a tribunal, but make it the duty or interest of some one to put its machinery in action. Under the present system it was neither the duty nor the interest of any one to be a Petitioner. It was very rare indeed that the person petitioning gained the seat by it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL contended that the clause would operate with the greatest possible injustice to the large majority of the electors in a borough. A successful candidate who was perfectly innocent would be exposed to this danger—a person who represented himself to be an agent who had opened a public-house and fraudulently treated or bribed some three or four individuals might come forward and say, "I bribed these men; I can show you how not only to unseat the Member, but to disqualify him, disfranchise the great majority of the constituency, and transfer the seat to a candidate who had polled only one-third of the voters." This was a question, not of expediency, but of justice. The clause seemed to him to carry the penalty too far.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, there was no such thing as an immaculate borough, with only two or three black sheep. The character of a borough was well known in the bribery market. The clause of the hon. Member for Reading (Sir Francis Goldsmid) went directly to the root of the evil. The Bill was the keystone of the arch of Reform.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR said, the great objection to this clause was that by its operation an injustice would be done to the opinions of the majority. Now, either that majority was tainted with the corruption of the candidate, or it was not. If it were, it ought to be punished as well as the candidate; if it were not, then it would be only too glad to get rid of a corrupt Member.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, the objection was, not that they got rid of a corrupt Member, but that they were also saddled with one to whose opinions they had the greatest objection.

Question put, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 48; Noes 79: Majority 31.

MR. FAWCETT brought forward a clause, the substance of which, and of a supplementary clause, he explained to be to throw the expense of elections upon the county or borough rates; but that, with a view to prevent clearly unnecessary and vexatious contests, a condition was annexed which was adopted with good effect in Australia, that the candidate should deposit a sum with the returning officer as a pledge of his sincerity in the contest. He had fixed the sum at £100, but he was willing to consult the feeling of the House, and either to diminish or to increase the sum. In order to prevent the constituency being put to unnecessary expense, he proposed that this sum should be forfeited if the defeated candidate did not poll one-tenth of the number of votes recorded for the successful candidate who was lowest on the poll. Here, again, he was in the hands of the House as to the exact numbers, as he only was anxious to affirm the principle. It was objected to this plan that the constituencies might not like it, and that Members might be afraid to disoblige their constituencies. In answer to that he could only say that the subject had been before the public for a long time—it had been discussed in all the papers, and he had received many hundreds of letters upon it; but there was not a single one that did not express the warmest approval of the scheme. Then it was said that this scheme would encourage unnecessary contests; but he did not think that would be the case. Everybody knew that at present the contests were got up mainly by solicitors and agents, and this scheme would rather have a tendency to check that course. Besides, the expenses of the municipal elections were all defrayed by the rates, and he was at a loss to understand why the county elections should not be defrayed in the same manner. It was the general opinion that the cost of elections was the great danger to the Constitution. If something were not done. and that speedily, to check the evil, it would be impossible in a few years to obtain a seat in the House except by a large expenditure of money, and he thought there was a danger to the Constitution in such a state of things.

Clause—

(Providing for returning officers' expenses out of rates.)

"At every Election for any county or borough, the expenses lawfully incurred by the returning officers for the provision of hustings, poll clerks, polling booths or rooms, and any other necessary requisites for the conduct of the Election, shall be defrayed in the case of any county from the county rate, and in the case of any borough out of the monies, and in the manner and proportions mentioned in the Act of the sixth year of Victoria, chapter eighteen, section fifty-five, with respect to the expenses of carrying into effect the provisions of that Act; and the account of such expenses shall be made, allowed, and paid in the manner provided in the said Act: Provided, That it shall not be lawful for any person to be nominated as a candidate at any such Election, unless he or some person on his behalf shall, before one o'clock in the afternoon of the day preceding the day of nomination, have paid to the returning officer the sum of one hundred pounds to be applied in the following manner (that is to say): where a poll shall take place at any such Election, the returning officer shall apply the monies so paid to him by any such candidate who shall not, at the close of the poll, have received a number of votes equal at least to one-tenth part of the votes received by the successful candidate, if only one, or by such one of the successful candidates if there shall be more than one, as shall have received the smallest number of votes, in and towards defraying the lawful expenses of the returning officer relating to such Election; and after any such Election the returning officer shall forthwith repay to any such candidate who shall have been declared elected without a poll, or who, whether declared elected or not, shall have received a number of votes equal at least to such tenth part, the monies so paid by or for him as aforesaid,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*)

—*brought up,* and read the first time.

MR. DISRAELI said, the question in which the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) was interested had also been treated by another Member of the House —the hon. Member for Middlesex (Mr. Labouchere)—and he confessed that if the House were to adopt the principle of the measure the proposition of the hon. Member for Middlesex seemed to him to be the simplest and the most sensible of the two. But he objected to the proposition, because the rates of the county had been so burdened of late that he thought they ought to lie fallow for a time, and that it would be unwise in a Bill for the suppression of corruption to introduce this invidious principle of increasing the rates. But there was another objection. This was a Bill to prevent corrupt practices, and he had yet to learn that the payment of the expenses of the returning officer by a candidate was a corrupt practice. It was not connected with the subject-matter of the Bill, and on these two grounds he must oppose the clause.

MR. LABOUCHERE observed that the payment of returning officers' expenses became a corrupt practice by the excessive charges which were made in some cases.

MR. CORRANCE: Knowing that some difference of opinion exists on this side of the House upon the merits of the question now before us, I may ask to be allowed to say a few words, which will, at least, explain my own conduct upon it. It seems to me an eminently unsatisfactory result of the present Reform Bill that it should tend, both in county and town, to increase the expenses of elections. And no less so, that on the part of Her Majesty's Government no effort of a *bonâ fide* nature has been made, at least as far as counties are concerned, to lessen that expense. First, the voting papers were quietly dropped out, and no further effort was made to retain the principle, even as far as out-county voters were concerned. On two occasions I endeavoured to bring this question before the House. I met no support, notwithstanding its importance to Members on this side the House. Let me confess that it caused me great regret. Then came the question of conveyance; and Clause 23 was struck out. It was, indeed, revived as far as the boroughs were concerned; but, although we were warned of its importance to ourselves by the right hon. Member for South Lancashire, I was once more unsuccessful in calling the attention of the Government to the point. No alternative was offered to me, and no effort made to meet the obvious want. On the other hand, by every provision of this Reform Bill, the expenses will be increased. Now, let me ask, to what result? The return of rich men, no doubt, and the representation of wealth. Now, there does seem to me to be a certain amount of danger in this if pushed beyond a certain point. I know it may seem to some a consistent thing that in a wealthy county representatives should be rich, and very consonant to social conditions that we should be governed thus; but let the House remember this—that among the constituencies there will not fail to be men, and these of no ordinary class, who will object to be thrown in with the lot, and who view with great repugnance a Government based upon such a mercantile principle as this; and that there may arise no small danger and inconvenience from such a source. It seems to me that we have already experienced the disadvantage of this; and it is as the representative of an agricultural community that I say this. I have asserted that we have something to complain of, and even some wrongs to be redressed; and though this is denied by the right hon. Member for South Lancashire, I repeat it as a fact. Well, perhaps it is our own fault, due to the state of our representation in this House. From such a cause our estates have been wasted and our choice of Members restricted greatly to our loss. There has been wanting even the stimulus of competition to such men to induce them to qualify for the post; and of this we feel the result in our present position in this House. Now, of these things I speak as one personally unconcerned, and I ask hon. Members to place themselves on the same footing while they consider this. It is a public question of no slight importance, and should be considered in no other light. One thing alone prevents us from accepting it—that it adds even slightly to the rates. I have stated my opinion firstly fully upon this, that such taxation is often illegal and always unjust upon its present base. I cannot consent to add to such burdens, even for so great an object as this; and unless the hon. Gentleman can propose some alternative I must decline to record my vote.

MR. BAINES argued that the Act of last year would greatly increase the necessary expenses of elections; and if those expenses were to be thrown on the candidates, it would be tantamount to restoring the old property qualification for Members, which had been abolished some years since by Parliament as wrong in principle. In Leeds the number of electors had been increased from 7,000 to upwards of 35,000; and as no more than 500 votes could be recorded under the Reform Act at any one polling-place, there must be between sixty and seventy polling places. It was customary to have at each polling-place a deputy returning officer at three guineas, a clerk at a guinea, besides messengers; and without the check which municipal management would certainly impose the expenses would be enormous. However prejudicial this might be to candidates, it would be still more injurious to those lately admitted to the franchise; for the votes conferred upon them would be of no use if we diminished the number of those out of their own class who could be returned to Parliament, by increasing the expenses of elections and throwing them on the candidates. A greater evil could not be inflicted on the constituencies than to reduce the number of those who might be fairly and justly called upon to represent them; and the House had been repeatedly appealed to from both sides to enable those to enter it who in interests and feelings were identified with the classes forming so considerable a portion of the large constituencies. The objection to imposing a new tax upon the rates was met in principle by the fact that the Reform Act extended the franchise to every ratepayer. When comparatively few of the ratepayers had votes, it would have been unjust to throw the expenses of elections on the whole body; but now that all the ratepayers were enfranchised, it was just and reasonable that all should contribute to the expenses attendant on the giving of their votes. The Parliamentary Committee of the Leeds Town Council had considered the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Fawcett), and approved of it. It was idle to suppose that any undue number of the working classes would be returned to Parliament. It would always be so expensive to live in London and to devote one-half of the year to Parliamentary Business, that there was no probability that any large number of Members in humble circumstances would enter the House; there was no fear that property would not always be well represented; and, under these circumstances, it seemed that the Amendment proposed was the necessary corollary of the extension of the franchise which had already been made.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he was much interested to hear the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Baines) so well describe the evils and dangers of a system of which he had been a most distinguished advocate. Not one of the labouring classes, if his statements were true, would ever be able to set his foot within those doors as the advocate of his class. It was an excellent illustration of the maxim—*Necis artifices arte perire sua.*

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he must give his vote in favour of the clause. He viewed with great regret the addition of any charges to the rates of this country; but the chief importance of the clause was as to its effect on the borough franchise. On the part of the community at large it would really effect a very considerable economy, because it had a tendency to prevent wasteful expenditure. It was a mistake to suppose that the expense connected with contested elections fell upon the candidate alone. In a multitude of ways it was a burden upon the community; and with a view to the interests of the ratepayers it would be desirable to have this provision. He regarded the clause as proceeding upon a sound principle. It was time Parliament expressed a judgment, especially with the widely extended constituency, as to the true nature of Parliamentary duties, and decided whether sitting and voting in the House was a privilege to be enjoyed by the individual or a duty to be performed towards the community. In his judgment it was a duty performed towards the community, and preaching upon the subject would be greatly strengthened by enactments showing that it was regarded as a duty. Of course, it would be unjust to impose upon the community any election expenses which could be regarded as optional; yet the essential and necessary expenses ought to be borne by the community. As to the bearing of the clause or some such clause upon the admission of rich men and poor men into the House, it was impossible not to feel the force of the arguments of the hon. Member for Leeds (Mr. Baines). It would be worse than ridiculous to admit all classes to the franchise, and yet to continue arrangements which practically limited the choice of candidates. He thought that to hold it was necessary for the safety of our institutions to prevent poor men from coming into that House was a most pernicious doctrine. On the contrary, in his opinion, nothing could be more desirable, with reference to the safety of those institutions, than that the artizans—the working classes—should be represented by men of their own order. Of course, they could not have many of that class in the House of Commons. There were barriers to it which no legislation had imposed; but let not Parliament impose other barriers — hard legal ones. The coming into Parliament of such men would be most beneficial to all classes. It would do more than anything else could do to strengthen the confidence of the people in the Imperial Parliament. He did not think this clause would effect much in the way of admitting those men; but, at least, it would remove a very odious barrier to their admission.

Mr. BONHAM-CARTER said, he was

in favour of the principle on which the clause was framed; but should prefer the clause of which the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. W. Beaumont) had given Notice—that one half the expense should be paid out of the rates.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the point which had been for some time under discussion was undoubtedly one of very considerable importance; but as that point had no reference to corrupt practices, he thought the proposed clause would be very much out of place in that Bill. The principle of the clause was one which deserved more consideration than could be given to it on the present occasion. It might be said that the counties and boroughs ought to bear the expenses of the elections; but he thought that principle was open to question. Suppose a Member of Parliament accepted an office in the Government, his appointment to which made it necessary that he should go to his constituents, ought the expenses of the election to be charged on the county or the borough, as the case might be?

Mr. J. STUART MILL: Is it fair or reasonable to take advantage of a technical difficulty in order to leave a question of this sort undecided until after the next election? If in a purely legal point of view it does not belong to the subject of corrupt practices, yet it belongs to a system of measures of which that relating to corrupt practices is the completion. Unless it be agreed to, the system will be left incomplete, and the Reform Act will, in some important respects, actually deteriorate the representation, for its practical effect will be to bring us nearer to a plutocracy than we ever have been before. I would most earnestly appeal to the hon. Member for Suffolk (Mr. Corrance), who has made so excellent a speech in favour of the proposition, to put for the present in abeyance his objections to any additional burthen on the local rates — objections in which, as I have stated on a former occasion, I in part agree, and which will certainly, with the whole subject of the incidence of rates, come under the early consideration of the new Parliament. I beg him to trust the fairness and sense of justice of the future House of Commons, and not to resist a provision required for the beneficial working of our political institutions, because it involves a very small, and probably temporary, addition to the local expenditure.

Mr. CORRANCE said, to the proposal made there was but one objection he could entertain—that it fell upon one kind of property, and not upon the whole, as it ought. Hon. Gentleman had promised their assistance to remove that, and he closed with the offer held out, and should claim it in due time and place, and upon that distinct understanding he would give his vote.

Mr. W. B. BEAUMONT, while preferring his own proposal, would give his support to the second reading of the hon. Member for Brighton's clause.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, it would no doubt be agreeable enough to Members not to be called upon to pay these expenses; but it should be remembered that the county rates were very heavy, and the borough rates so overpowering that in many places they could hardly be collected. Yet they were now asked to pass a clause which was admitted to have nothing to do with corrupt practices—the proper subject of this Bill. Far from lowering the expenses, it would in all probability increase them by diminishing the interest of individual candidates to keep them down.

Mr. WHITE did not hesitate to say that, taking into consideration the economy which would be practised if this charge were forced upon the constituencies, the burden on the property of the country would not exceed $\frac{1}{4}$*d.* in the pound.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY expressed his opinion that the Government were acting disgracefully in raising technical objections to the clause, which would certainly receive his hearty support. This was the first occasion on which any attempt had been made to diminish the expenditure at elections.

Question put, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 78; Noes 69: Majority 9.

Mr. W. B. BEAUMONT moved an Amendment in the hon. Member for Brighton's clause as to expenses of returning officers, &c., to the effect that one-half of these expenses shall be paid out of the rates.

Mr. BAINES trusted the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. W. B. Beaumont) would not persevere with his Motion, which was founded half in injustice and half in justice. The whole of the official expenses at municipal elections were paid out of the borough rates.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he was under the impression that there had been a distinct understanding between himself and the hon. Member for Northumberland to the effect that if his scheme were rejected the hon. Member should introduce his Amendment. On his part, he promised that, in the event of his own proposal being rejected, he would vote for that of his hon. Friend. He was somewhat surprised to find, therefore, that his hon. Friend had now deemed it necessary to bring forward his Amendment.

Mr. MONK hoped the hon. Member (Mr. W. B. Beaumont) would not withdraw his Amendment. He should not have voted with the hon. Member for Brighton if he had not understood that the hon. Member for Northumberland intended, if the clause were carried, to move his Amendment.

Mr. M. T. BASS said, he could not see that there had been any misunderstanding in the matter. He trusted that the hon. Member for Northumberland would not press his Amendment.

Mr. GLADSTONE was also of opinion that there had been no violation of any understanding; but at the same time urged the withdrawal of the Amendment.

Mr. HENLEY said, that they had been told that Gentleman went down to constituencies ticketed at the amount of money they could spend. He never heard of that before; but the authority was so good, he daresay the statement was true. If a candidate were saved the necessary expenses of an election, he would have so much more money to spend in bribery.

Mr. W. B. BEAUMONT said, he would withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. BOUVERIE objected to the proviso of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) providing that no candidate should be named unless before the day of nomination he should have deposited £100 with the returning officer. A proposal of that nature proceeding from the Liberal side of the House was calculated to make hon. Members' hair stand on end. It was the common right of the electors at an election to nominate anybody who was a subject of the Queen and of full age as a candidate for the constituency.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, the House would be glad to learn that anyone could be nominated and elected who was not in possession of £100, but whose friends were willing to put down £100 for him.

Mr. LIDDELL said, he doubted whether it was competent for the House, except in Committee of Ways and Means, to impose burdens upon rates, as had been done by the last division.

The CHAIRMAN intimated that the vote was quite in Order.

Viscount MILTON said, the clause which had just been agreed to contained no reference to the county of York or those other counties which were split up into divisions. He moved the addition at the end of the clause of the words—

> "Provided always that in case the county at which the county rate is made is or shall be divided into two or more parts for Parliamentary representation, then the same expenses shall be charged and defrayed by and out of the county rate levied for that part of the county for which the election takes place."

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER thought the principle of the Amendment was sound, as it would be unjust to saddle a whole county with the expense of an election for one of its divisions. But in most counties at present the county rate was indivisible, and there was no machinery for separating it. It would, therefore, be necessary to add some words to the Amendment to provide machinery for dividing the rate.

Mr. W. B. BEAUMONT said, there were many parishes that were partly in one division and partly in another.

Mr. BOUVERIE regarded this as an example of the difficulties in which the House had involved itself by accepting the clause. He approved of the principle of the Amendment; but he suggested that the noble Lord (Viscount Milton) should withdraw it for the present, and bring it up in a more practicable form at a future stage of the Bill.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the whole question was one of policy, not of words. The difficulty of dividing the rates would apply not only to counties but even to certain boroughs, where the parishes were not conterminous with the borough. There was neither time nor opportunity to carry into effect a policy of this kind, nor had the House given sufficient consideration to the subject.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE believed, that where there was a will there was a way, would not be frightened by the time argument, and would leave the counties to pay for divisional elections rather than sacrifice the clause that had been carried.

Mr. LEEMAN, as a practical man, said, there was no difficulty whatever in arranging the matter and properly apportioning the county rate.

MR. LOCKE also thought that there would be no difficulty in apportioning the expenses among the different districts of a county.

MR. CHILDERS said, the Committee had passed by a small majority, but after a considerable discussion, a very important clause, involving a new principle, and he thought it would be undesirable that they should now proceed to the consideration of matters of detail. He would therefore suggest that the noble Lord (Viscount Milton) should withdraw his Amendment, and that the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) should allow the proviso to be struck out of the clause on the understanding that upon the Report these two questions would be fully considered, and provision made respecting them.

MR. WYLD observed, that many hon. Members had voted for the clause who would not have voted for the proviso. He himself was under the impression that he was voting for the clause alone.

VISCOUNT MILTON expressed his readiness to withdraw his Amendment, with a view to afford an opportunity for a more careful consideration of the subject.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

MR. FAWCETT intimated, that he would not press his proviso at that moment if it were understood that they should hereafter have an opportunity of considering an amended proposal for the attainment of the same object. If hon. Members should think it a better arrangement he would have no objection to provide that the £100 should be deposited when a poll was demanded.

MR. WHITBREAD observed, that if the clause had been proposed without that proviso there were many hon. Gentlemen who would not have voted for it. He therefore suggested that the hon. Member for Brighton should withdraw the clause as a whole, and bring up a new one on the Report.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH thought that, before consenting to have the clause inserted in the Bill, the Committee should have a guarantee that some proviso would be inserted in it to prevent candidates who had no *bonâ fide* intention of contesting a seat from standing up on the hustings, getting themselves nominated, and then leaving the county or the borough to pay the expenses.

MR. BOUVERIE moved the omission of the proviso from the clause.

MR. HENLEY thought the proviso was a material element in the clause. The Committee were now asked to set aside the proviso and, for the present, to take the clause without it. He believed that there were many Members who would not have voted for the clause without the proviso.

MR. GLADSTONE observed, that inasmuch as the clause had not yet been added to the Bill nothing had been done to embarrass the Committee. He, and he believed many other Members, had voted for the clause without the slightest idea that they voted for the proviso. They had no notion when voting that the principle which they wished to affirm had been reduced to a practical shape.

MR. REPTON concurred in the view taken by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley).

MR. AYRTON thought the hon. Member for Brighton ought to make a statement of his plan.

MR. FAWCETT explained, that his whole speech in moving the clause was based upon the supposition that the proviso was to form a part of the clause. He would withdraw the proviso, in order to bring it up in an amended form on the Report.

Proviso, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 84; Noes 76: Majority 8.

Clause *added* to the Bill.

MR. CLAY said, the object of the declaration he proposed was to make it impossible for a gentleman to commit bribery and to hold up his head afterwards. He desired to make bribery an offence for which a man should be blackballed at his club and cut by his friends, for in that way alone could a proper stigma be attached to the offence. It was said that the declaration would catch the man with the sensitive conscience and not the unscrupulous man; but he must indeed be an unscrupulous man who could deliberately make the declaration at the table, knowing that it was false, and that its falsity was known to many others—those others his intimate friends and supporters. Some years ago, when he made a similar proposal, his hon.

Friend the Member for Nottingham (Mr. Osborne), in one of his most effective stage whispers, expressed wonder that he could be so green. He was simple enough to believe that the House of Commons contained the pick, not only of the intellect, but of the honour of England. To think otherwise would be treason to that great Assembly, the having been a Member of which, now for many years, had been the one only, and highly-prized illustration of his career. But if a man made the declaration falsely, there must be many who were acquainted with his lie; and if he escaped penalty, he could not escape disgrace, unless Englishmen were much changed indeed. Some years ago he proposed that making a false declaration should be treated as perjury; but on further consideration he thought it better to attach a penalty, to be given to the informer. He did not care about the amount, wishing it to be understood that it was not imposed as a punishment; for a man who had spent a large sum would think little of an extra £500. All he wanted was to offer a sufficient inducement to any one acquainted with the falsehood to come forward and expose it. By these means alone should we make the offence disgraceful and unworthy of a gentleman; and when we had made it so, he was certain it would not be committed by Members of the House.

Clause (Declaration to be subscribed by Members,)—(*Mr. Clay,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he hoped the Government would not accept the clause. They should pause before establishing new declarations like this when they had only just been engaged in abolishing a lot of the old promissory oaths. He believed that such declarations were only traps for tender consciences. They all knew when gentlemen had to make an oath that they had sufficient property qualification, that such oaths were constantly taken by persons who had not the qualification.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the Government would oppose the clause on the simple ground that these declarations had been very often tried and had invariably failed. They were, in fact, merely a means of putting difficulties in the way of tender consciences. Another reason why he opposed the clause was that the hon. Member who proposed it (Mr. Clay) did not trust hon. Members or believe that they would take it truly, but threatened to impose a penalty upon those who took it improperly. The penalty could not be exacted until a man had been convicted of bribery, and then he would be sufficiently punished, for he would be excluded from the House for seven years and liable to imprisonment. The declaration would only suffice to keep out of the House persons who might be afraid of the slightest accusation being brought against them, and making them feel they were henceforth unfit for the society of gentlemen.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, it was no great compliment to the House to represent that it consisted of persons whom a declaration upon honour would not bind. He himself thought a declaration on honour would bind the Members of the House, provided it was imposed with a serious intention of doing so. It had been too much the fashion to regard these declarations as mere forms; but they were so only when the engagement which they made was one which opinion did not really desire to enforce. The object should be to impress upon Members that the House was really in earnest and meant the declaration to be a sincere one. That object was sought to be obtained by the penalty of £500, and he thought this would be a means of enforcing the declaration.

Mr. J. LOWTHER suggested that a Member who could not subscribe to the declaration might wait until the time for the presentation of Petitions was passed.

Mr. CLAY denied that a declaration had been tried and failed. No man could take this declaration falsely without knowing it to be false and without knowing that the fact must be within the knowledge of others. When a man entered Parliament with a property qualification supplied to him by others for the purpose, the qualification was real and not fictitious, and the Member, therefore, could honestly make the declaration that used to be required. That a man was thus trusted with a property which he might appropriate to himself—and there was a case in which this had been done — was *primâ facie* evidence that he was a man of honour.

Mr. NEATE said, he thought the declaration would not meet the worst cases —those of boroughs, where it was well-known votes were bought, for the man who informed would be considered the basest of men.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE said, the strongest practical argument in favour of this declaration was that it would protect candidates against the election agents. A man might go down to contest a borough and tell his agents and canvassers that he intended to do so honourably and honestly. Under the old system agents might bribe unknown to the candidate until he received his election bills. The candidate in future, however, would be unable to take advantage of this device, because he would be unable to make the declaration.

MR. AYRTON said, the great difficulty was to find words which would attain the object. He could not conceive of words more cleverly suggestive of scruples and difficulties to conscientious men than the words of the clause. The declaration went beyond the only matter they had to consider, which was whether a man had done anything to disqualify him from sitting in the House Any declaration beyond that was one they had no right to ask a man to make. In one of the grossest cases of bribery that ever occurred the candidate was out of England at the time of the election; and the tendency of the clause would be to encourage the system of a candidate keeping aloof from the election, and of its being understood that it was the express duty of everybody about him to say nothing to him on the subject.

MR. SCHREIBER regarded the declaration as a protective in certain respects, which might prove advantageous.

MR. M. T. BASS felt persuaded that every clause of the Bill might be dispensed with if the one now under discussion were passed.

SIR FRANCIS GOLDSMID said, he thought the clause would lower the character of candidates by deterring the conscientious from candidature. He wondered anyone should attach importance to declarations of this kind, when officers constantly made and violated the declaration that they would not pay anything more than the regulation price for their commissions.

MR. P. WYKEHAM MARTIN said, the declaration would let in everybody who had no regard for their word, and would keep out the conscientious.

MR. DISRAELI said, that unless he could induce the Committee to assist him he saw considerable difficulties in the way of the progress of the Bill. Adopting the view of the Solicitor General, he did not wish to discuss the particular point before the Committee. He wished to induce hon. Members who had clauses to consent to the Bill being reported, and to bring them up on the Report. He could assure the Committee that the nicest calculation had been made on this matter, and it was of the utmost importance to the progress of of the Bill that that course should be adopted. Examining the Amendments he fixed upon three of importance in which it was desirable the Committee should express an opinion. They were those of the hon. Baronet the Member for Reading (Sir Francis Goldsmid), the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett), and the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Clay). They had yet to consider a most difficult question—the application of the Bill to Scotland and Ireland. This was now under the consideration of the Government, and he was by no means without hope that they would be able on the Report to make a proposition which would be satisfactory. If the Committee, after deciding the issue now before it, would consent to report the Bill, and to take the other Amendments on the Report that would immensely facilitate the progress of the Bill, and he should not despair of carrying it.

Question put, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 45; Noes 85: Majority 40.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Wednesday* next, and to be *printed.* [Bill 243.]

SAINT MARY SOMERSET'S CHURCH, LONDON, BILL.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* to a Select Committee of Eight Members: — Mr. BENTINCK, Mr. THOMAS CHAMBERS, Mr. WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE, Lord JOHN MANNERS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TITE, Mr. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE, and Mr. POWELL:—Three to be the quorum:—Leave given to the Committee to sit upon Monday.

TENURE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAND, &C. (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. REARDEN, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Tenure and Improvement of Land, the sale and purchase of Land and Tenants' interests, and the reclamation of Waste Lands in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. REARDEN and Mr. MICHAEL BASS.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 244.]

SCHOOLS AND TRAINING FACTORIES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Rearden, Bill for the Establishment of Primary and Industrial Schools and Training Factories in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Rearden and Mr. Leader.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 245.]

House adjourned at Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, July 20, 1868.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills—*First Reading*— Danube Works Loan * (272); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4) * (273); Colonial Shipping * (274).

Second Reading — Courts of Chancery and Exchequer (Ireland) Fee Funds * (171); Public Schools (262); Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment * (256); Municipal Elections (Scotland) * (263); Public Departments Payments * (264); Sir Robert Napier's Annuity * (265); Marriages Validity (Blakedown) * (271); New Zealand Company * (154); Turnpike Acts Continuance * (253, and passed).

Committee — Court of Session (Scotland) * (246-275).

Report — Burials (Ireland) (269); Bankruptcy Act Amendment * (270).

Third Reading — Ecclesiastical Commissioners * (259); Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment * (229); Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit * (237); Court of Justiciary (Scotland) * (232); Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland) * (233), and *passed.*

ARMY OF ABYSSINIA (VOTE OF THANKS).

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That he had received a Letter from Lieut.-General Lord Napier of Magdala, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., in return to the Thanks of this House and to the Resolutions of the 2d Instant, communicated to him in obedience to an Order of this House of the said 2d Instant: The said Letter being read as follows:—

"49, Cleveland Square, Hyde Park, July 18.

"My Lord,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated July 6th, communicating to me the resolution of the House of Lords, conveying the thanks of the House to myself and to Commodore Heath, C.B., Major-General Sir C. Staveley, K.C.B., Major-General George Malcolm, C.B., Major-General E. L. Russell, and Brigadier-General W. Merewether, C.B., and also the other officers of the navy and army. I have received the thanks of the House of Lords with a profound sense of the honour conferred upon me and also upon the other officers, the petty officers, and the non-commissioned officers and men of the navy and army engaged in the Abyssinian Expedition.

"I have taken the requisite steps to transmit the resolution to the officers named, and to communicate it to the several officers of the army and navy referred to.

"I regret extremely that this communication should have been accidentally delayed.

"I have the honour to be, my Lord, your most obedient servant,

"NAPIER OF MAGDALA.

"To the Right Hon. the Lord Chancellor."

Was Ordered to lie on the Table, and to be entered on the Journals.

THE CANNING STATUE.—QUESTION.

Lord CAMPBELL inquired of Her Majesty's Government, What Steps it is proposed to take with a View to replace on a fitting Site the Statue of Mr. Canning, in accordance with the general Opinion expressed last Session in the House against that on which it stands at present? The removal of the statue last year was condemned as an unwarranted though unintended diminution of the honour which had been paid to Mr. Canning. He had since heard ascribed to the Public Works Department the opinion that though the statue could not be replaced upon the site it had previously occupied, it would probably be placed in the centre of the open space and a few yards behind where it formerly stood.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, that none of their Lordships could have the slightest doubt of the disposition of the present or of any Government to comply as much as possible with the public taste in reference to such a matter s that to which the noble Lord's Question related; but the difficulty was to ascertain what that taste was. They all remembered the old proverb, *De gustibus non est disputandum*; and it was extremely difficult for any Government to ascertain precisely, amid the discordant opinions prevalent in such cases, what would really be the best course to follow. But, as to the facts, he could inform the noble Lord that, after the conversation with respect to the statue of Mr. Canning last year, the subject was again discussed in the House of Commons, which decided by a large majority that the present site was the one most desirable. The noble Lord seemed not to agree in this; but that was the information he derived from the best authority—the Office of Public Works. Subsequently to that, in a conversation with Lord John Manners, Mr. Westmacott also approved the present site. When Lord John Manners asked this year for a sum of £1,000 for the arrangement of the ground in front of which the statue stood, no objection was taken to the present position of the statue, although Lord John Manners referred to the matter. The Government, therefore, concluded that the present site was agreeable to the public; nor had they received any remonstrances on the subject from the family or admirers of the late Mr. Canning, which would certainly be attended to and treated with respect. There was a great difference between the circumstances of the case now and last year, when the conversation to which he had alluded took place. Then all the space which was now very handsomely enclosed was a sort of wilderness, and the statue looked as if it had been disrespectfully put out of view. But now the aspect of the place was quite changed; and, considering the general appearance of the ground, he could not agree with the noble Lord that there was anything in the position of the statue of which complaint could justly be made.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE admitted that an improvement had been effected in the appearance of the ground since last year, but still thought the position of the statue not satisfactory. In these matters there was something to be considered which was far beyond mere family feeling; for the memory of its departed great men was the heirloom of the nation. He hoped, therefore, that the expression of the opinion of the House in regard to this statue last year would receive due attention.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILL.—(No. 262.)

(*The Earl of Derby.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, I could hardly have acceded to the request made to me by some of my noble Friends near me that I should move the second reading of the Public Schools Bill unless I had felt sure that at this stage it was not likely to meet with opposition, or to give rise to any detailed discussion. It is difficult to imagine how any measure ever presented to your Lordships' consideration could have undergone more thorough examination or have received in its main principles more complete sanction than the Bill to which I have now to ask you to give a second reading. I would venture to remind your Lordships that in the year 1862 Her Majesty was pleased to issue a Commission to inquire into the management of the nine principal Schools of this country. That Commission was presided over by a noble Earl (the Earl of Clarendon) whom I see opposite, who conducted the inquiry with very great ability and very great diligence; and two other noble Lords, Friends of mine, were also distinguished Members of it. The Commission sat for, I think, a period of two years; it examined locally all the authorities and all the persons principally connected with those various establishments, and nothing could have been more searching or more complete than the examination and inquiry which they then made. They presented in the year 1864 a very comprehensive Report; and I am bound to say that whatever changes have since been made, and whatever investigations have since taken place, in the main the measure now submitted to your Lordships' consideration is founded on the recommendations made by that Commission. One of the points to which I believe the Commission agreed in attaching great importance—namely, that under the system now pursued at the Public Schools too exclusive an attention is given to the study of Greek and Latin, and too little attention to the modern languages. I should be the last to deprecate the study of the classical languages; but the Commissioners have been much misunderstood if it be supposed that their object, in recommending a larger introduction of modern languages, was to lower the standard of the Public Schools as a preparation for the Universities, although they thought that other branches of instruction might be usefully introduced. Before I go further, I would remark that, although no immediate result in a Parliamentary or legislative sense followed upon the Report, yet that the labours of the Commissioners were by no means fruitless. In regard to one of the Schools upon which the Commissioners reported in some respects unfavourably—the great school at Eton—a new Head Master, who is a relative of mine, has been appointed, and I rejoice in the amendment which has been apparent in that school. To show how far other branches of instruction beyond the classical languages have been introduced I will read a few lines which I have received from the Provost of Eton. He says—

> "There are at present 861 boys in the School. Of these, 761 are obliged to learn French. They have two hours a week at lessons and a French exercise. Nearly 300 of these 761 are also learning physical science (physical geography, mechanics, astronomy, hydrostatics, or optics), two hours a week and questions to answer. The first 100 in the school are compelled to learn some modern language, or physical science, or political economy. Of these, 28 are learning German, 11 Italian, 6 physical science, 7 political economy, the rest French."

This Paper shows that the recommendations of the Commissioners have not been barren of results. The principal recommendations of the Commissioners refer to the regulation of the new Governing Body to which is intrusted the duty of making very extensive alterations, partly by statute and partly by regulations. The statutes of the schools have reference to the foundation, endowments, and different fundamental rules of the College or School. These can only be altered by the authority of the Queen in Council, after due and ample notice has been given to all the parties interested. The regulations, as distinguished from the statutes, are those which principally apply to the discipline, studies, and numerous details of the School — and these may be introduced by the Governing Body without the sanction of an Order in Council. The Commissioners proposed to carry into effect the alterations they suggested; and my noble Friend (the Earl of Clarendon), in 1865, introduced a Bill of an important character to give effect to these recommendations. In illustration of the concurrence of opinion that led to this Bill, I may state that, on the Motion of my noble Friend, the Bill was referred to a Committee of your Lordships' House. They sat and took evidence. They allowed all the Schools to be represented — and they were very ably represented—before the Committee. I had the honour of being a member, and I must say that I never sat upon a Committee which gave a more dispassionate and industrious consideration to the subject referred to them. The Committee introduced considerable alterations into the plan. The Commissioners had in the Schedule of the Bill constituted the new Governing Body of the Schools. That was thought to be going too far in interference with the local and internal management of the Schools, and the Committee, with the concurrence of my noble Friend, struck out the Schedule which constituted the new Governing Body, and left the Governing Body as it had previously existed; but with the power of recommending reforms in their own constitution. In order to carry out those reforms, they appointed by name a number of Commissioners, without whose sanction no step could be taken by the Governing Body. It was by this time rather late in the Session, and the Bill was not carried to a third reading. In 1866, the same Bill was introduced with no modifications whatever; but at the next stage an alteration introduced by myself was carried by the narrow majority of 28 to 27, which took away from the Commissioners so to be appointed the power of altering the constitution of the Governing Body, unless the Governing Body themselves chose to make the alteration. I thought it was a very large and extensive power to place in the hands of the Commissioners—the power of naming the Governing Body. The Bill went down to the Commons at the close of the Session of 1866; but at that period of the Session there was but small chance of making successful progress with it, and in July the Order was discharged. In 1867, when I had the honour of being at the head of the Government, I thought it my duty to introduce the Bill precisely in the form in which it had received the assent of your Lordships. Then came the question of vesting in the Commissioners the power of altering the constitution of the Governing Body; and, although I still thought it better to send down precisely the same Bill, yet I said that if the Commons thought fit to make any alteration on that point I should not feel that I was bound to offer any opposition to such Amendments. That Bill was sent down early in the year—in fact, in the month of March, 1867. Your Lordships know the importance of the various subjects which engaged the attention of the other House during the whole of last Session, and it is not surprising that that House had not time to take this and other important measures into its consideration. Again, in the present year, other Bills connected with the great measure of last year have been submitted to the House of Commons, together with other questions more or less *apropos*, of which I shall say nothing, except that they occupied a great deal of time and prevented, until a late day, the progress of this Bill; so that it was only within the last few days that the measure was submitted to your Lordships' House. In the first place, therefore, the subject was inquired into by a Royal Commission. A Bill was then brought in, which was before your Lordships for three successive years, and was examined by a Select Committee. It went down to the House of Commons, where it was also referred to a Select Committee; and from that House the Bill has emerged in its present state. The main principle of the Bill has never varied from its first introduction, and has been acceded to by both Houses; and, under these circumstances, I hope it will not be found necessary by your Lordships to offer any opposition to the second reading. With regard to the composition of the Governing Body, a proposition has been made that does not altogether correspond either with the propositions first submitted to this House or the alteration made in it. The House of Commons has introduced a provision that the present Governing Bodies shall have the power for a limited time of reforming their own constitutions. It appears, however, to me that the time given for this proceeding is unnecessarily short, extending only until the 1st of January, 1869. That is a period of only five months; and it will probably be the month of November before the several Governing Bodies can meet to consider the subject. Whatever alteration they may make of the nature to which I have previously referred will have to be submitted for the consideration of the Queen in Council, and will not take effect until three months after being approved by Her Majesty in Council. The period allowed for any Governing Body to carry into effect the change in its constitution seems to me unnecessarily short; and although there is a provision by which the Crown may extend it for three months, the time will even then be so brief that I submit for your Lordships' consideration whether you concur with me in thinking that it might be usefully prolonged. In the event of the Governing Body taking no action, or no action approved by the Commissioners, within that short period, the Special Commissioners are then to have the power of taking into their own hands the composition of the Governing Body, and up to the 1st of January, 1870, or, if extended by the favour of the Crown, up to the 1st of January, 1871, the existing or reformed Governing Body is to have the power of framing statutes and regulations in pursuance of the provisions of this Bill. If the Governing Body, however, fail to satisfy the Commissioners with regard to such schemes and regulations before the 1st of January, 1870, or, if extended, before the 1st of January, 1871, the whole power devolves, as in the case of the Oxford and Cambridge Acts, upon the Special Commissioners of framing their schemes and regulations, the schemes being subject to the revision of the Committee of Privy Council, and two months elapsing before their coming into force, for the purpose of giving persons an opportunity of preferring objections. I presume that if the time is extended for the Governing Bodies to make their schemes and regulations, a corresponding extension will be allowed to the Commissioners, whose powers may be extended from the 1st of January, 1871, to the 1st of January, 1872, at which time the whole powers of the Commissioners lapse. With regard to the schemes and regulations now for the first time introduced into the Bill, your Lordships will find that the 7th clause enables the Commissioners to frame statutes as to the disposal of the income or property of the Schools, for the purpose of improving or enlarging the existing establishments or of establishing any subordinate or other Schools in connection therewith. There is a subsequent provision that no existing rights shall be interfered with; but the Commissioners will have power to regulate the income of future Wardens, Provosts, and Fellows. Now, there is a doubt whether such power was not included in the general powers of the Bill; but I have thought it right to call your Lordships' attention to the fact that this power is expressly given in this Bill, to the Governing Body in the first instance, and failing them, to the Special Commissioners. With regard to regulations, a provision has been introduced giving the Governing Body or the Special Commissioners power of making regulations which do not require the consideration of the Privy Council, for the purpose of giving facilities for the education of boys whose parents or guardians wish to withdraw them from the religious instruction of the School, and also for enabling boys other than boarders to attend school and participate in its educational advantages. Now, as to the latter, I doubt whether any such provision is necessary, for I recollect that when I was at Eton, considerably more than half a century ago, two little boys, aged five and six, whose parents resided at Windsor, were brought down every day, attended by their nursemaid, it being an object to enter as Collegers, at the earliest possible period, because no boy entering the same year was allowed to be placed above them in the School. Those boys were allowed to come to Eton and partake of all the instruction given there. Under what authority that was done, I do not know; but this Bill gives distinct authority for that purpose. I do not think that such a provision is likely to be extensively applied at Eton; whether it will have more extensive operation at Harrow, Rugby, and the other Schools, of which I have not the same knowledge, I cannot say. I understand a great effort was made in the House of Commons to make these last two powers compulsory on the Commissioners; but that House negatived the proposal, and have left it to the Governing Body or the Commissioners to decide whether or not they will extend the privileges of Eton by admitting boys whose parents wish to withdraw them from religious instruction, and also by admitting boys other than boarders to attend at the School for daily instruction. These, I think, are the only modifications of any consequence which the House of Commons have introduced into the Bill. They are matters for consideration in Committee; but they certainly would not justify your Lordships in offering any opposition to the second reading. I will now call your Lordships' attention to another point of great importance. Nothing can be larger than the powers which by this Bill are conferred upon the Special Commissioners, and it is, of course, of the utmost importance that those Commissioners should be persons commanding the confidence and respect of the country. Seven gentlemen were originally named; but from various causes only two of them remain on the present list—the most rev. Prelate who presides over the diocese of York and the Clerk of the Parliaments. The other gentlemen whose names now appear in the Bill are—the Marquess of Salisbury, the Recorder of London, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Coleridge, and Mr. Charles Stuart Parker. In the Bill as originally introduced the last name was that of a gentleman universally respected, the Rev. Canon Blakesley; but, for some reason—I know not what—his name was struck out when the Bill was in Committee in the House of Commons, and Mr. Parker's name was substituted. I have not the honour of personal acquaintance with either of those gentlemen, and I have no opinion to offer as to the propriety of the alteration; but I cannot help expressing great regret that any alteration of a personal character should have been made. At the same time, I am sure that no gentleman in that position would have the least desire that any personal interest or feeling should stand in the way of the passing of the Bill. There are several other questions on which I should not venture to express an opinion, such as the financial arrangement with regard to Westminster School. The Governing Body in the case of Westminster consists of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, with the Dean of Christ's Church, Oxford, and the Master of Trinity, Cambridge. Now, they have but a slight interest, if any, in the School; and it has been thought desirable—I have no doubt they themselves feel it desirable—that a new Governing Body should be appointed. It will therefore be necessary to make some arrangement with regard to the contribution to be made to the School, and a provision has been introduced by which, within a limited time, it shall be open to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and to the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, if they can agree, or if not, to either of them, to submit a scheme whereby the new Governing Body shall contribute to the School a sum not less than £3,500, and not exceeding £4,000, after deducting expenses of management. That is a question on which I understand the noble Earl at the head of the Commission will make some observations; but I presume they will be more fitly addressed to your Lordships when in Committee than at the present time. There are subordinate provisions affecting the different Schools; but considering the ordeals through which the Bill has passed, and the general assent given to it by your Lordships on previous occasions, and also by the House of Commons, I need not trespass further on your Lordships' time, and I will therefore conclude by asking you to give the Bill a second reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

The Earl of CLARENDON said, that as a Member of the Commission appointed six years ago and also of the Select Committee of this House, he thanked the noble Earl for his lucid explanation of the origin, progress, and general history of the Bill, which had freed him from the necessity of entering into some details which might otherwise have been necessary. He was glad to learn from the noble Earl's statement that the main principle recommended by the Commissioners, and founded upon the evidence given before them, had been in no respect departed from by the House of Commons. Seeing, however, that no intimation was given of a difference of opinion with respect to the principle of the Bill, and that such very little alteration was made in it at any stage of its progress, he regretted that so much time should have been spent in passing the Bill through the House of Commons. He knew very well that the time of the House of Commons last year was almost exclusively occupied with the Reform Bill, and that this year it was partly occupied with Reform Bills and partly with another subject; but as there always was an intention to send the Bill to a Select Committee, some steps should have been taken at an earlier period to expedite the measure. He did not think that the Bill should have come up to their Lordships' House at a period when they were told that they must absolutely pass it through its successive stages in the four or five following days. He hoped his noble Friend (the Earl of Derby) would consent to an extension of the period during which the Governing Bodies might reform themselves. It was not a very easy matter, and would not be done without considerable discussion. These Governing Bodies could not be brought together before November; and even if they were to agree more quickly than they could be expected to do, the assent of the Privy Council would be necessary, and before the arrangements could be made the time allowed to the Commission would have expired. He hoped, therefore, his noble Friend would consent to have the time enlarged. With respect to the Memorandum, a most satisfactory statement had been made by his noble Friend. And here he must take the opportunity of distinctly contradicting the allegations that the Commission over which he had had the honour to preside were opposed to the teaching of Latin. He certainly considered, and had often said in that House, that Latin should be the basis of every liberal education. But what the Commissioners complained of was that it was exclusively taught; and he must say that the Paper which his noble Friend had read fully justified the views of the Commission, and was an earnest of the great change which had occurred at Eton. But he begged their Lordships to bear in mind that all these alterations which his noble Friend had referred to had been made within the last six months. It appeared that now 761 boys, which was just 700 more than before, were learning French at Eton. The French Master in his evidence had stated that seventy boys were the maximum that had ever learnt any scrap of French, and he could not say that any real progress had been made. He (the Earl of Clarendon) remembered putting this question to the witness—"Having now been twenty years a French Master at Eton, your greatest ambition would be to be recognized?" and the answer was—"Exactly so." He would also recall to their Lordships' minds that when Dr. Balston was before the Committee, and was asked whether he did not think modern languages necessary to the liberal education of an English gentleman, he admitted that they were—that it was desirable to learn French, and that education was not complete without it; but he seemed to think that modern languages should be learnt somewhere else than at Eton. His noble Friend (the Earl of Derby) had alluded to the clause which he carried by the narrow majority of 1—that was done by a sort of "fluke;" and, certainly, when they had changed sides in the House, and the conduct of the Bill had devolved upon his noble Friend, he introduced it. But he (the Earl of Clarendon) would have endeavoured to induce their Lordships to reverse their former votes, and he thought he could have given very good reasons for such a course. His noble Friend, however, had made a very satisfactory statement now with regard to the clause. He was glad that the clause had been omitted. There was only one more point to which his noble Friend had alluded upon which he wished to say a few words—namely, as to Westminster School, and the importance of not altering in any way Clause 21 of the Bill. He believed the very existence of Westminster School might be said to depend on the retaining of that clause. In pursuance of the general wish, both of old Westminsters and the public, it had been decided that the School should not be removed into the country, but should be retained as a great Public London School. But, after personal inspection, and with the entire approval of his noble Friend opposite, it was recommended that a grant should be made by the Dean and Chapter and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners which was necessary not only for the help, but the proper status of the School. He believed that this matter had been taken into the very serious consideration of the House of Commons, and that Clause 21 would satisfy all the requirements of the school. Some legislation of this kind was necessary, for, although the Dean and Chapter were now very liberal-minded men, and would do what was right and just, yet in this matter they wanted some looking after.

LORD LYTTELTON said, he must deny that the introduction of French at Eton was altogether due to the new Master. The improvements adopted there in this respect were due to the friendly writing of Sir John Coleridge, to the writing of Mr. Higgins, which was not very friendly, and lastly to the Commission. As to the Bill, he approved entirely of the scope of it, which had not been materially altered. Having compared the Bill, however, with the recommendations of the Commissioners, with the Bill as it came out of the Select Committee three years ago, and with the Bill of 1867, he found that there were several changes in details of which he did not see the necessity. He would desire, therefore, to propose some Amendments which would make it more in accordance with the measure as it came out of the Select Committee of this House. Their Lordships had reason to complain very much of the position in which this House had been placed with regard to many important Bills by the late period of the Session at which these Bills had come up. He was told that if their Lordships touched a single letter of this Bill, they might imperil it. Now, that was an exceedingly unfair position for the House to be placed in. He did not wish to imperil the Bill; but he hoped there was time to make the Amendments which were necessary.

THE EARL OF CHICHESTER, speaking as an old Westminster boy, expressed a hope that nothing would be done to diminish the usefulness of that ancient foundation.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, that no blame could be attributed to the Government for the late period of the Session at which the Bill had come up to this House; but seeing the pressure of important business upon the other, it was difficult to see how greater despatch could have been secured. He could assure their Lordships that the Government had done all they possibly could to push on the Bill, which had been considered at Morning Sittings; but the opponents of the Bill were so determined to delay it, that the Government had found it impossible to bring it on until now. He agreed that it would be most desirable to extend the time within which the Governing Bodies were to make such reforms as were desirable. But the Privy Council would now under the Bill have the power of extending this period for three months, and their Lordships would probably do well to extend it for three months longer. Having been educated at Eton, he knew that at that time, although there was a French Master, few boys learnt French. But while strong prejudice existed against Eton on this account in the mind of many persons, he thought that much blame rested with the parents of the boys. It was impossible to learn French by a lesson of two hours a week, and the preparation of one exercise a week. Many of the parents of Eton boys were well-to-do and even wealthy, and it was quite in their power to teach their boys French, and perfect French, before they went to Eton. French might be taught, through a French *bonne*, without the child knowing he was learning French. He travelled with the late Duke of Hamilton who learnt French and Italian in that way; and wherever they went in those two countries the natives believed him to be one of themselves and no Englishman. If a boy arrived at Eton, having learnt French in that way—not grammatically, but by the ear—he would soon perfect himself as a French scholar. He knew a family, and that not a rich one, in which four or five children were acquiring French through companionship with a French child. He thought it rested rather with parents than with the Heads of the much abused Schools to teach children a language which he believed it was impossible to learn in a desultory way at a Public School, where so many other things were taught. One evil in connection with Public Schools was the length of the holidays, which took from three to three and a half months out of the year, to the total interruption of tuition during that period. By far the greater number of boys had complete holiday, their minds were allowed to lie fallow, and, if their memories were not unusually retentive, they forgot much of what they had learnt. Under these circumstances, he was compelled to say that many of the sins which were laid at the door of Public Schools ought to be laid at the door of the parents. If the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) had not kindly taken charge of the Bill, he would himself have introduced it into this House.

Viscount STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE hoped that some time would be given for the consideration of the Amendments before the next stage of the Bill was taken.

Lord EBURY urged the utter impossibility of boys being instructed properly with the amount of tutorial assistance employed at the Public Schools. When thirty or forty boys were intrusted to one teacher they could not make the progress they would if the teachers were more numerous in proportion to the pupils.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, a noble Lord opposite (Lord Lyttelton) had remarked that it would be dangerous to make any Amendments upon the Bill, because they would be refused by the House of Commons. Now, there were some points in the Bill which the Government considered worthy of consideration; and he did not believe that the other House would act in so unusual—not to say so unconstitutional—a manner as to refuse to consider their Lordships' Amendments to a Bill sent up to that House at so late a period of the Session. That seemed to him rather a reason why their Lordships should make alterations. The Bill had been twice fully considered by their Lordships, and had been twice referred to Select Committees; so it might be considered their own Bill; and they had a perfect right to make what Amendments in it they thought proper. He quite agreed that time should be given for the consideration of the Amendments; and he should therefore propose not to take the Committee until Thursday.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

BURIALS (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 269.)

(*The Earl of Kimberley*).

REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

The Earl of KIMBERLEY *moved* that the 4th clause, as amended, be omitted. The clause was designed to apply to certain parish churches recently erected on new sites, the churchyards of which were purchased solely for the use of the persons worshipping in the churches. If that were so the churchyards would be solely for the use of members of the Established Church; and in that case the Bill would not, and ought not, to have any application to them. He was informed, however, that it went further, and that it would apply to certain small graveyards as to which it would result in positive inconvenience to exclude certain persons from being buried in them.

Moved, to omit Clause 4, as amended.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that no real argument had been advanced against the clause when it was proposed in Committee. He himself considered that the clause was a very fair one. The clause merely declared that any claims for exemption were to be determined by the Lord Lieutenant in Council. The Bill itself only dealt with the performance of the burial service. Particular churchyards would practically be reserved for the Established Church congregations, because persons would not allow their relatives to be buried unless their own burial service was read over them. Their Lordships should not, he thought, be too critical upon the Bill, because it stood upon, and was framed upon, a wrong basis; for the framers of it were in error in thinking that there was any right of burial in the churchyards in question. Any right of sepulture in the parish churchyards was simply a right conferred by Lord Plunket's Act. He thought there was no foundation for the objections urged against the clause.

Lord CRANWORTH replied, that whatever might be the foundation of the Bill, the clause, as it stood, had no foundation at all, for it would not enable the Lord Lieutenant to do anything.

The Earl of LEITRIM objected to the Bill generally, holding it to be wholly unnecessary, and calculated, if passed, to prove an element of discord in Ireland.

The Marquess of WESTMEATH had been astounded at the introduction of that Bill—especially at the present most inopportune time. The measure would only increase religious animosities in Ireland, and work most mischievously. It would repeal the necessary precautions provided by Lord Plunket's Act without establishing any substitute for them; and now, when the most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of Armagh) proposed a most reasonable protective clause, which did not interfere with any private rights, the noble Earl (the Earl of Kimberley) must needs oppose it. That noble Earl, because he happened casually to have once held high Office in Ireland, thought he knew something of that country, and presumed to take charge of all its interests. God forbid that his unfortunate country should ever again fall under that noble Earl's administration!

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that persons who came to perform the rites of burial when another burial according to the rites of the Church was proceeding, would be acting illegally, and would be punishable according to the existing law.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, he would not trouble their Lordships to divide.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Ordered, That for the Remainder of the Session the Bill or Bills which are entered for Consideration on the Minutes of the Day shall have the same Precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 20, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—District Church Tithes Act Amendment* [246].

Committee — Registration (Ireland) (213); Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-comm.*) [139]—R.P.; Inland Revenue* [207]; Army Chaplains* [225]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Expiring Laws Continuance* [241].

Report—St. Mary Somerset's Church, London* [228-247]; Registration (Ireland)* [213-248]; Inland Revenue* [207]; Army Chaplains* [225]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Expiring Laws Continuance* [241].

Considered as amended — Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment* [181].

ASSESSED TAXES.—QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, If he is aware that persons in the country districts who keep one horse and a phaeton, or a wagonette, to let for hire, and pay the Post Horse Duty of £5 per annum, if they use the same horse and vehicle occasionally for the conveyance of their wives and families are now charged, in addition, with the Assessed Taxes of £3 1*s.* per annum, making the total annual charge for Duty on one horse and one vehicle £8 1*s.* per annum; and, if he is so aware, whether he will provide a remedy for this grievance?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, in reply, that it was undoubtedly true that the alleged grievance existed, and it was a subject of frequent complaint. It must be recollected, however, that the post horse duty was paid really by the public, who used the post horse and carriage, so that the proprietor was re-imbursed by the amount he got from the hirer. The assessed taxes the persons referred to in the Question only paid in common with other members of the community for the luxury they enjoy.

METROPOLIS—INCLOSURE IN REGENT'S PARK.—QUESTION.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, What is the cause of the delay in the completion of the works in the inclosure in the Regent's Park, and when the same are likely to be completed; and, whether it is intended to cover the bottom of the lake with cement?

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, in reply, that the works were completed, and the water would be introduced almost immediately. The reason why the water had not been introduced was that a defect had been discovered in the drainage of the Regent's Park College, and till that was made good the water could not be let in; but that defect had now been remedied. It was not intended to cover the bottom of the lake with cement.

ARMY—MANUFACTURE OF ROCKETS. QUESTION.

MAJOR ANSON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will afford Mr. Hale an opportunity of substantiating the complaint he has briefly made—namely, that his Rockets are manufactured in the Royal Arsenal in a manner which renders them more costly and less efficient for the Public Service?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, he could not consent to afford Mr.

Hale an opportunity of substantiating his complaint that his rockets were manufactured in the Royal Arsenal in a manner which rendered them more costly and less efficient for the public service. Mr. Hale had received a large sum of money as compensation; and in making these rockets there was no further need of the services of Mr. Hale. The rockets were made in the best manner for the public service.

NAVY—THE "ACHILLES" AND "MINOTAUR."—QUESTION.

CAPTAIN **MACKINNON** said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, If it is true that the designer of the *Achilles* was compelled by the Controller, against his judgment, to provide more masts than she was designed for; and, whether any notice was taken of the vehement protest of the designer on the Naval Committee ordering the *Minotaur* more masts than suited her form, or for which she was designed?

SIR **JOHN HAY**, in reply, said, some misapprehension existed on the part of the hon. and gallant Member as to the form of the Return which was laid on the table some time ago with regard to this Question. Four out of five naval officers forming the Committee reported against the masting of the *Achilles* with four masts; but when the matter was brought before the Admiralty, it was unanimously resolved that the Controller should be ordered to give the *Achilles* four masts. The original design was for four masts, and it was laid down accordingly. This was complicated with another Question. That Committee recommended that double topsails should be adopted in that class of ship; finding that the area of canvas of three masts would not be sufficient, it was therefore considered desirable that four masts should be adopted to give a sufficient spread of canvas. With regard to the *Minotaur*, there was no protest on record at the Admiralty.

AFFAIRS OF CEYLON.—QUESTION.

MR. **GORST** said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to institute any local inquiry into the affairs of Ceylon?

MR. **ADDERLEY** said, in reply, that Sir Hercules Robinson, the Governor of Ceylon, was on his way to England, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies awaited his arrival in order to obtain from him a statement of the grievances and proposals of Reform made on the part of the island; at the same time it was not his intention to make any constitutional changes in the form of the Government.

NAVY—ROPEMAKERS IN CHATHAM DOCKYARD.—QUESTION.

MR. **OTWAY** said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is true that the wages of the Ropemakers in Chatham Dockyard have been reduced to nineteen shillings and two pence per week, and that men who have been working overtime have been suddenly dismissed from the service; and in such case whether the Board of Admiralty contemplate any arrangement which would diminish the distress occasioned by these proceedings?

LORD **HENRY LENNOX**, in reply, said he presumed that the hon. Member referred to the reduction made in the time men were employed — namely, from six to five days in the week. If this reduction had not been made the amount of Supply voted for the Department would have been exhausted by the end of the year, a circumstance that would have led to the dismissal of all the men, and to great distress in Chatham. This was an arrangement which had been proposed by the late Board of Admiralty, and the steam machinery which had been erected was capable of working small quantities when the times were slack, and also of working off what was wanted at periods of pressure. This was the first time the Board of Admiralty had attempted to follow the advice of our great political economists—namely, to regulate our supplies with the reasonable demands of the year. Judging from the tone of the hon. Gentleman's Question, he was afraid that the change was not likely to meet with much favour amongst the artizans of Chatham. Very few hired men had been dismissed, and those had received as long a notice as the requirements of the service allowed.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN SPAIN. QUESTION.

MR. **BAINES** said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If it is true that Julian de Vargas, a Spanish Schoolmaster at Malaga, has been imprisoned in a felon's prison since the 12th of March, and is now under prosecution by the Fiscal, who demands a sentence of seventeen months' imprisonment for having in his House a Spanish Bible and Testament and a few French Protestant books not of a controversial character; and whether he will use the friendly influence of this Government with the Government of Spain to obtain an abandonment of this religious persecution, so calculated to offend the public feeling of the rest of Europe, where the rights of conscience are now acknowledged by the law of all countries—Protestant, Roman Catholic, and even Mahometan?

LORD STANLEY, in reply, said, he believed that the facts of the case to which the hon. Member referred were these—A man named Vargas, a schoolmaster at Malaga, was now under prosecution by the local authorities of the district. There was some discrepancy between the several statements that had reached him from various sources as to the precise nature of the charges against this person. The charge against him, he believed, was not that of having Protestant books in his possession, but that he, being a schoolmaster, was alleged to have taught Protestant doctrines to the pupils under his charge, and the fact of his having certain Protestant books in his possession was only brought forward as evidence in support of the charge. The proceedings instituted against him had been instituted by the local authorities upon their own motion, and not by the Spanish Government who did not even appear when the matter was first mentioned to know that such proceedings had occurred. With regard to the later part of the Question he need hardly remind the hon. Member that this was a very delicate matter for the Government to meddle with, because, the man being a Spanish subject and subject to Spanish laws, whatever Her Majesty's Government might think of the policy of the proceeding, they had absolutely no right to interfere. Any communication between the two Governments upon the subject must be one of an entirely friendly and unofficial character; and even in that case we had to guard most carefully against the appearance of wishing to dictate to the Spanish Government. The only ground upon which diplomatic action could be founded in a case of this kind was that such proceedings tended to create a good deal of excitement among a Protestant community, which might result in international ill-feeling. Upon that ground alone had he felt himself at liberty in a perfectly friendly and unofficial manner to advise the Spanish Government to deal with Vargas with as much leniency as was possible under the circumstances.

CAPTAIN PIM'S ELECTORAL ADDRESS.

QUESTION.

MR. NEATE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, in reference to a passage in the Address recently published by Captain Pim, the Conservative Candidate for Gravesend, in which he says,—"as your Member and a Naval Officer, it would be my duty to urge upon Government (and I have every reason to hope with success), the great natural advantage your Borough possesses"—*i. e.*, for the formation of a Dockyard and Arsenal, Whether he is aware of any communication between the Admiralty and Captain Pim which would have authorized the latter to hold out such an expectation to the Electors of Gravesend, or whether the idea of such an arrangement is now or ever has been entertained by the Admiralty?

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, he could not help expressing his regret that the hon. Member for the City of Oxford, who felt himself secure in his seat, should have thought it his duty to interfere with a gentleman who was a candidate seeking to secure a seat in Parliament. He should have thought that the House and the country would view with leniency any statement made by candidates who were anxious to win the favour of this new and numerous constituency. The hon. Gentleman asked him whether the gallant Captain had had any communication with the Admiralty with regard to the establishment of a Dockyard and Arsenal at Gravesend. He had not seen the whole of the gallant Captain's Address, but the extract which had been read to the House by the hon. Member led him to suppose that the gallant Captain had not even suggested such a thing, but that the project having been suggested by the constituency had been favourably received by him, and that he hoped that his powers of persuasion, if returned, would be such as to enable him successfully to plead their cause in Parliament. No doubt it would be a great loss if they did not in the next Parliament have Gentlemen returned who possessed those powers of persuasion which the gallant Captain believed he possessed.

NAVY—COALING HER MAJESTY'S SHIPS.—QUESTION.

MR. H. EDWARDS said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether, in view of the great economy in time and cost which would be effected in the shipment of Coal at Portland, by availing of the direct Railway communication with the Coal districts of South Wales, it would not be desirable to provide forthwith the necessary facilities at Portland for coaling Her Majesty's Ships, in lieu of the more expensive and tedious mode of supplying through depôts?

MR. DU CANE, in reply, said, he gave an answer to this Question a few evenings since, when the last Vote for the Navy Estimates was under discussion. He then stated that the coaling arrangements by means of pontoons at Portland were merely temporary. If the hon. Gentleman would look to the Navy Estimates he would find in Vote 11 that £30,000 was taken for the coaling arrangements at Portland, £2,000 of which had been taken this year for the commencement of the works. The Admiralty were endeavouring to enter into arrangements with the Great Western and South Western Railways, by which it was hoped that by the aid of those systems the South Wales collieries would be brought into direct communication with the inner line of breakwater at Portland. The subject was one that had attracted the attention of the Admiralty, and the proposed new means of communication would be carried out with as little delay as possible.

MONITORS IN THE FRENCH NAVY.
QUESTION.

MR. SEELY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is correct, (as stated in *The Engineer* of the 17th instant), that the French Government have now at Bordeaux two Monitors fully armed, equipped, and ready for sea, and a third building?

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, in reply, that the best Answer he could give to the hon. Member was that, according to the best information that the Government possessed, the French Government had no Monitors at Bordeaux, although they had one at Brest. One was certainly building at Bordeaux; but it was not being constructed, he understood, for the French Government.

IRELAND—CORONER'S INQUEST AT MONAGHAN.—QUESTION.

MR. VANCE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Relative to an alleged irregularity in the proceedings of a Coroner's Inquest which has been lately held in the town of Monaghan; and if any information has reached him respecting the origin of the affray which led to that inquiry, and who were the aggressors?

THE EARL OF MAYO said, in reply, that a full report of the occurrences to which the hon. Member referred had not reached the Government, but it certainly appeared that there had been some irregularity in the proceedings at the coroner's inquest to which he referred. With regard to the second part of the Question, as to who were the aggressors, it would clearly be contrary to his duty to express any opinion upon the subject, seeing that it was likely to be made the subject of judicial investigation.

IRELAND—DIETARY IN WORKHOUSES.
QUESTION.

MR. COGAN said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a Return presented to the House on the 3rd of May from the Poor Law Commissioners' Office in Dublin, from which it appears there are seventy-eight unions in Ireland in which a third meal is not yet allowed to the several classes of healthy inmates of the workhouse, and that there are fifty-five unions in which the workhouse inmates or certain classes of them are not provided with shoes and stockings, notwithstanding the strong remonstrances of the Poor Law Commissioners against the continuance of these practices as being calculated to be injurious to the health of the inmates; and, whether the Poor Law Commissioners intend to take any and what steps to secure a general uniform observance in the workhouses of their recommendations on the subject?

THE EARL OF MAYO said, in reply, that he really had little to add to the remarks he made a short time since in reply to the hon. Member for Waterford upon this subject. He stated on that occasion that the Poor Law Commissioners had made, and were making, great exertions to press upon the Boards of Guardians their opinions of the question of diet, and he believed with considerable success. When the right hon. Member (Mr. Cogan) complained that seventy-eight unions continued to give only two meals a day, he must remind him that a short time ago that was the general rule, except as regarded children and infirm persons. Considerable difference of opinion continued to exist with reference to the dietary in Irish workhouses, and he could only say that the Poor Law Commission would continue to use every exertion in their power to induce Boards of Guardians to adopt their views.

ARMY—EMPLOYMENT OF SOLDIERS.

QUESTION.

MR. SHAW-LEFEVRE said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Sir John Simeon), he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the system of employing soldiers in trades and callings which has been for some time pursued at Parkhurst Barracks; whether he is satisfied with the success of the experiment; and, whether he is prepared to recommend the adoption of the principle in other Depôt Battalions?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that he was happy to say that the system of employing soldiers in barracks had been found to work very satisfactorily. The system had been already extended to the other depôts, and it was the intention of the War Office to still further extend it.

SCOTLAND—PAROCHIAL ASSESSMENT.—QUESTION.

SIR WILLIAM STIRLING-MAXWELL said, he wished to ask the Lord Advocate, Whether his attention has been called to the discrepancies which occur in the practice of Parochial Boards in Scotland in imposing assessments under the Poor Law Amendment Act—namely, that some Parochial Boards make no deductions in terms of the thirty-seventh section of the Act, while some Parochial Boards make an uniform deduction in regard to all classes of property, and others make different deductions in regard to different classes of property; and, whether he is prepared to state, for the information of the Parochial Boards, the course they ought to follow in regard to making deductions under the thirty-seventh section of the Poor Law Act?

THE LORD ADVOCATE: Sir, I consider those Parochial Boards are in error which make no deductions from the gross rent of property for the probable annual average cost of the repairs, insurance, and other expenses, if any, necessary to maintain such properties in their actual state, and all rates, taxes, and public charges payable in respect of the same, as required by Section 37 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 8 & 9 *Vict.*, c. 83, in order to bring out the net or rateable value for the purposes of the Poor Law assessment. I consider also that those Parochial Boards are in error which make an uniform deduction from the rents of all classes of property, because it is impossible that the deductions required by Section 37 of the Poor Law Amendment Act can be the same in amount for different classes of property, such as houses or manufactories, and for arable or pasture land. Those Parochial Boards which make different deductions in terms of the 37th section founded upon the difference of the cost of repairs, &c., in different classes of property alone act in accordance with the provisions of the statute. Parochial Boards, after ascertaining the net or rateable value, have by the 36th section of the Act power, with the consent of the Board of Supervision, to classify properties and to fix such rates of assessment as to them may seem just. The Board of Supervision have issued circulars bringing these matters under the consideration of the local Boards, which it is hoped will correct the erroneous systems which have hitherto prevailed.

METROPOLIS—FLOWERS IN THE PUBLIC PARKS.—QUESTION.

COLONEL NORTH said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether his attention has been called to the decision of Mr. Arnold, the Police Magistrate at Westminster, on Thursday last, in the case of a woman brought before him for plucking a plant in Chelsea Hospital Garden, that it was no offence, as plants and flowers were not protected by law; and, if this is so, what protection there is for the plants and flowers in the Public Parks which are maintained at so great expense?

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, in reply, that his attention had been called to the case alluded to by the hon. and gallant Member, and he believed the decision of the magistrate was erroneous. Sir William Atherton's Act was, he believed, still operative, and he was prepared to proceed under its provisions against any such offenders.

IRELAND—QUEEN'S PLATES.

QUESTION.

GENERAL DUNNE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, By whose authority was a Queen's Plate removed this year from the Curragh to Limerick; are the Stewards of the Irish Turf Club vested with any powers to prohibit the transfer of a Queen's Plate from the Curragh to any other locality in Ireland; and, with whom does it rest to authorize the changes of the Queen's Plates from one locality to another in Ireland?

THE EARL OF MAYO said, in reply, that the removal was made by the orders of the Master of the Horse, after several communications with the authorities at the Curragh, who were willing to accede to the arrangement. It rested with the Master of the Horse to make any changes which might be deemed necessary in connection with the running for the Queen's Plates.

ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION—VOTE OF THANKS TO LORD NAPIER.

MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House, that he had received a Letter from Lord Napier of Magdala, dated the 18th day of this instant July, acknowledging the Thanks of this House to himself and other Officers for the success attending the Abyssinian Expedition:—Letter read as follows:—

49, *Cleveland Square, Hyde Park,*
July 18, 1868.

Sir,

I have duly received the Resolutions of the House of Commons conveying the Thanks of the House, for the manner in which the Campaign in Abyssinia was conducted, to myself and to Commodore Heath, C.B., Major General Sir C. Staveley, K.C.B., Major General George Malcolm, C.B., Major General E. L. Russell, Brigadier General W. Merewether, C.B., and the other Officers of the Army and Navy:

And the further intimation that the House acknowledge and approve of the conduct of the Petty Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, and Men of the Navy and Army, both European and Native, during these operations:

I beg to express for myself, and on behalf of the Officers and Men of the Force, our profound sense of the honour conferred upon us.

I have taken the requisite steps to convey the said Resolutions to the Officers named, and to the several Officers of the Navy and Army who have served in the Expedition.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
NAPIER OF MAGDALA.

P.S. I regret extremely that this Communication should have been accidentally delayed.

To the Right honble. John Evelyn Denison,
Speaker of the House of Commons.

REGISTRATION (IRELAND) BILL.

(*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

[BILL 213.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. ESMONDE said, he rose to make an objection to the title of this Bill, which, he contended, did not cover its contents, inasmuch as a Registration Bill could not be presumed to contain provisions with reference to polling-places. The objection might be got rid of either by discharging the Order and bringing in a new Bill, or by altering the Bill in order to make it correspond with its title. He believed that the objection ought to have been taken on the second reading; but, as the Bill was read a second time before it was printed, it was impossible for him to have offered the objection at that stage.

MR. SPEAKER said, that most Bills, after indicating the contents, contained the words "and for other purposes." In this instance these words did not occur; but the objection taken by the hon. Member was a preliminary one, which ought to have been offered on the second reading, and it was now too late to make it.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, that in moving the second reading he had informed the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) that the Bill would contain provisions for additional polling-places, and had also stated the fact in the few words with which he introduced the measure; and he trusted, therefore, that the House would acquit him of having acted in any way unfairly. It was true that the Bill was read a second time before it was printed; but he stated at the time that if that course were at all objected to he should not think of pressing it.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, he could not regard an accidental remark made to himself in the light of a communication to the House of the contents of the Bill. It would have been much better if the noble Earl had had the Bill printed.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that the Irish Members had been taken quite by surprise. This Bill had not been discussed, not a word said, upon the second reading. It was introduced at two o'clock in the morning on Tuesday week. The noble Earl did not then explain its provisions fully. The noble Earl stated that the object was simply to have the registration taken in such time as to enable the General Election to take place in November, and then just as he was sitting down he said that it would also contain some alteration with respect to the increase of polling-places. It was put down for a second reading on Thursday, and when it came on it was found that it had not been printed. At the time of the second reading he and several other Irish Members were in Ireland. When the Bill was printed it was discovered that it made a most material change in the law of Ireland regarding polling-places. The result had been to bring back Irish Members who had left for the Session, and the first opportunity they had of considering it was after the Appropriation Bill had been read a second time in that House. He certainly thought this was not fair in the noble Earl or Her Majesty's Government. If he were in "another place," he might say that it was a dodge or a trick, but as he knew that that would be un-Parliamentary in that House, he would not use the expression. According to the existing law in Ireland, application might be made to the magistrates in Quarter Sessions for new polling-places, and if such application were sanctioned by the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council the alteration took effect. By the present Bill it was proposed to render the sanction of the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council unnecessary. Now, nine-tenths of the magistrates in Ireland were Conservatives of the highest possible order, and to place in their hands such a power was certainly not a proposal that ought to be made at the end of a Session when so few Irish Members were in London. The result would most probably be that every magistrate who was a landlord would make his own rent-office a polling-place, and the tenants would be marched up to give their votes. It was a proposal he could not sanction, and he felt it his duty to give the Bill every opposition in his power.

Mr. SYNAN said, the Irish Registration Bill ought to have been brought in simultaneously with the English Registration Bill, and not in the last week or the last fortnight of the Session. But in the English Bill there were provisions for increasing the polling-places according to the increase made in the county constituency; while in Ireland there was no increase in the constituency, and it was expected that the Irish Registration Bill would be confined to registration. In the speech of the noble Earl (the Earl of Mayo) in introducing the measure, as reported in *The Times*, not a word was said about an increase of polling-places. On the second reading the noble Earl said that clauses relative to polling-places would be introduced, and they were introduced before the Bill was printed, and what the clauses were had only just become known. [The Earl of Mayo: I stated them publicly.] He was not aware what they were till Saturday night; and the clauses had kept him and other Members in town. Many Irish Members who had not seen them had, however, gone to Ireland; and he objected to the alteration of the law at this late period of the Session.

Mr. VANCE said, he must contend that there had been no surprise in this matter. The Bill would increase, instead of diminishing, the facilities for voting. If hon. Gentlemen wished elections to be conducted with order in Ireland they would vote for additional polling-places. The clauses relating to new polling-places were precisely similar to clauses in the English Bill, except where concessions had been made to Irish Liberal Members.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, he had not supposed the Bill was anything but a simple Registration Bill. The House ought not to consider the circumstances of England and Ireland as being alike. In England the magistrate would exercise his power with respect to additional polling-places as a matter of business; but in Ireland party feeling ran so high as to make it highly undesirable to give this power to the magistrates without some check. He hoped the Government would withdraw this portion of the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WARREN) said, he could assure the Irish Members that there had been no intention on the part of the Government to cause them any inconvenience. He suggested that the discussion on the subject of the polling-places could be taken much better in Committee than on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair.

COLONEL GREVILLE-NUGENT said, that as the Irish Reform Bill did not touch the county franchise he could not see why the Government had thought it necessary to interfere with the question of polling-places in a Bill which he had supposed to be merely a Registration Bill. At present application could be made at Quarter Sessions for an increase in the number of the polling-places. He thought the Chief Secretary for Ireland ought to give some explanation before the House was asked to go into Committee.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, that perhaps it might facilitate matters if he now offered a few remarks by way of explanation. He believed he could satisfy the House that there was an absolute necessity for the clauses which provided facilities for increasing the number of polling-places. As the law stood at present it was impossible to get additional polling-places in Ireland, no matter how general and how just the demand for them might be. That had been decided on several occasions, in accordance with the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown. The alteration he proposed was not one in the law, but merely a provision to make the existing law workable. By the 13 & 14 *Vict.* c. 50, it was provided that certain places duly scheduled in that Act should be the polling-places for the whole of Ireland; but by Clause 22 of that Act it was further provided that no barony or half barony in a county could be divided for the purpose of making additional polling-places. By the 25 & 26 *Vict.* c. 62, that latter restriction was removed; but no provision whatever was made for the distribution of the voters in accordance with the number and the situation of the polling-places. This was sought to be amended by the 27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 22, which was partly retrospective and partly prospective in its provisions; but here, again, there was a defect, because if an alteration of the polling-places occurred in, say, the early part of the year, it was impossible to obtain any re-distribution of voters for nine or ten months after. In the event of an election in the interval, very great confusion would be certain to occur, by reason of the uncertainty as to where each man should vote. It had been therefore held by successive Advisers of the Crown that, under the circumstances to which he had referred, it would be improper for the Privy Council to make the Order respecting the applications for additional polling-places contemplated by the Legislature. The consequence was that the law was a dead letter, and it was impossible to obtain additional polling-places for any county in Ireland. The first case arose in reference to Kilkenny. It was submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown, who gave their opinion that it would be improper and dangerous to make the Order. The result was that the last Act was passed; but, while providing for the case of Kilkenny, it omitted to provide for the other case to which he had just referred. In the year 1864 the magistrates of Queen's County applied for additional polling-places. The Law Officers, however, advised the Privy Council not to make an Order, as it would be productive of great confusion. As the whole necessity of the present legislation arose out of that opinion, it was desirable that it should be read to the House. It was as follows:—

> "We are of opinion that the Privy Council ought not now to make the proposed orders, involving as they do a division of baronies. We think that the making of such orders would cause very great confusion and embarrassment, by constituting new polling-places for barony divisions without any machinery being in existence for making out separate lists of voters for each division before an election may take place for the county in which the divided barony is situate. The Act of Parliament, 27 & 28 *Vict.* c. 22, is, we think, defective in not providing that the polling at elections which may happen between the making of the order for the new polling-places and the revision of the separate lists consequent thereon should proceed as if no such order was made, and the said Act must, we think, be amended. Pending this amendment, it appears to us that the Privy Council should make no order involving a division of a barony. We think it right to add that, in our opinion, the amendment of the Act ought to provide that the separate lists should be made out and revised at the Quarter Sessions next after the order of the Privy Council, by enacting clauses similar to the 10th and following sections in the Act abovementioned, and that elections in the meantime should be conducted as if no such order was made.
>
> "THOMAS O'HAGAN.
> "JAMES A. LAWSON.
> "EDWARD SULLIVAN."

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN: What is the date?

THE EARL OF MAYO said, it was dated

the 27th of December, 1864. No doubt, that opinion was perfectly correct; and, after such advice, it was obviously impossible for the Privy Council to make any Order for additional polling-places. Another case had arisen more recently in reference to the county of Donegal; but the application was not complied with, on the ground that the Privy Council felt it unsafe to make an Order on the subject until the law was completed. Both the late and the present Governments, therefore, had been obliged to refuse relief when it had been applied for. He hoped hon. Members would now see that the accusations brought against him of taking the House by surprise, of making material alterations in the law, and other ridiculous and absurd charges had no foundation whatever. He merely proposed to facilitate the action of the present law; and, with one single exception, he did not deviate from the very letter of the advice given to the Crown by its Law Officers of the late Administration in the case to which he had referred. The necessity in Ireland for additional polling-places was very urgent. To show this, he would compare three Irish counties with three English agricultural counties, as it would obviously be unfair to take manufacturing counties in this country for the purpose of making the comparison. The English counties he had selected were North Devonshire, Westmoreland, and the North Riding of Yorkshire, and these he would compare with the counties of Tipperary, Donegal, and Cork. In North Devon there were eleven polling-places for 9,500 electors, or one polling-place for about every 900 voters; but in Tipperary, where the number of electors was the same—9,500—there were only five polling-places, or one for every 1,900 voters. Again, Westmoreland, with 4,200 electors, had thirteen polling-places, or one to every 400 voters; whereas Donegal, with 4,300 electors, had but four polling-places, or one to about every 1,100 voters. He might mention that there had been repeated applications from Donegal for additional polling-places, and that some of the voters in that county had to travel no less than twenty-five or twenty-six miles across a mountain to record their votes. To show further the disadvantage at which Irish counties were placed in this respect as compared with English counties, he need only state that whereas the North Riding of Yorkshire, with 15,400 electors, had seventeen polling-places, the county of Cork, with 15,700, had only ten. Then in Ireland itself the greatest inequalities existed between different counties with regard to polling-places. The county of Clare, for instance, with 5,460 electors, had ten polling-places, while the county of Cavan, with 5,900 electors, had only four. These statistics must convince the House that, putting aside all other considerations, there was a necessity for immediate legislation. He believed the present Bill would effect a great improvement. According to the old law, which was inoperative, alterations with respect to polling-places could only be made at Quarter Sessions, which in Ireland were not generally well attended by the magistrates, but were mere hole-and-corner meetings. He proposed, therefore, that a public notice should be given of all intended alterations of polling-places, with the view of securing the attendance of all the magistrates and other persons interested, and that the subject should be discussed at a Special Sessions. This, indeed, was the only alteration he proposed to make in the existing law. When the list of polling-places had been arranged by the magistrates it was to be submitted to the Privy Council, as at present, for approval and rectification, and afterwards published in the *Dublin Gazette*. It was also provided that in the event of there being an election between the appointment of new polling-places and the revision of the lists, the old lists should remain in force as respects the polling-places. Of course the Executive Government, through the action of the Privy Council, would in every case be responsible for alterations in the polling-places. He implored the House to pass these clauses; they would save large numbers of electors in Ireland from having to take long and sometimes dangerous journeys. They carried out the principle which was always acted upon in England of bringing the polling-places as near as possible to the electors. He was astonished that any Member connected with Ireland could get up and oppose these provisions. They were proposed for no party purpose whatever: in fact, the greater number of applications for additional polling-places came from the North of Ireland; but he believed that they were calculated to facilitate elections in Ireland, to prevent disturbances, and to contribute largely to the convenience of the voters.

Mr. LAWSON said, he thought the speech of the noble Earl was the strongest possible argument against the clause, because if the grievance was one of so many years' standing it was difficult to understand why the noble Earl had not addressed himself to it before, instead of so unexpectedly proposing to legislate upon it by introducing special clauses in a Bill introduced for quite another purpose. The noble Earl told them that a formal and technical defect in the law was pointed out in 1864; but he was in power in 1866 and 1867, when there were applications from King's County and other places, and yet he took no steps towards remedying the defect. Why did not the noble Earl propose the change in the Irish Reform Bill when there would have been an opportunity of discussing its expediency? The alterations proposed by the noble Earl were not quite so insignificant as he had made out. By the present law no additional polling-places could be applied for except at Quarter Sessions, and he must say that he was surprised to hear the noble Earl talk of Quarter Sessions in Ireland as "hole-and-corner" meetings, for they were as well attended as Quarter Sessions in England. The noble Earl now proposed that six Justices of the Peace, or twenty electors, upon requisition to the Lord Lieutenant, should have power to convene a Special Sessions, to be held ten days from the date of the application. This proposal he condemned as an unconstitutional innovation. The power to convene the Special Sessions would rest with the Lord Lieutenant, and not with the Privy Council, and the month's notice now necessary would be dispensed with. The Special Sessions proposed to be substituted for the Quarter Sessions in this matter would really be "hole-and-corner" meetings. He looked upon these provisions as an after-thought. He fancied they had been added at the suggestion of some person whose object was to enable a large number of fresh polling-places to be granted in the ensuing month of August, a time when a great many of the influential residents were out of the country, for the purpose of obtaining some political advantage. He trusted that the clauses would not be pressed. If they were he hoped the Irish Members would give them their most determined opposition.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, I think the best way to advance the Business would be for us to go into Committee without further delay. If there are on our part any of the deep-laid plots that the right hon. Gentleman opposite supposes, the scrutiny of the Committee will soon reveal and defeat them. But until we get into Committee we are making no progress.

MR. COGAN said, it would be a great inconvenience if just on the eve of a General Election the polling-places throughout Ireland were changed. But the great objection to the plan was that it was a surprise, no intimation on the subject of these polling-places having been given on the introduction of the Bill.

THE EARL OF MAYO: I stated distinctly on that occasion that provision would be made for additional polling-places.

MR. COGAN said, that the no mention of them would be found in the report of the noble Earl's speech, probably on account of the very late hour in the morning at which the noble Earl addressed the House. He trusted that the House would come to a clear decision on these clauses before going into Committee. It was clear that the most strenuous opposition would be given to the third part of the Bill, and as practical men they ought to consider that at this period of the Session great powers and facilities were given to an Opposition to defeat any measure of which they disapproved. Those powers had been exercised already on another Bill, and if they were driven to exercise them on this Bill very serious consequences might ensue.

MR. HORSMAN said, he hoped the House would follow the advice of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, and go into Committee; but he rose to call attention to two preliminary points on which he thought the whole discussion in Committee would turn. The two points were these. In the first place, his right hon. and learned Friend objected not so much to legislation on this matter as that the clauses referring to it were in the wrong Bill. The Government had had the opinion of counsel before them for four years, recommending a change in the law; but the clauses making the change ought, as in the English Bill, to have been placed in the Reform Bill, and not in the Registration Bill. The other point was that if these clauses were to appear in the Registration Bill the Government ought to have given Notice of their introduction. But the Bill was allowed to be read a second time without being printed, because it was supposed that it would be strictly confined to the subject which was represented by its title; but when the Bill was printed they found to their surprise that it referred to quite different matters, and many of the Irish Members who had left England were obliged to return to this country in consequence. These were the points which required explanation. There was nothing of which the House was so jealous, and the right hon. Gentleman had shown to-night that there was nothing of which he was so sensitive, as the suspicion that the House was about to be taken by surprise. Having listened to this discussion with the greatest interest and attention, he was brought to the conclusion that the noble Earl had given no answer at all to the objections of his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Greville-Nugent), and that the Bill as a Registration Bill ought not to have been extended to the increase of polling-places. Under these circumstances, he hoped the Government would not persist with these clauses.

Mr. HADFIELD said, he thought the House should not come to any hasty conclusion with regard to principles which might have a vital effect on the character of the Bill. It seemed to him that if this Bill contained any lingering remnant of the old system of favouritism and ascendancy, it was time for that House, which represented the people of the United Kingdom, to put an end to it. The object of the clauses he understood to be to give the landlords power to bring their tenants like serfs to the poll. Now, if that were so, he asked the House to pause before adopting them. He implored the House to consider that this was but a remnant of powers attaching in past times to property as disconnected with labour and the rights of industry, and that it was now time to put an end to them all. He would support the proposition of the right hon. and learned Member for Portarlington (Mr. Lawson). He would never be satisfied till the Union was made complete, and Ireland enjoyed all the rights and all the liberties of England.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Definition of "Principal Act").

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, the present would be a good opportunity to ask whether the Government intended to persevere with the third part of the Bill? Several hon. Gentlemen took a great interest in the question which stood next on the Paper (the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill), and it might be convenient to them to know if that Bill was not to come on till eleven or twelve o'clock that night.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 2 to 21, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 22 (Courts of Revision to be held between 8th September and 6th October).

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he wished to make an appeal to the Government as to the necessity of taking some steps to secure greater facilities than had commonly been given heretofore for the registration of voters belonging to the working classes. By the Act of last Session they had in towns greatly extended the bounds of electoral privileges, more especially by the concession of the franchise to lodgers. But from what reached him he feared that this boon would be rendered useless, unless the Government would either introduce a measure or give directions to the Revising Barristers as to the time at which the Revision Courts should be held. It was plain that those who lived by their labour could not afford to hang about a Revision Court for the greater part of a day, or of more days than one, to secure their claims being admitted; and, if they were in consequence denied their promised share of enfranchisement, would not a feeling inevitably arise that hopes had been held out to them that were not meant to be realized? He was sure that this was not in the intention of any party in that House; and therefore he trusted that he might be pardoned for making a suggestion which, if acted on, he trusted would tend to prevent dissatisfaction or distrust arising. The Revision Courts were to be held in September; and at that season of the year there could be no possible objection to their sitting in the evening from six till eight for the purpose of hearing the claims of lodgers. He would suggest that whenever a Revising Barrister was called upon by a sufficient number of persons, say fifty or 100, to hold his Court on alternate days till eight o'clock in the evening he should be bound to do so. When the ordinary day's work was done the frugal and careful man would thus have an opportunity of making good his claim, which he otherwise could not be expected to do. He (Mr. Torrens) put it to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Treasury whether he could do anything more generally acceptable, more considerate, or more just, than to act upon the suggestion which he (Mr. Torrens) had ventured to make. He had been anxious to urge a similar provision in the English Bill.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he did not know what the law might be in England, but in Ireland it was competent to a Revising Barrister to sit to any hour, and he himself, when he was a Revising Barrister, in his younger days, had on one occasion sat till ten o'clock.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 23 and 24 *agreed to.*

Clause 25 (Expenses of Chairman).

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN suggested that the scale of remuneration should be fixed by the Lord Lieutenant or the Law Officers, instead of by the Revising Barrister, to whom the duty was a very invidious one.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Warren) said, that the Government could not tell what the clerk's duties had been, and might give too much or too little, while the Barrister knew exactly to what he was entitled.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 26 to 31, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 32 (Occupiers not to claim as Lodgers, and Persons making false Declaration as to Claim guilty of Misdemeanour).

Mr. LAWSON said, that this clause, which made it a misdemeanour for anyone who was an occupier to have himself rated as a lodger, created a new misdemeanour, and was not in either the English or the Scotch Bills.

The Earl of MAYO could only express his surprise and regret that the clause had been proposed to be omitted. He thought the Committee would not wish that those who were entitled to claim as occupiers should also claim as lodgers. The clause could be inconvenient only to those who were desirous of setting up fictitious claims.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he must object to the clause, which made the offence of making a false declaration to get on the register a misdemeanour. Why should a clause of that kind be introduced into the Irish Bill when it was not in the English Bill?

Mr. VANCE said, the lodger franchise was a new franchise. It was well known that much stir was now making in the city of Dublin to take every advantage of it. It was stated by the correspondent of *The Times*, that if the matter was allowed to proceed as intended, it would amount almost to universal suffrage, for all those persons who could not claim as occupiers were determined to claim as lodgers. The clause could not be objected to by any man who did not wish to make a fraudulent claim. If the clause was not in the English Bill there was no reason why a precedent for introducing it should not be set in the Irish Bill. He would point out that there was no rating check upon the lodger.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he could now see whence the clause originated. It appeared from the observations of the hon. Member for Armagh (Mr. Vance) that objections were entertained in certain quarters to a lodger franchise for the city of Dublin. The clause appeared to be framed solely with reference to that class of voters.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, the clause contained two distinct and incongruous propositions. It ought to be divided into two clauses, and he thought it would be impossible for the Committee to pass it in its present shape. The first part enacted that no person rated as an occupier should claim to be placed on the register as a lodger; the second part said that a person making a false claim as a lodger should be guilty of a misdemeanour. The first part was open to objection, because a man might be wrongly rated as an occupier. To the second part, the objections were insurmountable. The Committee ought to proceed on the principle of equity and equality with regard to all persons claiming the franchise. All the reasons for providing against fraudulent claims on the part of the lodger were equally applicable to the case of the leaseholder and freeholder.

Mr. SYNAN said, he objected to the clause, which he believed to be due to the oracular interference of the hon. Member for Armagh (Mr. Vance).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Warren) said, there would be no difficulty in dealing with the two parts of the clause separately if the Committee desired it. It was manifest that the lodger clause required peculiar safeguards, which he could not but suppose hon. Members, who were in favour of purity of election, were anxious to see provided. The object, then, of the first part of the clause was to make rating as an occupier conclusive evidence that the person was not a lodger, so that a man who was rated as an occupier could not come forward and say, "It is true I have not paid the rates which according to the ratepaying books I am liable to pay, and I claim as a lodger." With regard to the latter part of the clause, he trusted that no hon. Member would, after consideration, say that the Government had done wrong in attaching a stigma and punishment to wilful and corrupt falsehood in reference to the elective franchise.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, some hon. Gentlemen seemed to entertain a perfect horror of the lodger class. He did not see how a person duly rated could claim as a lodger, for a lodger must reside in some part of a house occupied by another party. He thought that to meet a danger of so problematical a character as the one supposed, it would be most unwise to apply this new and exceptional legislation to Ireland. He strongly objected to the second part of the clause, which created a new crime, and did not see why the penalty should apply to lodgers and not to other claimants for the franchise.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that the lodger qualification was a perfectly unique one and would be fruitful of fraud. So far from wishing to see the provision limited to Ireland he should like to see it extended to England, and so far from its being unnecessary, it was only analogous to the proposals made on the other side of the House with respect to the declarations required from candidates. Every precaution ought to be taken against fraudulent attempts to obtain votes.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he saw that the Government attached importance to the first part of the clause. Though he thought it a great mistake to introduce legislation of the kind proposed into a Bill of this character, yet he desired, out of deference to the views of the Government, to suggest the introduction of the word "duly." The first part of the clause would then run thus—"No person duly rated as the occupier of any house or premises shall be registered in respect of being a lodger." With respect, however, to the latter portion of the clause, he would remind the Committee that it was a distinct stigma, not only upon lodgers as a class, but on the Irish lodgers as compared with all others.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, he saw no objection to the introduction of the word "duly." He would observe that in Ireland the lists were taken from the rate books, and no one could get on them without being duly rated.

The Attorney General for Ireland

MR. MAGUIRE said, it was all very well to talk about extending these provisions to England, but the English Bill could not be re-opened. He did not wish—and he thought it came with a bad grace from the noble Earl the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Attorney General for Ireland—to brand their countrymen with a desire to get on the register by corrupt practices. If the clause were not extended to England, why should it be applied to Ireland?

MR. HADFIELD said, he objected to the imposition of a new penalty, and to the attempt to fix on Irish lodgers the crime of misdemeanour. Instead of increasing the list of crimes it was most desirable to diminish the number. The voters under the Reform Bill would be enormously increased. In his own constituency the number would be increased four-fold, and it was not likely they would be willing to be convicted of misdemeanour. He protested against the doctrine of the Attorney General for Ireland which made that a crime in Ireland which was not an offence in England.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, he thought there was some force in the objection, and he would consent to leave out the latter part of the clause, which made a false declaration a misdemeanour.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 33 (Evidence to support Claim).

MR. LAWSON said, that as the clause was worded he apprehended that it might preclude an appeal. He thought the words stating that the evidence should be such as was satisfactory to the chairman or Revising Barrister should be struck out. He moved to leave out all the words after the word "claim."

THE EARL OF MAYO said, the law of registration in Ireland was different from that in England. In England a claimant would be obliged to bring forward some evidence of his claim. In Ireland any one who made a claim was put on the electoral roll of the borough or county as the case might be, unless his claim was objected to. A case had occurred in which the Revising Barrister erased a name which was not objected to. On appeal the late Judge Perrin ordered the name to be placed on the register. It was therefore necessary, as a large number of claims would be made by lodgers, to place the law by a clause of this kind substantially on the same footing as that in England.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that the noble Earl was quite correct in his statement of the law on the point. A man could register himself for every one of the thirty-two counties by sending in a claim for that purposes, and if his claim was not objected to he would have a vote in each of those counties. He thought the noble Earl would do well to bring up a clause to alter the law in that respect.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, he had heard of a case in which a man had succeeded in getting himself on the register for eighteen counties without any real qualification.

SIR JOHN GRAY said, he believed it was a fact that one individual had claimed to vote in twenty counties, and that he had actually got on the registers of eighteen and voted in five. He made out his claims by means of maps and documents in the Landed Estates Court.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he would move, in order to make the operation of the clause general with regard to all claimants, whether lodger or other, to omit the words "in respect to the occupation of lodgings."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 34 (Act and Parts of Acts in Schedule (E) repealed).

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that they had now come to the objectionable part of the Bill—the clauses for establishing new polling-places—and these clauses he proposed to strike out. In 1865 he assisted the right hon. Baronet the Member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel) —who was at that time Chief Secretary for Ireland—in the preparation of a Bill to remove the very difficulties in respect of increasing the number of polling - places which the noble Earl now proposed to remove by this and the next twelve or thirteen clauses of the Bill. The rejection of that Bill was moved, and was carried by a factious majority of 2, and it was a curious fact that the noble Earl the present Chief Secretary and the hon. and gallant Member for the Queen's County (General Dunne) voted with the majority on that occasion. This fact showed that if there were any defect in the law, his side of the House was not answerable for its continuance. The present Government were in Office two years, why had not they thought of amending the law before, and not reserve the question till the fag end of a Session, and the advent of a General Election? Was not this evidence of some electioneering contrivance? He would say no more at present, as he intended to speak again and divide the Committee on every clause, and perhaps on every line of every clause, relating to what he considered a most objectionable scheme. He would, however, make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government that in order to facilitate Public Business, he should not go on with this part of the Bill.

MR. DISRAELI said, the hon. and learned Baronet had made an appeal to him of a peculiar kind; for, though conceived in an amicable spirit, it was founded on a threat of a very elaborate character. He had no doubt that if an opportunity presented itself his noble Friend (the Earl of Mayo) would give a sufficient answer to the attack which the hon. and learned Baronet had made upon him with respect to the Bill of 1865. It was quite clear from the last expression of opinion on the part of the hon. and learned Baronet that he was influenced at the present time by personal reminiscences of a peculiar nature, though he (Mr. Disraeli) could not withstand the conviction that as the discussion went on the hon. and learned Baronet would come to the conclusion that to pursue the course he had just announced would not tend to advance Public Business, nor to raise the hon. and learned Baronet's character for learning and good temper. He trusted there would be a full and complete discussion of these clauses. If they could not bear such discussion, of course they would not be carried; but he could not bring himself to the belief that the House would witness from the hon. and learned Baronet or any of his friends that exhibition of Parliamentary tactics which had been just referred to.

GENERAL DUNNE said, that he had been accused of inconsistency because he voted against the Bill of 1865, and he had done so because at the time there were special objections to that Bill, which was merely brought forward for a party object, and not on any principle. He could only say that the hon. and learned Baronet, who was one of the promoters of the Bill, had adopted a most singular method of proving his consistency on the present occasion by voting against it, when no one knew better than he did the necessity for some means of preventing violence at the ensuing elections.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that his Bill did not deal with the question of jurisdiction. It had left the appointment of polling-places with the Quarter Session and the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council.

MR. ESMONDE moved the omission of the 34th clause, the first of those relating to the alteration of polling-places. There was no reason for passing this clause now which did not exist when the Irish Reform Bill was before them. The Irish county constituencies had not been increased, and these clauses were quite out of place in a Registration Bill, which never would have been allowed to pass a second reading unopposed, and without having been printed, except on the supposition that it was what its title proclaimed it, a mere Bill for the registration of voters.

MR. AGAR-ELLIS said, the present law had worked well except in one particular, which was not at all touched by the present Bill.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, he concluded that the hon. Member could not have been in the House at the time he made his opening statement. He would therefore repeat that, according to the opinions of the Law Advisers both of the late and the present Governments, the existing law was totally inoperative, and that it would be unsafe and improper for the Privy Council to add to the number of polling-places in Ireland on application from any quarter.

COLONEL GREVILLE-NUGENT said, that these clauses had taken Members for Ireland by surprise, and they had not had the opportunity of consulting their constituents with regard to them. He objected to these clauses being included in the Bill, and begged to move that the Chairman be ordered to report Progress.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, he did not deny that difficulties existed with respect to increasing the number of polling-places in Ireland; but he would suggest that the best course for the Government to pursue would be to withdraw the clauses relating to jurisdiction, and on the Report to bring up new clauses to remove the technical difficulties referred to. He had no objection to remedy existing defects in the system, but these clauses would make a very serious change in the tribunals by which the matters were to be decided. It would make the mere *ipse dixit* of justices in Session the law of the land, without any appeal to the Privy Council.

General Dunne

THE EARL OF MAYO said, he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that he was mistaken in supposing that the authority of the Privy Council would be affected. The Bill, with the Amendment of which he had given Notice, would not deprive the Privy Council of any control it at present possessed. He might add that he was quite willing to accept the Amendment of which Notice had been given by the right hon. and learned Member for Portarlington (Mr. Lawson), which perhaps was couched in terms more clear and explicit than his own. The only alteration proposed to be made in the law was that in respect to the Special Sessions. A great deal had been said about altering the law in Ireland from that which it was in England; but it was remarkable how hon. Members opposite, when it suited them, could at one time argue that the peculiar circumstances of Ireland rendered necessary a different law for that country from that in England; and at another insist upon the same legislation for Ireland as had been established in the other parts of the United Kingdom. The simple proposition now was, that Special Sessions for the purpose of appointing polling-places in Ireland should be convened. He maintained that this mode of proceeding—namely, by Special Sessions, was a vast improvement of the law, and infinitely superior in the way of publicity to the old mode of proceeding by Quarter Sessions, even if the latter were practicable in the present instance. When hon. Gentlemen exhibited such an ardent desire to have the same law in this respect for England and Ireland they evidently forgot what was the law in England, which was that upon which he had based his first proposition. He had shown that in Ireland there was a great want of polling-places. For example, in the county of Donegal, voters had sometimes to travel twenty-five or thirty Irish miles, and in the counties of Cork and Waterford to travel also immense distances for the purpose of recording votes. The principle of multiplying the polling-places was admitted by all parties. He confessed he was lost in amazement to find a party movement now made to defeat the carrying out of that principle, of which, he believed, every man in Ireland having an interest in peace and the proper conduct of elections would express his approval, if asked to give his candid opinion. He could not conceive any party object to be gained by this proposal. They had a General Election coming on, when the want of a sufficient number of polling-places would be felt as an injustice and an enormous inconvenience. He therefore submitted that there was nothing in the proposition he had made to justify the opposition of hon. Members from Ireland.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, he would repeat an anecdote he had heard, which he thought would have a bearing upon this question. In the county of Leicester a question arose at the last election in respect to polling-places, and it turned out that a Committee of Justices, on whose recommendation new polling-places had been created, was constituted precisely of the same gentlemen who formed, a few weeks before, the Election Committee of one of the candidates. Those circumstances having excited extraordinary interest in Leicestershire, a legal opinion on the present state of the English law with regard to polling-places was obtained, to this effect—that although under the Act of last year the justices were enabled for the first time, contrary to the provision of the former law, to divide their counties into polling districts, nevertheless that process having taken place no further change could be made except by a process identical with the Irish mode—namely, by means of petition from the justices in Quarter Sessions to the Privy Council. It was because the noble Earl proposed seriously to alter that system that he and other Irish Members opposed the provision. If the Government were unwilling to acquiesce in his (Mr. C. Fortescue's) reasonable proposition, he hoped that the Committee would at once divide upon the clause, and with that view he would ask his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Greville-Nugent) to withdraw his Amendment that the Chairman report Progress.

MR. HEYGATE said, he wished to explain the state of things in Leicestershire during the last election, which had been referred to by the right hon. Gentleman who spoke last. Many complaints had been made as to the distances which some of the electors had to travel in order to reach the polling-places. It was found that serious inconveniences had arisen to all parties concerned, and scenes of tumult and disorder had been created by mobs of roughs—but from no political motives whatever—in consequence of the want of a sufficient number of polling-places. The magistrates remedied the inconvenience by creating polling-places within five miles of every village; but nothing like party feeling influenced their decision. The Committee which had been appointed to inquire into the subject of polling-places on that occasion was constituted as fairly as possible, and without the slightest reference to party purposes. The results were satisfactory to all classes. The object of Parliament should be to protect electors from inconvenience and insult, and on this ground he should support the clause.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he was of opinion that this matter being intimately connected with questions of class and party, should be handled with some tenderness. He was sorry that the noble Earl had designated the opposition to the clause a party move. A very large portion of Irish Members—who had the best means of judging—regarded the proposed alteration as of a serious character, and believed that it would act injuriously upon the conduct of the coming elections in Ireland; and the defect existing, as the noble Earl has stated, in the present law was no justification for it, since all parties would be willing to co-operate in removing that defect, and it had been shown that that could be done without resorting to the sweeping change proposed by the Government. Whether the proposal was an improvement or not was not the question, for the matter could not be fairly discussed under present circumstances, Irish Members having had no notice that it would be raised, beyond a fugitive sentence uttered by the noble Earl at two o'clock in the morning, which naturally was not reported in the newspapers. During the passage of the English Registration Bill the noble Earl, being asked to produce this measure, said he was reserving it till that Bill was disposed of, a statement which implied that the entire issue depended on the English Bill. Even if the proposal were a good one it ought not to be brought forward in the last week of a Session, and he felt bound to protest against it.

MR. DISRAELI said, he was quite willing to accept the proposition of the right hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) if it could be shown to be practicable. He had been surprised, on an allusion being made to the impending election, to hear a derisive cheer from the hon. and learned Baronet (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) and some of his Friends, as if they had discovered some secret motive for the clause. Why, all those arrangements for registration had reference to the impending election, the desire to advance which on the part of the House as much as possible was the only reason for the introduction of the Bill. This being the case, it was of undeniable importance that there should be free and convenient access to the polling-places. If it was possible to have a Special Quarter Sessions, so that the body which had hitherto dealt with these regulations might continue to do so, he should be perfectly satisfied. If the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Louth could suggest any terms by which the course recommended by him could be adopted, he should willingly support it, and it was therefore unfair to impute to the Government any covert purpose.

General DUNNE said, that a special meeting of the county and a Special Quarter Sessions would probably be attended by the same magistrates. He was anxious that the arrangements should be made by the entire magistracy of a county, so that the magistrates of a particular section of it might not bring about objectionable arrangements. His own county had made a demand for additional polling-places, and if they were of any utility at all they should be provided in time for the next election.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, the right hon. Gentleman opposite had misunderstood his proposal. He objected to the proposal of a Special Sessions, because his noble Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland had failed to give a sufficient reason for it, and because it would create those Sessions as a permanent tribunal. He objected to meetings at this particular period of the year. His proposal was to remedy the technical defects which had been alluded to by a measure like that introduced by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel) and the hon. and learned Baronet the Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen). He was wholly opposed to the exceptional legislation proposed.

The Earl of MAYO said, he must maintain that the inconvenience caused by an insufficient number of polling-places, and the scenes of violence which were likely to occur if the defect was not removed, called for exceptional legislation. In reference to the objections urged as to the late period at which this proposal was brought forward, he wished to explain that until he received an application from the county of Donegal the question had not been brought prominently under his notice, and though it had been mentioned incidentally, he was not till then aware that such great evils existed. On looking into the matter he found counties with 6,000 or 7,000 electors having only four or five polling-places. In view of an election, which would probably be contested with singular warmth, ought such a state of things to remain? He did not attach great importance to Special Sessions, and if power were given to the Lord Lieutenant to summon the ordinary Quarter Sessions for this purpose, leaving their jurisdiction for other years unaffected, he should offer no objection. He was anxious only that additional polling-places should be provided in time for the impending election. Had they not hastened the time for all these proceedings? Had they not run the risk of great inconvenience arising to numbers of electors, and of many of them being excluded from the register, owing to the limited time at their disposal in consequence of their desire to give the country an opportunity of declaring its opinion at the earliest possible moment? Therefore, when he asked that with regard to the next election there should be special legislation in order to provide the requisite number of polling-places, he did not think he was asking anything wrong or unreasonable. Now, in the English Registration Act that had recently received the Royal Assent, there was a clause which provided that a power of dividing the counties into polling districts and of assigning polling-places to each might be exercised by the Justices from time to time as they should see fit, and it was added that such power of dividing each county into polling-places should be deemed to include the altering of such places. Therefore, the Bill which passed a few weeks ago had altered the law in England in the way that he proposed to do in Ireland, and yet he was charged with having a political motive in view when he sought to relieve the Irish voter from the disabilities under which he lay. He cared not by what machinery additional polling-places were to be established, provided it was made available for the next election.

Mr. MONSELL said, he thought it was an unwise thing to take the period just before a General Election to make new arrangements with regard to polling-places. But what he and those who agreed with him honestly objected to was this—and the noble Earl must feel the force of the objection—that for an election which, according to the noble Lord himself, would be fought with peculiar vehemence, it was proposed to place the initiative with regard to a change of polling-places in a body of men whom he respected as much as the noble Lord, but who were known to be far more favourable to the party opposite than to that (the Opposition) side of the House. He was quite willing that power should be given to the Privy Council to sanction the creation of additional polling-places in those cases in which application had already been made.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he believed that the Bill had been introduced not to protect the voters, but to enable the landlords to poll their tenants against their will. So high did party spirit run in Ireland at election times that magistrates were not allowed to act at elections unless they got a fresh commission; and yet it was into the hands of these very magistrates that the noble Lord now proposed to put a power which might be used with the most crushing effect against the unfortunate tenantry.

Viscount HAMILTON said, that at the last contested election in the county of Donegal, when a number of voters who had travelled about twenty-eight or twenty-nine miles arrived within a mile of Letterkenny they were met by a ruffianly mob, who destroyed their cars. Applications had at different times since then been made to have new and convenient polling-places provided, but the Privy Council always returned the same answer — that under the existing law it was impossible. He hoped, therefore, the Committee would consent to give the magistrates the power provided in the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Warren) said, that the discussion had commenced in a very angry tone. They had been told by one hon. Member that the landlords took their tenants like serfs to the poll; another hon. Gentleman had said that he would divide on every line of the Bill; but the discussion appeared to be about to take another tone when the right hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) suggested that two clauses should be brought up for the purpose of meeting the admitted difficulty of the case. It had been admitted then, by an authority than whom none was higher, that there was a defect in the law which required to be remedied. Now, he maintained that it was right that an authority should exist somewhere—that a power should be vested in some body, to create polling-places. There existed a technical difficulty in the way of providing these polling-places, and a remedy was proposed. What were the objections to the proposal of the Government? The first was that no effectual supervision by the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council was provided. But an Amendment had been suggested by which that objection might be removed. The real point of conflict was the necessity of providing additional polling-places before the next election; he apprehended that if there were any necessity for them it was eminently with reference to the next election; and it was with that view that provision was made for resort to Special Sessions when Ordinary Sessions were not available, just as a similar provision was made in the 6 & 7 *Will.* IV. A Bill had been introduced this Session with reference to the presence of military at elections by those who objected to that species of protection being given to voters; the only effectual way of obviating the necessity for that protection was to provide additional polling-places, so as to facilitate the access of electors to the poll without danger of molestation and violence; that such was the object of this measure; and it had no party object beyond that of securing to electors the free exercise of the franchise.

Sir HERVEY BRUCE said, those who thought that landlords were desirous of driving their tenants to the poll as if they had no will of their own would entertain a different opinion if they knew more of the North of Ireland; for landlords exercised nothing but a moral influence, acquired by residence and good deeds among their tenants. Would it not be better to take the polling-places to the electors than to incur the heavy expense of taking electors in cars to polling-booths, in localities where they were not known? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Louth (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) made a proposal but little different from that of the noble Earl; and he was inclined to accept it until he heard the second explanation. If the right hon. Gentleman would promise to support the Government on the Report in providing additional places for the next election he would not vote with the Government on the 34th clause; but he must do so in the absence of such an undertaking.

Mr. VANCE said, he regretted that the right hon. Member for Louth, who was acquainted with the working of the present law, did not give Notice of clauses to remedy it. The Bill would do what was wanted; and if the right hon. Gentleman was not able to propose what would equally accomplish that he ought to support the Bill. It would be dangerous to give up the clauses on the mere assumption that other clauses would be brought up and that they would effect the object.

Mr. HEYGATE said, that such anomalies would not be tolerated in England as existed in Ireland with regard to the distances voters had to travel to the poll. There was an increasing dislike to the long journeys; and the lower the franchise was reduced, the more necessary was it to bring the poll to the voter. In this matter, he asked, why was the urban voter to have a privilege denied to the agricultural voter? The former could reach the poll by walking a short distance from his home; and why should the latter be compelled to make the sacrifice involved in travelling several miles?

Mr. LEFROY said, he hoped the right hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) would agree to an arrangement by which a sufficient number of polling-places might be provided for the protection of the voters in Ireland.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, there was a clause in the Scotch Act giving the sheriff the power of increasing the number of polling-places in any district, so that not more than 300 need vote at one booth. He did not see why a different law should be applied to Ireland.

Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 74; Noes 84: Majority 10.

The Earl of MAYO: Sir, it is quite clear we must take it that the decision at which the Committee has just arrived is conclusive upon the subject of providing additional polling-places for Ireland at the next election, and therefore I propose to withdraw the whole of Part III. of the Bill. In so doing, however, I must say distinctly that, in the event of scenes of violence and bloodshed occurring at the ensuing election in Ireland, the responsibility will rest not with us, but with the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, who, in defiance of every principle of their own, and in defiance of every vote they have given with regard to the provision of additional polling-places in England and Scotland, have voted against the clause which was intended to provide facilities for polling in Ireland. Of course it will be the duty of the Government to endeavour to do everything in their power to preserve peace at the ensuing election; but the difficulties they will have to contend against will be enormously increased by the decision at which the Committee have just arrived.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE: Sir, the noble Earl (the Earl of Mayo) has prophesied the most frightful consequences as the result of the vote just given, and he has chosen to throw upon us the responsibility of those consequences. We are quite ready to bear whatever responsibility properly belongs to us; but we decline to acquit the Government of any blame which may hereafter attach to it in consequence of neglecting until a few days before our separation to take means to prevent what the noble Earl fears, but which I, for one, do not. But the noble Earl's remarks are not consistent with his own statement of an hour ago, when he seemed to anticipate that the number of applications would be very few indeed. [The Earl of Mayo: Not very many.] The noble Earl said the number of cases of difficulty which had arisen were few, and that they had mostly arisen in the quieter districts—some places in the north, I believe. Now, with respect to the Midland, Western, and Southern regions of Ireland, I am convinced that in the present political state of the country there is no reason to fear any danger unless extravagant, unreasonable, and improper means are taken to prevent the great mass of electors from recording their votes in accordance with their wishes. If attempts are made to compel the large body of the Roman Catholic voters to support the Established Church in Ireland contrary to their feelings, difficulties may, indeed, arise. It may be hardly credible in this country that an attempt could be made to maintain Protestant ascendancy by means of the Roman Catholics' votes; but I am afraid we cannot allow ourselves to hope that the attempt will not be made.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, the noble Earl ought to have been the very last person to throw responsibility on the Opposition when he knew he had voted against the Bill of 1865 which, if it had passed would have prevented any difficulty upon the point now before them.

Mr. VANCE said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman opposite was bound to do something to remedy the evil which he admitted to exist, and it would be very unsatisfactory if Parliament were prorogued without effectual measures being taken. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to attempts to maintain Protestant ascendancy in Ireland. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman there was no such thing as Protestant ascendancy in Ireland; but there was a vast amount of Papal aggression.

MR. O'BEIRNE said, he wished to explain that no Gentleman on that side of the House had objected to the creation of additional polling-places, all they wanted was that such places should be appointed in the same way as they had hitherto been.

Clauses 35 to 45, inclusive, *struck out.*

Clauses 46 and 47 *agreed to.*

Clause 48 (Power to Lord Lieutenant to appoint Revising Barristers in certain Cases).

MR. LAWSON said, that this clause cast upon the Lord Lieutenant the duty of appointing additional Revising Barristers. He (Mr. Lawson) thought it would be well to amend the clause in such a way that the English practice should be followed. He therefore begged to move, in page 21, line 26, to leave out "the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland," and insert "any Judge of Her Majesty's Superior Courts of Common Law in Dublin sitting as vacation Judge for the despatch of chamber business." He also thought that such appointments should be made only if they should prove necessary.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, he objected to the alteration. The public had hitherto exhibited no want of confidence in the appointments made by the Lords Lieutenant, and those appointments had this advantage, that whereas the appointments made by a Judge who might be a strong partizan could not be challenged, the Lords Lieutenant were responsible to Parliament for the exercise of their patronage. In some places it might be necessary under the peculiar circumstances of this year to appoint additional Revising Barristers, though he hoped that it would not be necessary so far as Dublin was concerned. It was not the intention of the Government to make any appointment until the revision had progressed some way, nor unless it was shown that the present officials would be unable to get through the work in time. But if some assistance were needed, care would be taken that the selection should not be confined to men of one particular party.

MR. LAWSON said, he would not, after the statement made by the noble Earl, press his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN moved a new clause (Parties at the Revision Court may appear and be heard by Counsel).

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WARREN) said, he must oppose the clause. The time of the Revising Barristers would, he thought, be too much taken up by long speeches from counsel.

Clause *withdrawn.*

Schedules A, B, and C *agreed to.*

Schedules D and E *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Wednesday,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 248.]

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 139.

(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Hunt.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress July* 16.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On Question, "That the Preamble be postponed,"

MR. CRAWFORD said, he wished to make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman at the Head of the Government as to the expediency of proceeding further with the measure. It had already, he said, been discussed with great minuteness on the Motion for going into Committee, and it was quite evident from the opposition it had met with, that there would be a lengthened discussion on the clauses. That being so, and seeing that the Bill must also lead to considerable discussion in the other House, he did not think there was any hope that it could be carried to a satisfactory conclusion in the present Parliament. It should be borne in mind, too, that those who opposed the Bill in its previous stage represented no less than 10,000,000 of the inhabitants of the country, and that those whose interests would be affected in the matter would not be content unless they were heard by counsel against it in "another place." Taking into account, besides, the great amount of business which still remained to be disposed of—among other measures the Electric Telegraphs Bill, which would give rise to a great deal of discussion in both Houses—he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would see the propriety of responding to his appeal, and, in deference to the wishes of those who were deeply interested in the question, not proceeding further with the Bill then under the consideration of the Committee.

MR. HEADLAM said, the question was one which affected, not only the interests of the metropolis, but of the country at large, inasmuch as the Bill, if passed, would make the importation of foreign cattle difficult for all future time. He objected to legislation being pressed on so important a question at so late a period of the Session, and the proper course was, in his opinion, to postpone the present Bill, and to institute an inquiry into the whole subject.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, I think the hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Crawford), in the appeal which he has made to me, was very inconsistent. He tells us that this Bill was very recently discussed with great minuteness in this House, and he asks us on that account not to proceed with the Committee upon it. But is it not the proper inference to draw from the very minuteness of the discussion which has already arisen that our proceedings in Committee will be greatly facilitated in consequence, and that, coming to a subject which we have fully mastered, we shall be likely to make more progress than under ordinary circumstances we could fairly anticipate? I am bound, also, to say that I cannot express any sympathy with the general views which the hon. Gentleman has advanced on this subject. He refers to the Paper containing the order of Business, and tells us that if we do not go on with this measure we may go on with the Electric Telegraphs Bill; but he must know that it is necessary, especially at this period of the Session, to arrange the Business before us with some adherence to the plans which have been laid down, and that the Electric Telegraphs Bill has been fixed for half past four to-morrow, in order that the Committee upon it might not be broken. Therefore, if we do not go on with the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill, we cannot go on with the Electric Telegraphs Bill without deranging all that has been settled and disappointing many hon. Members who have left the House on the faith of the arrangement made. To agree, therefore, to the proposal of the hon. Gentleman—which I can by no means accept—would simply be to waste an evening. It appears to me that we shall go with great advantage into Committee, inasmuch as every point of the Bill—according to the hon. Member for the City—has been thoroughly investigated. Then, with regard to the right hon. Gentleman who has just addressed us (Mr. Headlam). His speech was one against the principle of the Bill and against the policy of the Government, and not a speech in Committee on the Bill. At this stage, with Mr. Dodson in the Chair, it is ridiculous to go into the principle of the Bill and to say that the large majorities by which the Motions to stop the progress of the measure were defeated are not to be respected because they were the result of passion. I may remark that those majorities were furnished from both sides of the House, which is strong evidence that the decisions of the House in respect of this Bill were as free from passion as the votes of a popular assembly can possibly be, and that the subject is felt to be one of general, I might say universal, interest. The right hon. Gentleman made an appeal to the Government not to proceed with the Bill; and he based that appeal on grounds which I think cannot be entertained at this stage. I have risen at the present moment to prevent any discussion of this kind from proceeding—a discussion which is always very inconvenient when we are in Committee. I hope that we shall not only proceed with the Committee, but shall make such progress as will assure us of carrying the Bill to a successful issue.

MR. CRAWFORD said, that the Telegraphs Bill stood next on the Paper after this Bill.

MR. DISRAELI: Yes; but in conversation on Saturday it was arranged that it should be taken as the first Order to-morrow.

MR. CRAWFORD said, he was not aware of that; but the right hon. Gentleman had not referred to the difficulties which this Bill would have to encounter in the other House.

MR. DISRAELI: I am responsible for the arrangement of Business in this House, and in its arrangement I endeavour to consult the convenience of Members; but I am not responsible for the management of Business in "another place." It is not very long ago since comments were made to the effect that "another House" was not occupied so much as the country would desire; and therefore I think no one here should complain if the Members of that House are now asked to give us their valued assistance in advancing the Public Business.

MR. AYRTON said, he should not have risen to continue this discussion, but that hon. Members on his side of the House were cut short on a former night by hon. Gentlemen opposite, who declined to allow them to discuss the principle. They declined to allow hon. Gentlemen to address the House, and yet they declined to allow the House to adjourn; while they talked of sitting up all night, or sleeping on the Benches, of refreshing themselves, and stimulating themselves to oppose the adjournment of the discussion. When the Bill was formerly discussed he (Mr. Ayrton) urged that it was unnecessary, because a Bill had been passed last Session on this subject which had been unanimously adopted as a compromise between conflicting opinions; and they were told at the time that it would be satisfactory. But in answer to his remarks he was told by the First Minister of the Crown that that Bill, so far as the metropolis was concerned, was a dead letter, because the local authorities would not put the Act in force. He (Mr. Ayrton) had since applied to the local authorities, and he was positively assured by them that they had received no communication whatever from the Government requiring them to carry the Act into effect. Fearing their memory might be at fault he desired them to search among their records, which they did, but could find no authority on the subject. Now, he wished to know from the Government if they would produce the Correspondence, or state in what form it had taken place—whether verbally or in writing. The present Bill contained no compulsory powers; so that even if it were passed it would not put the Government in a better position as regarded the taking of land than that in which they stood under the Act of last year. If they could not get land by agreement, they would have to come to Parliament next year for compulsory powers to take it.

MR. HENLEY said, he could not help thinking the tactics adopted by the other side in regard to that Bill somewhat peculiar. If, as the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) now said, the Privy Council already had power to do all that that Bill would accomplish, why did the hon. and learned Gentleman not inform the House of that on the second reading? The House had been occupied three days in discussing the Motion for going into Committee, and the adjournment was moved at nine or half past nine—a thing almost unprecedented — merely, as it seemed, that they might have the same speeches made over again, the whole burden of the song then being, "Let us trust to the Privy Council, with its elastic powers; an Act of Parliament is unnecessary." But, surely, if the Privy Council had had the power to save the country from the cattle plague, and yet had failed to do so, it was not surprising that the House should want to have some statutory authority for that purpose? But the hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Crawford) now came down, and in the blandest manner asked them how they could expect to pass that measure at that period of the Session. He did not know whether the hon. Member desired to have dear meat; but it was quite clear that he wished the inhabitants of London to have their trade subjected to all the existing inconveniences. He hoped this matter would be soon settled, and not kept hanging between heaven and earth in the way it did at present.

MR. DENT said, he would remind the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken that no discussion was taken on the second reading of the Bill. He had risen to make a remark personal to himself. He thought he had reason to complain of a speech lately made elsewhere by the hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Read), in which his conduct in opposing that measure was unfairly denounced and characterized as rendering him unfit to be a member of the Royal Agricultural Society. The hon. Member had stated that he (Mr. Dent) had always taken a course opposed to agricultural interests. Now, he appealed to the House whether that was the case. He had never spoken in that House as representing the Council of the Agricultural Society, and he thought it was unfair of the hon. Member to make the statement he had. His object as a Member of Parliament was not to look at public questions in their bearing upon the interests of one particular class only, but as they affected the community at large; and for that reason he had opposed the present Bill. On the same principle he was ready to vote for Amendments in the measure which would make it less onerous and less oppressive.

MR. LOCKE said, he trusted the right

hon. Gentleman would not persevere with the Bill, which was extremely unsatisfactory to the metropolis. If the proposed cattle market should be established meat would be a great deal dearer than it was at present, and 3,000,000 of people would be left in the hands of the agricultural interest, to be dealt with as they might think proper. That was the position which consumers in the metropolis occupied with regard to their supply of bread before the repeal of the Corn Laws, and they were not desirous of being placed in the same position with regard to meat. How could the House pass the Bill at once? There was a great mass of evidence before the Committee, and it was most difficult to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion. The opinion of the noble Lord who presided had changed from north to south and from east to west, and any man must possess the greatest temerity who would venture to predict the effect of the Bill. Supposing the Bill to be carried, the project would not be advanced one step. Did any one even know where the proposed market was to be? A great amount of evidence was given on the subject by the butchers. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite said that butchers were no judges in the case; but they were as good judges as farmers or landed proprietors. Members on the Opposition side knew well the course taken by the landed proprietors with reference to the Corn Laws; that they would have starved the people of this country if they could; that their object was to raise the price of corn and put the money into their own pockets, and some of the Liberal party were so foolish as to think that the landed proprietors entertained precisely the same idea with respect to meat as they did with respect to corn. The butcher said, and it was a very reasonable assertion on his part—"If there is to be a market it must be accessible to me; I must have an opportunity of purchasing carcases and carrying them away conveniently, at a small expense, to some place where they are to be retailed." How did the Bill deal with that matter? It did not indicate any spot where the market was to be established. Would any hon. Member point out any spot where the proposed market could be placed? [An hon. MEMBER: Smithfield.] Was the hon. Member aware that no market could be established within seven miles of Copenhagen Fields? The Bill ought to be pressed no further this Session, and in the Recess the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to go down the river and select some spot near Southwark as the site of a market from which the tanners of Southwark could conveniently get hides. The City of London ought to have been asked whether they would establish a market for foreign cattle on the banks of the Thames. This Bill was an interference with the privileges of the City of London as to the markets of the metropolis. In the Select Committee it was proposed to put certain burdens on the City, and the representatives of the City walked away. They refused to have anything to do with the affair. So did the Metropolitan Board of Works. And how did the case stand now? The Privy Council was to have power to make regulations, and the construction of the market was to be intrusted to five Commissioners who had not twopence in the world. They had no money; but the City had, and that was why he always liked the City to undertake matters. They not only had money to undertake the execution of a work, but they asked you to dinner to congratulate them when they had done it. He was one of their officers in former days, and he had a great respect for them. The Consolidated Fund, he was informed, was in an awkward state at present, and therefore it could not be made to supply the means of establishing this market. Moreover, supposing the Bill were passed, it could not be brought into operation for three years, and perhaps never. Besides all this, there was no market authority, and Heaven only knew what a market would be without an authority. It would be a scene of riot and confusion. Cows and bulls would be running wild, the offal—of which they had had in these discussions supplies *ad nauseam*—would be pitched at everybody, and the confusion would be complete. Everything that could possibly be said on this subject had been said already; and he would therefore say no more, but would content himself with appealing to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of Her Majesty's Government to postpone the consideration of the Bill until next Session. There was no machinery to carry it out. It could easily wait; there was no occasion for pressing it on as the Government were doing.

MR. KENDALL said, that the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) and his Friends had done their work in attempting to talk out this Bill, and had done it well. But business was business, and ought to go forward; and were the majority who supported this Bill to go back to their constituents and say that they had allowed the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), the hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke), the hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Crawford), and the right hon. Member for Ashton-under-Lyne (Mr. Milner Gibson), to talk down this Bill, although there was a large majority in its favour? He, for one, would not go back and say so. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman at the Head of the Government, who had shown courage in this matter, not to be beaten by such an opposition.

MR. CANDLISH said, he thought that the matter ought to be looked at from a business point of view. Regarding it in that light, the First Minister of the Crown must see that there were no means of giving effect to the Bill. He found that last year 177,000 head of cattle, and 500,000 head of sheep came into London, and that the maximum charges imposed under this Bill for the importation of these animals would do little more than pay the interest on the money which the Bill proposed the Commissioners should borrow for the purpose of forming the markets. The Commissioners to be appointed to carry out this Bill—the Corporation of London having refused to accept it—would have no security to offer for the capital necessary for the erection of the market, except the tolls. The Bill would therefore be inoperative and illusory. ["Oh!"] How many hon. Members opposite would lend money on the security of these tolls? Not one would lend a sixpence.

MR. R. W. DUFF said, this was a case of the metropolitan Members against the country. The metropolitan Members were making an attempt to talk out the Bill, and it was the duty of the country Members on that (the Opposition) side of the House not to countenance such a state of things. One of the principal arguments against the Bill was that it would raise the price of meat. So far as the metropolis was concerned, it was probable that the effect of the Bill would be to raise to some extent the price of meat; but the Legislature must not sacrifice the interests of the whole country to those of the metropolis, large as those interests were. Mr. Dudley Baxter, who had obtained some reputation as a statistician, had published a pamphlet showing that only one-twelfth of the whole of the cattle consumed in this country came from abroad, and one-twenty-fourth of the sheep. Would the House benefit the interests that supplied the one-twelfth of the markets or those that supplied the eleven-twelfths? Would they, for the sake of that small importation, risk the whole stock of the country? The metropolitan Members had a case against the Bill, but that arose from the existing regulations, and if those were removed the metropolitan market would be open to the whole stock of the country. It had been said that this was an election cry, but on which side? Considering the sacrifices some of the farmers of the North of Scotland had made for the Liberal cause, it was the height of ingratitude on the part of the Leaders of the Opposition to oppose this Bill. In matters of police regulation like the present they must disregard the laws of political economy. Absolute free trade in cattle and freedom from disease were incompatible, and they must choose which they would have. The true way to provide the poor with cheap meat was to keep our cattle healthy. He should give his cordial support to the Bill.

MR. MELLY said, he would admit that the case was one of town against country; but he had looked at the figures of the late division, and he thought they would be a sufficient answer to the assertion of the hon. Member who had just sat down that the Bill was only opposed by metropolitan Members. He found that the 82 Members who voted against the Bill on the late division and the 25 Members who paired against it represented 457,099 electors, and 10,204,013 of the population. It was notorious that the Bill was opposed by the representatives of most of the large communities. Perhaps there had never been a question on which they had been more unanimous than in their opposition to this Bill. This was not a question, therefore, merely between the metropolitan population of 3,000,000 and the rest of the country. It was not a little remarkable that the Members for Liverpool and other Conservative representatives of large towns were absent from the division, possibly as arrangements had been entered into excusing their absence. The representatives of the manufacturing population of the metropolis, of the Midland counties, and of the North of England repudiated the Bill, and it was objected to by the large employers of labour, who were responsible for the happiness of those they employed. The price of animal food in London affected the price throughout the whole country. Every animal killed at £10 instead of £15 reduced the price £5 in every market in the country. The right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown probably wished to go to the country as the friend of the farmers as well as the friend of the Church; but he, and those who represented large manufacturing districts, would rather go to the country as the friend of the working man. As the representative of a large Midland constituency he should vote against the Bill. Independently of the objections to its principle, there was not machinery for carrying it out.

Mr. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE said, that the hon. Member who had just spoken said he represented the working classes; but the working classes would recollect at the coming election that it was the Conservative party, with a Conservative Chief, that first proposed the tariff under which foreign cattle were admitted into this country. He had sat in the House in 1842, and at that time not a single animal could be imported. Having voted on that occasion, with the late Sir Robert Peel, for admitting foreign cattle, and also for the repeal of the Corn Law in 1846, he repudiated the imputation that he was a Protectionist in supporting the Bill before the House.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he regretted that the appeal of the hon. Member for London (Mr. Crawford) had not been acceded to. He did not think a single Member on either side believed in the probability of this Bill being passed. It was only persisted in for the sake of a victory of country over town, and it was absurd at this period of the Session to continue a conflict having no other object. Even if the measure passed this House, evidence would be required on the subject in the other House, and it would probably be referred to a Select Committee, so that it could not become law, unless, indeed, the Prorogation were delayed for three weeks or a month. He did not believe the Prime Minister was prepared for such a proceeding, and he presumed the understanding was that to-night should be wasted and that then there should be an end of the matter. Even the hon. Member for Banffshire (Mr. R. W. Duff) had admitted that the scheme was counter to the interests of the metropolis and to political economy. If the Bill were passed it could only be by a class struggle at the end of the Session. Was it advisable to try to hurry through the House by means of the exceptional strength of the Government at the end of the Session a Bill which was opposed by the City of London and other large towns of the kingdom. The feeling of the country would be that the Government had taken the present opportunity of forcing the Bill through Parliament, knowing that the next election would be against them.

Mr. R. W. DUFF explained that his argument was that, in the case of police regulations, the ordinary rules of political economy must be disregarded.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he had understood the hon. Member to admit that the Bill was prejudicial to the interests of London; and that this was the case was tolerably evident from the opposition to it of all the metropolitan Members. It was true the hon. Member for Cornwall (Mr. Kendall) had described those Gentlemen as actuated by an anxiety to retain their seats; but even on this hypothesis their constituents were opposed to the measure.

Colonel NORTH said, he must remind hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Bill was introduced as long ago as the 5th of December, and that every possible obstruction had been thrown in its way. During the sixteen years he had sat in the House he had not witnessed such a scene as that of Thursday last, when thirty Gentlemen kept up the opposition to the Bill till three o'clock against 130 Gentlemen who supported it; that opposition, moreover, being led by two ex-Cabinet Ministers, though a much larger number of Members of their own party voted on the other side. But for an appeal made on behalf of the Speaker by an hon. Member opposite, he believed the scene would have been kept up an hour longer. It was all very well for Gentlemen opposite to urge the withdrawal of the Bill; but he hoped Members around him would sit till six o'clock in the morning, if necessary, rather than yield to these obstructive tactics.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he did not intend to enter into the question of opposing the Bill by means of time; but he must protest against the doctrine of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel North). The hon. and gallant Member, on reflection, would not, he thought, adhere to his assertion in its full breadth. According to the accounts that had reached him of the operations of which the hon. and gallant Gentleman so much complained, they were all comprised within a single hour.

Colonel NORTH said, that the right

hon. Gentleman himself took part in them, and then walked out of the House.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he did not regard this as a just accusation, and would like to know the hon. and gallant Gentleman's idea of justice. Was it a just accusation? He heard a Member near the hon. and gallant Gentleman say, "No, it is not," and he hoped the hon. and gallant Gentleman was by this time ashamed of what he had said. [Colonel NORTH: Not at all.] He was obliged, then, to tell the hon. and gallant Gentleman that his assertion amounted to an arrogant declaration that he (Mr. Gladstone) had no right to give his vote upon a Bill in this House, for the vote he gave was upon the merits of the Bill. In any vote having reference to time or to adjournment for the sake of delaying the Bill he had taken no part whatever; and therefore, with great deference to the superior knowledge, judgment, ability, and experience of the hon. and gallant Gentleman—[*loud cries of* "Oh, oh!" which prevented the remainder of the sentence from being heard]. It was all very well for the hon. and gallant Gentleman to retort by a personal observation that had no foundation. He was not sure whether the hon. and gallant Gentleman had been present much during the debates on this Bill. [Colonel NORTH: I think every night.] He thought that in that case the hon. and gallant Gentleman would be able to bear him out in what he was about to say—namely, that during nearly the whole of the debates upon this Bill about the same time had been occupied by the speeches on one side as by those on the other. The noble Lord the Vice President of the Council opened the debate with much the longest speech that had been made throughout the whole of the discussion. He fearlessly referred those who had any doubt on the matter to the columns of the newspaper, and then they would admit the justice of what he said. In fact, the nature of the subject involved so many complex considerations that it could not be treated otherwise than with much detail on both sides. The best proof of that was that the debate was not carried on by long strings of speeches from the same side of the House, but by short addresses, in which hon. Members from each side followed one another. And here he wished to say that if he had used any strong expression with regard to the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Colonel North) he wished to withdraw it, though that hon. and gallant Member did not seem disposed to recede from the statement which he had made. He (Mr. Gladstone) had wished simply to defend himself and his Friends from the accusation brought against them. With regard to the merits of the Bill, he had on a preceding occasion offered many objections to the measure, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had replied to those objections in a tone of perfect candour and fairness; but he must say that the right hon. Gentleman's speech appeared to leave the Bill in a worse position than before. In his opinion the Bill was a bad one; but, nevertheless, he intended to yield with deference to the opinion of the House. [Viscount GALWAY: Why don't you go on with the clauses, then?] Because they were now discussing the Motion on the Preamble. Now, he would ask what would be gained by the passing of this Bill? The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said with truth that it would be necessary to come to a new Parliament for another Bill before this Bill could take effect, because, though it might be possible that by voluntary arrangement a particular plot of ground might be obtained for a separate market, yet that railway accommodation which was absolutely required could not be obtained except by the usual method of notice. When the new Bill for obtaining a site was submitted to Parliament neither the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel North) nor the noble Viscount behind him (Viscount Galway) would hold that the new Parliament would be in any degree committed by the decision at which the present Parliament might have arrived. It would be the business, right, and duty of the new Parliament to pronounce a perfectly independent judgment on the merits of the Bill. And if the new Parliament should pronounce such an opinion, whether favourable or adverse, nothing would have been gained by pressing forward this Bill. One remark more with respect to the financial provision. [Viscount GALWAY: We have had all this over and over again.] Yes, but it must be gone over many times more, and it was perfectly clear that it had not as yet made its way in the slightest degree into the inner intelligence of the noble Viscount. In answer to his observations on this part of the scheme the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that by the Bill as brought in by the Government, a revenue would have been provided which would have sufficed for the expenses of the establishment. But would the right hon. Gentleman allow him to point out that, even if that were a true and sufficient answer with regard to the Bill as it was brought in, it was not a true and sufficient answer with regard to the Bill in its present shape; because the right hon. Gentleman ought to know, if his many duties would permit it, that new charges had been introduced which would raise the outlay from £300,000 to £500,000, and no revenue whatever had been provided to cover those new charges? He believed the hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke) was perfectly right in saying that those Commissioners would go forth into the money-market, and that they would be objects of commiseration rather than of any other feeling, hopeless and helpless, unless some new source of supply was opened, of which as yet they had no scheme before them. Though he respected the judgment of the House in the decision which they had arrived at he still felt that there were very many questions on which they would require explanation with respect to this Bill; and on every legitimate opportunity it would be his duty to question the scheme, and resist its further development.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he had not intended to take up the time of the House, because it seemed to him that the arguments advanced did not apply to the question before the Committee, which was whether the Preamble should be postponed, but were rather arguments against the principle of the Bill, and should have been employed on the second reading or on the Motion for going into Committee rather than at present. But after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gladstone), he would be scarcely showing respect to him or to the House if he did not advert to some of the points which had been referred to. The hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) objected on the score that they could already do, independently of the Bill, all that they desired. [Mr. Ayrton: All that you can reasonably desire.] Well, then, the hon. and learned Gentleman meant to say what they desired to do that was unreasonable. And then the hon. and learned Gentleman had found fault with the First Minister of the Crown. But the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister had never said that the Metropolitan Board of Works had cast any obstruction in the way. They did nothing of the kind. The Chairman, Sir John Thwaites, gave every assistance in his power; but even with all the knowledge which Sir John Thwaites possessed of the peculiarities of the metropolis, they had found it impossible to carry out the Act of last year in the metropolis, though it had been carried out in other seaports throughout the country. The hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) had complained that this was a class struggle at the end of the Session. But that was not the fault of the Government. They introduced the Bill on the 5th of December; on the 13th of December it was read a second time, it was then referred to a Committee, and all the members of that Committee were well aware that the Government forbore from bringing forward a great deal of evidence, scientific and other, which they thought essential, in deference to the opinions of hon. Gentlemen on the other side, who desired that there should be no further delay. Therefore, it was very unfair to charge the Government with delay. The delay was far more due to hon. Members of the Opposition, who, day after day, insisted upon calling a great mass of irrelevant evidence, and who argued points which had been previously decided. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) had said that if they could not get land they must come to Parliament next Session. But it had been understood all along that a certain piece of land was available, which was in the hands of the Corporation. This, therefore, would require no Provisional Order, nor additional Bill. The same remark applied to the objection with respect to railways. They would not have to bring in a Bill to construct railways for this reason, that the piece of land in question was already accessible to existing railways. He was confident the Corporation would undertake to carry out this measure; and if the clause of which he had given Notice was passed, the Corporation would be able to pledge, not only the limited funds at their disposal, but their whole property, and so be able to raise the means at the cheapest rate. With regard to the supposed financial difficulty, he must observe that this was either an object of national importance and benefit, or it was not. If not, then the Bill should be opposed and rejected on that ground alone; but if it would be a national benefit, then it would be worth while for the nation to guarantee the expenses, and defray any deficit which the income of the market might be unable to cover.

MR. GOSCHEN, who was received with cries of "Divide," said, hon. Members on that side of the House are in this predicament, that if they wished to discuss the measure they were met with cries of "Divide," and if they wished to adjourn at a late hour they were told they were factious. He would ask the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council on what clause it will be most expedient to discuss the general financial bearings of the question? [An hon. MEMBER: The last clause.] He would bow to the decision of the House, and discuss the matter on another clause.

MR. AYRTON said, it had been asserted that the metropolitan Members had endeavoured to talk down the representatives of the counties upon this subject. It so happened that the metropolitan Members, except the right hon. Member for the City (Mr. Goschen) and himself, had abstained from taking part in the discussion, because they desired the discussion to show, as it had done, that the question was a national one, and that the views of the majority of the people of the country were against the Bill. No doubt the representatives of counties and small boroughs connected with them were, in the present state of the representation, a majority of the House, and the proceedings on this Bill would furnish a powerful argument for the re-consideration of the representation of counties.

SIR J. CLARKE JERVOISE pointed out that there was no discussion on the second reading of the Bill. If there had been one thing made clear, it was the fact of the great inefficiency of the Privy Council. Nevertheless, he for one did not see how that inefficiency was to be cured by a Bill of this dangerous character. Such a proceeding was like the application of a blister over the whole body for the healing of a local irritation.

Preamble *postponed.*

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Interpretation. 18 & 19 *Vict.* c. 120).

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he rose to move an Amendment, the effect of which was to exempt sheep from the operation of the Bill. He was at a loss to understand why the Government proposed to place a restriction upon the importation of sheep. If there were a statutory restriction upon their importation into the port of London, there must be a similar restriction applied to other ports. It showed no confidence in the Privy Council to say they could not be trusted to regulate with the help of their scientific advisers the importation of sheep when circumstances of danger arose; and if they could not, we had better do away with the Privy Council. What was the meaning of this proposal? The farmers could not supply the people with food. We had a limited island and a growing population, and yet it was proposed permanently to restrict the importation of foreign sheep. Since the adoption of Sir Robert Peel's policy no such change as this had been proposed. Did anyone pretend to say there was any danger in the importation of sheep? [An hon. MEMBER: Yes.] Well; but the Privy Council did not think so. To use the words of a very moderate Lancashire paper, the *Manchester Guardian*, "Such a proposal would justify the most strenuous opposition." It was not a metropolitan question only. Foreign sheep could not be sent alive from London to other large towns, and that would have a most disastrous effect upon the importation of foreign sheep. What was the danger—what were we afraid of? Foreign sheep were at present forwarded to every part of the country, and was there any danger? The Privy Council did not think so, or they would make regulations to stop it. The Government did not think it wise to do that upon their responsibility as Ministers. He had in his hand a Return of what had gone on since we first admitted foreign sheep into this country; and he found that they had increased from 634 sheep and ten lambs imported in 1842, to 914,170 imported in 1863. That importation had, however, been checked since 1865, owing to the Orders in Council with regard to cattle. The restrictions imposed then by the Privy Council had reduced the importation by 500,000. Sheep, however, had never been treated as cattle. They had heard a great deal about the Commissioners' Report, advising the stoppage of the importation of cattle; but the Commissioners never made any recommendation respecting sheep, and he did not think that sheep were treated in the same way as cattle in the measures passed with reference to the movement of cattle. There had always been a difference with regard to the importation of sheep and the importation of cattle. In this Bill that was abolished, and they were both placed upon the same footing. The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government seemed to be posed by this question of sheep. He (Mr. Milner Gibson) could not understand how any Government should incur the responsibility of excluding sheep, seeing how it must affect the working classes of this country. There was a slight restriction already; sheep to enjoy freedom must be imported by themselves; but the Bill contemplated no such distinction. The Select Committee had inserted in the Bill the word "sheep," instead of the more limited words "sheep imported in vessels with foreign cattle." Sheep were sold out of the metropolis to the best butchers at Richmond, Twickenham, and that neighbourhood. They were also purchased by butchers in other counties. If the foreigner who dealt in sheep were not treated in the same way as the Englishman, he would not send his sheep to this country at all. If he had healthy sheep, and he was told that they should not be sold in the metropolitan market nor forwarded alive to inland towns, he would not send his sheep to this country at all. The object of the Bill was, indeed, indirectly to bring about a prohibition against foreign sheep, which Sir Robert Peel thought he had put an end to in 1842. A gentleman residing in London had written to him stating that 6,000 or 7,000 foreign sheep were at times sent out of the metropolis weekly to Wolverhampton, Manchester, and other large towns. Now, if it was intended to stop that traffic, some very good reason ought to be given for such a proceeding. If in the present hot weather these 6,000 or 7,000 sheep were killed at Barking Creek and forwarded to the metropolis to be sent to the great manufacturing towns in the shape of dead meat, he fancied that the legs of mutton would look a little green on arriving at their destination. The contractors for the army and navy would not take dead meat, because the Commissariat and Admiralty preferred seeing the live animals, so that they might judge what the soldiers and sailors would have to eat, and consequently the proposal of the Government was to give to British agriculturists the monopoly of supplying the army and navy of this country with live meat. One eminent contractor stated before the Select Committee that if in purchasing live sheep and cattle he was to be exclusively limited to British agriculturists, he should be obliged to raise his contract at least £50,000 a year. That amount would have to be paid by the British taxpayers. The Bill was a deliberate proposal to establish a gross monopoly at the expense of the taxpayers and consumers of this country. No one ever alleged that foreign sheep coming from healthy districts in a ship by themselves, unaccompanied by cattle, would introduce the cattle disease into this country; and, consequently, the clause now under consideration appeared to him to be so indefensible that he would press his objections to it over and over again, in spite of any charge which might be brought against him of offering improper obstructions. The President of the Board of Trade went before the Select Committee and gave useful evidence, though not as a public officer representing the community, but, as he frankly and fairly declared, in the character of the farmer's friend, and in the interest of the producer. He went into the price of his Southdowns; but he would get a better price for these if foreign sheep were excluded. Now, he wanted to call the attention of agriculturists to this question. He wished he could act with the farmers and with Chambers of Agriculture. He believed, however, that hon. Gentlemen opposite would find the Chambers of Agriculture more difficult to manage than they imagined. They had three pet schemes—the malt tax, County Financial Boards, and the exclusion of foreign cattle. With regard to the malt tax——

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER rose to Order. It was not competent for any hon. Member to go into the malt tax in connection with this clause.

THE CHAIRMAN said, it was not competent on this clause to discuss the malt tax; but it was competent for an hon. Member to refer to it in illustration of his argument.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, that the Chambers of Agriculture had been induced to give up the malt tax and the County Financial Boards by a promise of getting the exclusion of foreign cattle. The farmer was told that the repeal of the malt tax would be inconvenient to the Government, and that the Financial Boards would displease the magistracy; but the Government would go in for cattle exclusion. Now, he (Mr. Milner Gibson) would gladly enable the farmers to exercise control over the expenditure of rates in counties; but the object of this cattle-and-sheep-exclusion scheme was to reverse the policy which let in foreign cattle to compete with their own. He believed that was the fact. But the exclusion of foreign sheep from Denmark, for instance, which were unaffected by disease, would be a great loss to the farmer. There were thousands of acres in Scotland not stocked at the present time, and these restrictions would stop the importation of sheep as well as cattle. The evidence of Mr. Robinson, a great promoter of this Bill, showed that the farmers as well as the consumers had an interest in the importation of sheep. The compulsion to slaughter sheep at the port of importation would make a difference of 6*s.* a head in the price. The quarantine system for fat stock was out of the question. It was condemned by most of the witnesses favourable to the Bill for store stock. It would be a great restriction, and afforded no security against cattle plague. For lean stock it was not practicable. There was only one security against cattle plague, and that was the prevention of cattle or sheep coming from an infected place—the restrictions not being greater than the necessity of the case and safety required. That was the course which statesmanship dictated. That was the course which France was taking—all the ports and frontiers of France were open. There was perfect free trade. Foreign sheep and French sheep, foreign cattle and French cattle, were sold in the same market.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER asked, where they were killed?

MR. MILNER GIBSON: They were killed wherever the purchaser chose to take them. If they were to be killed in Paris, they must be killed in the abattoirs. The French Government were not so unreasonable as to oppress the French people with unnecessary restrictions or impose large sacrifices on the population to benefit the agriculturists. They did not demand anything so monstrous in order to meet a temporary emergency. If a permanent law should be passed, it would never be repealed without the consent of the other House of Parliament, the Members of which were extensively engaged in that very cattle trade for whose benefit foreign cattle and sheep were to be excluded. Why were they afraid of these foreign sheep? Did they think they would introduce disease? Why, the Privy Council would not undertake the responsibility of prohibiting them. The Privy Council would not have been silent unless their advisers had told them to be so, and as they had not attempted to put such a wanton restriction on the supply of food to the people of this country, why should the House now be asked to impose it by a permanent law? Experiments to test the liability of sheep to take the cattle plague had been conducted in 1865 by Professor Dick and other eminent authorities, and the results militated against the notion that they were likely to take the cattle plague and to carry infection to cattle in their wool or otherwise. No doubt they might, under certain circumstances, take the cattle plague. He had heard that men had taken it; but he contended that sheep were much less liable than other animals to take or to communicate it. He should be glad to hear what the Prime Minister or the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to say upon this part of the question. The Commissioners had never recommended the separate market now proposed. After the Commission had concluded their task a Committee sat, consisting of nineteen Members, including the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and they unanimously agreed that this proposal for a separate market was wrong. That Committee had read all the evidence taken before the Commissioners and the Commissioners' Report, and they agreed that it was undesirable to put the proposed restriction on the trade and the food of the country. One Member of that Committee was the Marquess of Salisbury, one of the ablest of the Commissioners; and he (Mr. Milner Gibson) contended that on this subject the Committee were quite as good authorities as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe.) His Report was written in a time of panic, whereas the Committee approached the subject more calmly. He appealed to those Irish Members who, under the leadership of Mr. O'Connell, were mainly instrumental in carrying the great question of Free Trade, to support the Amendment he now proposed. Many of their poor fellow-countrymen were living in Wolverhampton, Manchester, Ashton, and the other seats of industry in this country, and he asked them not to aid the attempt which was now deliberately made by the supporters of this measure to deprive these poor Irishmen of the few opportunities they had of tasting animal food. ["No, no!"] That could not be denied. The struggle of life was great enough without increasing its difficulties by such a measure as this. He trusted that the Government would consent to strike out the word "sheep" from this clause, which they could do without interfering with that part of the Bill which dealt with sheep which had been brought over in the same vessels with foreign cattle. He begged to move that the word "sheep" should be omitted from the Interpretation Clause.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 8, to leave out the word "sheep."—(*Mr. Milner Gibson.*)

Mr. HENLEY said, the difficulty of the subject was sufficiently great without the real point being smothered by matters so completely extraneous to it, as were the topics which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson) had introduced into the discussion. Indeed, the way in which the right hon. Gentleman had treated the matter convinced him that he had been speaking throughout against his own conviction. The real question with which they had to deal was "aye" or "no"—were sheep liable to this disease, and could they bring it into this country? The right hon. Gentleman, losing sight of the real point in dispute, had devoted the greater part of his speech to the discussion of the question of free trade in food. The right hon. Gentleman had, however, given up the case with reference to sheep imported in the same vessels with foreign cattle; but what security was there that the sheep had not mixed with foreign cattle before they entered the ship? He had admitted that butchers going from market to market might convey the cattle plague in their clothes, and sheep had as handy clothes to convey the infection as the butchers. If the right hon. Gentleman could not prove that the means of detection in the case of cattle and sheep coming by sea were as great as those possessed by the French in the case of the cattle and sheep coming over their frontier, the whole of the fabric which the right hon. Gentleman had built up would fall to the ground. He would not himself give an opinion as to sheep having this disease; but, as far as he could form an opinion, he thought that it would be sufficient if the restriction were to apply to sheep coming over with cattle. If the right hon. Gentleman was not able to show that sheep were not liable to the disease, the whole of his arguments about the food of the people could only have been lugged in with the view to muddle the water, and keep in the background the real question, which was, whether sheep were or were not any source of danger? It was most unjust to charge the agricultural classes with trying to injure other classes in their action in regard to sheep. The object they had in view was to keep the disease out of the country, for by so doing they would tend to lessen the price of meat, and he could not see that the right hon. Gentleman's proposal would be attended with that result.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he thought the Amendment in its present form could not be accepted. The clause originally was to apply only to sheep which came over in the same vessel with cattle; but the Committee, in consequence of a great weight of evidence, unanimously altered it so that it should apply to all sheep. Professor Spooner said that the infection could be carried in wool, and Mr. Rudkin, the Chairman of the Markets Committee, said that the great fault of the present system was that sheep could go from the metropolitan market into the country. The Committee therefore were urged to cut out the words "imported with foreign cattle." He, however, would, in consequence of the want of time, offer no objection to these words being re-inserted.

Mr. AYRTON said, he was of opinion that before the proposed Amendment of the noble Lord was adopted the noble Lord must show that sheep which were not infected could be the means of communicating the disease. It was a most monstrous proposal that, because the cattle plague was engendered in certain spots on the Continent, no sheep were to be allowed to be imported from any part of the world. The proposal was one which would have the effect of preventing the free importation of sheep, and would thus result in depreciating the value of those sent to this country to an extent which would greatly discourage that branch of trade. The area of the cattle plague was becoming more circumscribed day by day, and what right had the Government to say that there should not be free importation of sheep into the port of London, and that in fact they would create a monopoly for the advantage of English sheep breeders?

Mr. READ said, he wished to call attention to the fact that all the veterinary evidence given before the Committee by opponents of the Bill distinctly showed that sheep transmitted the cattle plague more freely than any other agent, and were themselves subject to the cattle plague. Imported sheep also very often came with the small-pox, and in 1866, when he had lost all his cattle, he bought some imported store sheep, but found them all so diseased with scab that he had to kill them at once.

MR. NEATE said, he approved the proposal of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council to except sheep imported alone.

Question put, "That the word 'sheep' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 134; Noes 52: Majority 82.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU moved to insert after "sheep" the words "imported in the same vessel with foreign cattle." His only object was to save the time which would otherwise be lost in endless discussions.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 3 (Constitution of Market Authority).

MR. WATKIN moved that the Chairman report Progress.

MR. DISRAELI said, he would remind the hon. Gentleman that the hour was not very late, that there had been no Morning Sitting that day, and that there would be no Morning Sitting to-morrow. The Committee, therefore, he thought, came to the discussion of the Bill with unusual freshness, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not persevere with his Motion.

MR. WATKIN said, that no doubt there was abundant opportunity for the two parties in the House to discuss the question; but there was a large party deeply interested in it out-of-doors, and in order that they might know how it had been discussed, and learn the decision of the Committee, he must persevere with his Motion.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Watkin.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 37; Noes 132: Majority 95.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, that the clause under discussion, as well as those which followed it, involved important principles, and as there were many Members who desired to speak, he must appeal to the majority not to oppress the minority by insisting, contrary to all usual practice, on going on with the debate at an hour when the strength of Members was exhausted. These were important discussions, as was shown by the fact that they had practically extorted from the Government the admission of sheep. ["Oh, oh!"] Yes, by the last Amendment sheep were practically admitted. The hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Read) had said to him, "They have spoiled the Bill, and you ought to be satisfied;" but he was not satisfied, and he hoped the Government would not proceed further to-night.

MR. LOCKE said, he rose to move an Amendment, in page 2, line 15, to leave out the word "or;" and he also proposed to leave out the words from "if" to the end of the clause. If the Committee adopted the Amendment, he would be enabled to move that the Corporation should be the authority of the market, and this, he believed, would be entirely in accordance with the views of the noble Lord who had introduced the Bill. The City of London had a Committee to regulate all the markets, and as they had invariably done so to the satisfaction of the public, this market should be placed under their direction, instead of that of Commissioners, who would not understand what they were to do. The proposal of the Government to give inexperienced Commissioners the power to raise money—how they were to raise it did not appear—was very improper. Should these Commissioners become the market authorities, it would be a great failure.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 15, to leave out the word "or."—(*Mr. Locke.*)

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, he would remind the hon. and learned Gentleman that if the Amendments of which he had given Notice were carried, there could be no Commissioners, while the Corporation would not be obliged to take up the work of establishing the market.

MR. GOSCHEN asked why the Commissioners were left in the clause if they were not to be called upon to act; and if they were to act, how they were to be provided with funds? He believed they had been introduced into the Bill merely to place a screw upon the City. He wished to know how the Government intended to deal with this question of Commissioners? They had not yet had an explanation of the financial part of the question—not a single line of estimate. There was no precedent for Government Commissioners interfering with municipal concerns as here proposed. If appointed, it was at least to be hoped that they would be supplied with Imperial funds.

After a few words from Mr. SELWIN-IBBETSON,

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, he wished to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any assurance had been given by the Corporation that they would have anything to do with this measure or were willing to act under it as the market authority? It had been said in the Common Council and in the newspapers that the Government had broken faith with the City.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU rose to reply.

MR. MILNER GIBSON: I asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: It is most unusual for any Member of the House to single out a Member of the House to answer a Question. I cannot answer it, because the Privy Council and not my Department is the Department of the Government that was in communication with the Corporation of London.

MR. MILNER GIBSON: I asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer as the chief Member of the Government now present, and because I saw his name on the back of the Bill.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, that before the Bill went to the Committee upstairs the Corporation had intimated to the Privy Council Office by letter enclosing a formal Resolution, that they would undertake the execution of the Act. It was not true that the Government had broken faith with the City. The Corporation had furnished to the Committee a scale of tolls and a number of clauses, all of which were inserted into the Bill, except one which the Metropolitan Board succeeded in persuading the Committee to strike out. That produced a certain feeling of resentment, perhaps, in the mind of the Corporation. It was proposed to restore that clause, and then he was confident that the Corporation would undertake the execution of that Bill, and would be quite able to provide the funds requisite for the purpose. He spoke advisedly and on good grounds of authority. In fact, they had experienced considerable difficulty in dealing with two rival and jealous parties, the Metropolitan Board and the City; the City got angry with the Metropolitan Board, and a quarrel arose as to what should be done with the surplus which would accrue from the market. The City wanted to secure that surplus to themselves; the Metropolitan Board desired that it should be applied to the reduction of the tolls. They quarrelled over the booty, in fact, and the City being beaten, pretended to retire in a huff. The City had however, since evinced a friendly assistance. This was the "great financial difficulty."

MR. GOSCHEN said, he was quite sure that the Corporation would not undertake the execution of the Bill if it remained in its present state. No answer had been given to the question how the Commissioners were to have funds provided for them.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I thought, Sir, I gave an answer to that question the other night. I then stated that the Commissioners would have no funds to fall back upon, except the tolls; and I believe that on that security persons would lend money to the Commissioners to establish the market. We could not assist them out of the Consolidated Fund, or give them a guarantee. If the Bill were restored to its former state, so that the Corporation should have the surplus tolls, there would not be the slightest difficulty in regard to the Corporation of London undertaking the execution of the Act. I believe the Metropolitan Board of Works would be willing to undertake it if they would have a right to the surplus tolls. If the clause be restored to its original shape, the difficulty will disappear.

MR. AYRTON: Does the right hon. Gentleman think that the tolls would be sufficient to enable the Commissioners to raise money for all the purposes of the Bill—to buy the ground, carry out the works, and give compensation?

MR. MILNER GIBSON: There has been so much misrepresentation that I must beg leave to say a word or two. I never said the Government had broken faith with the Corporation; I merely said it was stated in the Common Council and in the newspapers. I think the proposition to give the surplus tolls to the City is the worst of all that have been made. Here is a market to be supported out of the tolls, and if there be a surplus, they should be devoted to the lowering of the tolls.

MR. LOCKE said, if the word "or" were struck out, he would endeavour to strike out the remainder of the clause. There never was such a market authority on earth as would be created if the House carried this clause.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, that when once he heard it admitted that the population of London would suffer by this Bill, that was quite enough for him. He advised hon. Members opposite not to be the stupid country Gentlemen to be driven before the Government. Seeing that the Commissioners were to have no means of carrying out the scheme of the market, he hoped they would see that the Government were really laughing at them. The Government had broken faith on a question of bribery, and they should adjourn to see if the City of London would accept this new offer. He therefore moved that the Chairman report Progress.

MR. AYRTON thought they ought to have some explanation from the Government of how they intended to treat the Committee, because after a certain hour it was impossible for notice to be taken in the newspaper reports of what took place, and therefore no means were afforded to the public of knowing what occurred. The last thing heard of the City of London was that they had withdrawn in the Select Committee from all connection with the Bill, and he wished to know whether the Government had communicated further with the City on the subject?

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, that if the Motion for reporting Progress was withdrawn a division should be taken on the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke). When they had passed the clause the Government would consent to report Progress.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question put, That the word "or" stand part of the Clause.

The Committee *divided* :—Ayes 113; Noes 26; Majority 87.

MR. SHAW-LEFEVRE then moved that the Chairman report Progress.

MR. GOSCHEN supported the Motion. The noble Lord (Lord John Manners) had been understood to say that the Chairman should report Progress after this division. ["No!"]

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that what his noble Friend had consented to, was that when the Committee had arrived at the end of the clause, the Chairman should then report Progress. As, however, there had been some misunderstanding on this point, and as it was now nearly two o'clock, he would not oppose the Motion to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Shaw-Lefevre.*)

The Committee *divided*: — Ayes 36; Noes 91: Majority 55.

MR. CRAWFORD moved that the Chairman leave the Chair. Seeing that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill could not control his own party even—the Members of the Government having voted some one way and some another—he trusted they would not now proceed further with the Bill on which they were so much divided in opinion.

MR. HENLEY said, he would appeal to his hon. Friends to give way. He thought it was useless to attempt any further Progress to-night.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER explained that, being unwilling to take advantage of any misunderstanding, and several hon. Members having stated that they had misunderstood his noble Friend (Lord John Manners), he had thought it right that Progress should be reported. He had consequently voted in accordance with that view; but it was quite open for his hon. Friends behind him to take what course seemed to them proper.

MR. FLOYER said, he must point out that the misunderstanding had entailed no consequences on hon Gentlemen opposite, none of them having left the House. He could not conceive how the noble Lord could have been understood otherwise than as consenting to report Progress after the clause had been agreed to.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, he was surprised at his words having been misunderstood, and could only attribute it to the lateness of the hour and the length of the Sitting. A misunderstanding having, however, occurred, he hoped his hon. Friend would allow Progress to be reported, with the view of resuming the Committee on Wednesday.

MR. CRAWFORD said, he was willing that the Motion that the Chairman leave the Chair should be negatived, in order that the usual Motion to report Progress might be proposed.

Motion *negatived.*

MR. CRAWFORD moved that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Crawford.*)

The Committee *divided* : — Ayes 33; Noes 52: Majority 19.

After further short discussion, the Motion to report Progress was *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

House adjourned at a quarter after Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 21, 1868.

MINUTES]— PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*— Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*.

Second Reading — Colonial Shipping * (274) ; Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland)* (268); General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment * (267).

Committee — Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * (226) ; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment * (252) ; Vaccination (Ireland)* (254) ; Courts of Chancery and Exchequer (Ireland) Fee Funds * (171) ; Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment * (256) ; Municipal Elections (Scotland)*(263-276); Public Departments Payments * (264) ; Sir Robert Napier's Annuity * (265) ; Tain Provisional Order Confirmation * (242) ; Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation * (241) ; Larceny and Embezzlement* (245-277) ; New Zealand Assembly's Powers * (247) ; Militia Pay * ; New Zealand Company * (154) ; Turnpike Acts Continuance (253).

Report—Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * (226) ; Vaccination (Ireland) * (254) ; Courts of Chancery and Exchequer (Ireland) Fee Funds * (171) ; Court of Session (Scotland) * (246-275) ; Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment * (256) ; Public Departments Payments * (264) ; Sir Robert Napier's Annuity * (265) ; Tain Provisional Order Confirmation * (242) ; Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation * (241) ; New Zealand Assembly's Powers * (247) ; Militia Pay * ; New Zealand Company * (154).

Third Reading — Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies * (238) ; Burials (Ireland) * (269) ; Bankruptcy Act Amendment * (270) ; Marriages Validity (Blakedown) * (271) and *passed.*

SOUTH EASTERN AND BRIGHTON AND SOUTH COAST RAILWAY COMPANIES BILL.

Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to One of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to Order).

LORD REDESDALE regretted that he felt obliged to ask their Lordships to insist on the omission of Clause 88, which they had struck out from the Bill, but which the Commons had re-inserted. The Commons, in their Reasons, said that the clause in question did not affect the interests of the public, but only those of the holders of stock in the South Eastern Company. They said, in effect, that the Companies ought to be left to regulate their capital in their own way. That argument, however, if it were admitted, would go towards putting an end to all restrictions whatever by Parliament on the financial operations of Railway Companies. It was desirable that there should be as little diversity of interest as possible in Railway Companies ; but in this case there was a large amount of ordinary stock which it was proposed to divide—one-half into preferred, and the other half into what was called deferred stock—thus creating at once two separate interests in the ordinary capital of the Company. He had no hesitation in saying that the main object for which it was desired to effect that separation was for stock-jobbing purposes. Having one stock fixed at a high rate of interest, and another at a fluctuating rate, this enabled persons, by manœuvring the dividend on the fluctuating stock, to raise its character, and he had no doubt that this was the motive for the alteration which had been made in the Bill. As the subject was one with which many of their Lordships might not be very well acquainted, he had stated his reasons for the course he was taking in a Memorandum which had been distributed for the information of their Lordships. He knew that in these cases the promoters of Bills often canvassed their Lordships and tried to impress them in favour of their own views, and he was anxious that their Lordships should understand the real merits of the question. The matter was a serious one in connection with railway legislation, and he trusted their Lordships would insist on striking out this clause.

Moved, "To insist upon the Amendment made by the Lords to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND said, he could not agree either with the course which the Chairman of Committees advised the House to adopt or with the reasons on which that advice was founded. The noble Lord had taken the extraordinary step of circulating a Memorandum among their Lordships, stating his views on a subject which was to be discussed by them in relation to a Private Bill. The noble

Lord said, indeed, that he had done that in order to impart knowledge to those noble Lords who did not understand the question ; but such noble Lords would do far better to look into the matter for themselves than be led by the nose by his noble Friend. He had listened attentively to his noble Friend ; but the only reason he had heard advanced for objecting to the clause was because, as he elegantly termed it, they were brought forward for stock-jobbing purposes. He could not agree with him in his view of the question. He thought the tendency of Parliament of late years had been not to interfere with the financial arrangements of these companies; providing, of course, that Parliament saw that no injustice was done to mortgagees, or other parties who might be injuriously affected by legislation. For that purpose the Joint-Stock Companies Act was amended last Session ; and he also had the honour of conducting through that House the Railway Companies Act, by which certain restrictions were put upon the issue of shares at a discount and the limitation of the interest on debenture stock. Moreover, the course proposed by his noble Friend was entirely opposed to the recommendations of the Railway Commission, which went very fully and carefully into the question, and gave it as their opinion that it was the more judicious course for Parliament to relieve itself from interference in the financial affairs of Railway Companies, that it should limit itself to the questions of the construction of the lines, the relations between the public and the companies, and the requiring from them of guarantees for the due performance of the conditions on the faith of which their powers were granted. The clause to which the noble Lord objected referred only to the shareholders themselves, who need not come into the proposed arrangement unless they pleased. Instead of proving injurious to the proper management of the Company, he believed the proposed subdivison of the capital would tend to give all the parties concerned an additional interest in seeing that the Directors did their duty, and in putting the undertaking into a better state. On these grounds, he hoped their Lordships would acquiesce in the Commons' Amendment.

LORD REDESDALE remarked that this was the first attempt to apply the principle of division to paid-up stock. It was true that in a few instances companies had been allowed, when they otherwise would have been unable to get out a portion of their unpaid-up stock, except at a discount, to issue it as preference stock. He objected to the creation of a diversity of interests, the object of these divisions being to apply the deferred stock to jobbing purposes, unfounded statements being circulated as to the dividend forthcoming upon it. The promoters expected to obtain a great advantage in this way ; but the limitation with regard to 3 per cent was an admission that the process might be disadvantageous under particular circumstances, and he believed it would be injurious both to the companies and to the principles of railway legislation.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he wished to say a few words, being acquainted with the opinion of railway men on this subject. He had hoped to hear the noble Lord (the Chairman of Committees), on rising a second time, withdraw the insinuations he had made against the Gentlemen who promoted this Bill. On a former occasion the noble Lord had no other mode of resisting a proposal to give certain powers to the Board of Trade than by insinuating that that Board was under the influence of the Railway Companies; and he now charged the promoters of this Bill with the intention of spreading reports about dividends and jobbing with the shares in the stock-market. He thought the noble Lord should make his attacks on private character in a place where he could be answered, and not under cover of the privilege of this House. Last year, indeed, the noble Lord was a little bolder and ventured into print; but the result of that experiment was so unsatisfactory that it was doubtful whether he would repeat it. Now, he protested against the noble Lord's assumption that any person whose policy was different from his own was influenced by sordid and corrupt motives. Where the public interests were concerned it, no doubt, behoved Parliament to be very vigilant ; but in this case the question was merely whether a shareholder should be allowed to make his property more valuable by dividing it into two parts, one having a fixed and the other a variable dividend. Why should the owner of railway more than of any other property be debarred from making the best use of it, or from putting it into the most marketable form ? The landed interest was strong in this House, while the railway interest was weak ; but, if the reverse were the case, would it not be thought an intolerable grievance if, because some railway manager had theories about landed property, and was attached to certain narrow formulas, the House were to prohibit the division of estates as their owners pleased, and insist that all farms should be of equal size? He hoped their Lordships would adhere to the golden rule of doing as they would be done by. He could not express the aversion and dread with which he saw the extent to which the great powers of the House were used in a manner which must not only be injurious to the interests, but offensive to the sense of justice of a large portion of the people. These shareholders were the best managers of their own affairs. [Lord REDESDALE: They have not proved themselves so.] He attributed the present condition of railway property to the petty and narrow formulas which had induced Parliament to prevent companies from managing their property to the best advantage. If their Lordships thought this property should be dealt with differently from all other property he had not a word to say; but he would entreat them not to place their whole powers in the hands of one man, and not to believe that because he had studied the question more than most of them that he was necessarily correct. He had the greatest respect for the ability and good intentions of the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees; but he was satisfied of the evil effects which his mode of legislation had worked upon a large portion of the property of the nation.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he thought their Lordships ought to feel very much indebted to his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees for the anxiety he invariably evinced that legislation in these matters should be founded on sound principles. He (the Lord Chancellor) was the more entitled to say this, as he did not agree in the conclusion at which his noble Friend had arrived in this instance. He thought that just in proportion as their Lordships exercised a vigilant supervision over the dealings of Railway Companies with the public, so should they abstain from meddling with the companies' internal affairs. Now, the proposal was that a person having £10,000 of railway stock should be at liberty to divide it into two sections, and that until the dividend reached a certain amount it should be confined to £5,000, in lieu of being spread over the whole £10,000. In other words, it was proposed to create out of this £10,000 a preferential stock of £5,000, which would be much more disposable in the market, and to retain the rest for the chance of dividends after the first dividend was paid. He wanted to know why a man should not be allowed to do that? What was the reason assigned by the noble Lord? He said that it would be very inconvenient, and very much against the interest of the Railway Companies, that there should be a variety of stocks. But supposing that were true, why should their Lordships consider what was for the interest of the Railway Companies? Were not the Railway Companies the best judge of their own interest? He spoke with some experience with regard to the legal questions which had arisen in those cases in which it had been found that Railway Companies had been mismanaged. His observation was this—that whenever there was an improper management with regard to the earnings of the company the circumstance which had always led to its detection was this, that there had been conflicting interests—that there had been two classes of stockholders in the company. If therefore their Lordships wished to make it unlikely that mismanagement should be detected, they would allow only one kind of stock in the company; but if they wished that mismanagement should be detected and exposed, then they would not prevent the creation of different kinds of stock.

LORD ROMILLY said, that if the public were not affected he should not be inclined to insist upon the Amendment. Did anybody believe that if the Railway Company retained all the £10,000 railway stock they were childish enough to prefer 5 per cent on £5,000 and nothing on the remaining £5,000 to 2½ per cent on £10,000? What it really would effect was to enable the Railway Companies to sell the half which was worth nothing for a substantial value. It was accomplished by what was called "rigging the market" which was by fictitious transactions and representations to give to shares worth nothing a temporary value in the market. It might be said that only foolish people would be induced to buy such shares and also that the Railway Companies would not avail themselves of this power. But laws are made to protect foolish people and Parliament was bound not to give powers to persons who might abuse them, in the belief that they would not do so. Bodies of gentlemen are frequently found to do collectively for a company what no one of them would do for himself individually. For the last three or four years his time had been almost wholly taken up with investigating cases in which companies had made false representations to individuals, and thus induced them to take shares. He had therefore come to the conclusion that the effect of this measure should be that Railway Companies would be able to give an appearance of advantage to a class of worthless shares, and so induce the public to trust them in a way the state of their funds did not warrant, and that their Lordships would be doing a great evil if they consented to do so.

On Question ? their Lordships *divided :* —Contents 11 ; Not-Contents 30 : Majority 19.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE BILL.

(*The Lord Clinton.*)

(NO. 253.) COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

LORD REDESDALE objected to the compensation clause, which their Lordships had struck out of former Bills, and the re-introduction of which created expectations on the part of officers of trusts that some provision would be made for them when the trusts expired. The officers included solicitors and surveyors who ought to have no difficulty in finding employment in place of that lost by the cessation of a trust.

A noble LORD said that surveyors, who must have been ten years in the service to entitle them to compensation, and who in some cases might lose employment altogether, were entitled to some consideration.

After a few words from The Earl of STRADBROKE,

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, he thought there was reason for giving surveyors compensation, for in many cases great credit was due to them for getting trusts out of debt.

LORD CLINTON said, there was some force in the distinction which had been drawn between the surveyors and other officers of turnpike trusts. Many of the surveyors were employed exclusively in the service of their trusts, derived their whole income from them, and some of them had reached an age when it would be difficult for them to turn their hands to any other occupation if deprived of their offices. This compensation clause which they were now considering was first introduced into a continuance Act in the year 1866, and was then rejected by their Lordships ; it was again introduced as a part of the Government measure in 1867 when it was again rejected; and it now appeared for the third time, inserted into the Bill by a private Member during its progress through the other House and not objected to by the Government. It was not perhaps a subject which was likely to lead to a collision between the two Houses, but the other House had shown itself sufficiently in earnest on the subject to induce their Lordships, he hoped, to give on this occasion a more favourable consideration to the clause.

(In the Committee.)

LORD REDESDALE said, that he would move an Amendment on the compensation clause on the Report.

An Amendment made : The Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next.

FORESHORES.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH, in moving an Address to Her Majesty for Copies of certain privately printed Papers relating to Foreshores, said, the subject was one of very great importance, and one in which the interests of the public were largely concerned ; but it involved a more intimate knowledge of the law than he could pretend to possess. Of late many claims had been put forward on behalf of the Crown to the Foreshores, which proceeded on the assumption that the shores and bed of the sea formed part of the proprietary rights of the Crown. He was informed, however, this was an entire misconception of the law, and that by usage they belonged to the owners of the adjoining lands. He was informed that the cases in which the Court of Exchequer had decided in favour of the Crown were always cases in which the Crown was the owner of the land on which the Foreshores abutted. There were important Papers now in the possession of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, relating to this subject, which had been transferred to them from the Treasury. These Papers had already been printed, because, being very voluminous, the expense of multiplying them in manuscript would have been very great. But, as they were in print, he thought they might be usefully produced.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to request that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to order that there be laid before this House by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, Copy of each of the following privately printed Papers; namely,

"Report on the Right to Foreshores and the legal Decisions affecting the River Thames and the Rights of the Citizens of London from the Time of Henry III.; by J. W. Pycroft, F.S.A., M.R.A.S.; Reg. Sept. Antiq. Reg. Soc., pp. 161: Also,

"Arguments relating to Sea Lands and Salt Shores: Objections thereto and Answers to such Objections (now first printed from MSS. in the Landsdown Collection [British Museum], London 1855, pp. 61.), disclosing that the Foreshore is the Property of the adjacent Proprietor, and not belonging to the Crown by virtue of its Prerogative, and that the latter has no primâ facie Rights therein or thereto, and of a certain Résumé of the 5th August filed on the 21st of May last:

"As also a Copy of the Shorthand Writer's Notes in the Case of the Attorney-General *v.* Jones, in the Exchequer, in which Her Majesty's Barons of that Court declared that the Foreshore belonged to the Subject by Usage; as also a Copy of all the Correspondence had in reference to such Case previous to the Commencement of these legal Proceedings or subsequent thereto; as also of the Writ upon which Issue was afterwards joined, and all Proceedings subsequent thereto, including the final Decision of the Barons of the Exchequer declaring the Law of England to be that Foreshore belonged to the Subject by Usage: Also,

"Copy of the Defendant's Bill of Costs (previous to Taxation), as also a Statement of the Amount which has been paid to him: And also,

"Statement of the Reasons why the History of the Result of this and Seven other adverse Cases in which the Attorney-General and the Lord Advocate were defeated was omitted to be stated in their Annual Reports addressed to Her Majesty, and presented by Royal Command (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 185., Session 1867.)"—(*The Duke of Buccleuch.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND regretted that he was not able to acquiesce in the Motion of the noble Duke. If all the Papers moved for by the noble Duke were ordered to be printed they would amount to something like four or five folio volumes, and the subject was not such as to warrant the large expenditure of public money that they would cost. Moreover part of these Papers were no more than private statements and arguments addressed to one side of the case. The matter was, in fact, a private and not a public affair—the public had nothing to do with it, and he objected to the outlay of public money in printing private documents. He had no objection to grant certain Returns in continuation of what had been moved for by Mr. Augustus Smith in the House of Commons between 1863 and 1866.

LORD REDESDALE said, he saw no good reason why the Government should object to lay on the table a copy of the judgment in the case of the "Attorney General *v.* Jones."

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that if the judgment in question decided any important principle it was to be found in the authorized Report in their Lordships' Library. There would therefore be no public good in printing it. To print at the public expenses the pamphlet of an enterprizing and somewhat eccentric gentleman like Mr. Pycroft would, he thought, be a somewhat unjustifiable use to make of the public money.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH then moved an Address for—

"Statement of all legal Proceedings which have been instituted by the Law Officers at their Instance in the Name of the Crown, or in the Behalf of Her Majesty, with respect to the alleged Title claimed by the Crown to the Bed or Shores of the Sea or the Foreshores or Beds of Navigable Rivers against Corporate Bodies or Private Individuals from the 1st Day of January 1843 to the present Time:" [and other Particulars.]

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

BED OF THE SEA, &c.

Then THE DUKE OF RICHMOND *moved* an Address for—

"Statements: Of all legal Proceedings instituted by the Law Officers or otherwise on Behalf of the Crown, with respect to the Title of the Crown to the Bed or Shores of the Sea or the Beds or Shores of Tidal Navigable Rivers against Corporate Bodies or Private Individuals, from the 21st Day of July 1863 up to the 31st December 1866:

"Of the Nature and Object of the Suit in each Case; the Name of the Law Officer by whom it was commenced; and whether the Decision or Result was in favour of or adverse to the Crown; and the Amount of Costs incurred on behalf of the Crown:

"Of the Length of Time during which each Suit was pending before it was brought to a Conclusion or its Object was attained; the Nature of the Steps taken therein; and any Observations necessary to explain the same:

"Of the Terms upon and Authority or Advice under which any such Proceedings have been settled:

"Of the Estimated Value of any Property that has by means of such Suits been recovered by the Crown:

"Of the Cases in which such Suits have been discontinued by the Law Officers of the Crown: And,

"Of the Particulars of all Cases in which the Title of the Crown to Property of the above Description has, between the 21st Day of July 1863 and the 31st Day of December 1866, been admitted without Litigation; the Estimated Value of the Property; with a Statement showing how the same has been leased or disposed of up to the last-mentioned Day."—(*The Duke of Richmond.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 21, 1868.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee* — Electric Telegraphs (*re-comm.*) [239]; Poor Relief [186]—R.P.; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland)* [210]—R.P.; Hudson's Bay Company* [240]—R.P.; Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London, (*re-comm.*)* [247].

Report—Electric Telegraphs (*re-comm.*) [239]; Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London, (*re-comm.*)* [247].

Considered as amended—Inland Revenue* [207].

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Army Chaplains* [225]; Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment* [181], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Trades Societies and Combinations of Workmen* [219]; Church Rates Abolition* [21].

NAVY—ADMIRALTY CIRCULARS ON MEDALS OF 1847, 1848, AND 1858.

QUESTION.

CAPTAIN MACKINNON said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, If the Admiralty Circulars on Medals of 1847, 1848, and 1858 are to remain in force?

LORD HENRY LENNOX, in reply, said, he had no doubt the hon. and gallant Gentleman was aware that a Committee had sat to inquire into this subject towards the close of the year 1848; and at this distance of time it was not considered proper to re-open the case.

IMPRISONMENT FOR COSTS ON A DISMISSED CHARGE.—QUESTION.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been called to the case of Mr. William Castle, of Melton Mowbray, recently sentenced by a bench of magistrates to fourteen days' imprisonment with hard labour, for non-payment of twelve shillings imposed on him as costs on account of a dismissed charge, he being sixty-three years old, and, as he states, unable to pay that sum; and whether Her Majesty's Government will adopt any measure to prevent imprisonment, imposed in lieu of a pecuniary payment, from being accompanied by the penal infliction of hard labour?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY replied, that he had not heard of this case till it was mentioned by the hon. Gentleman yesterday; but he had taken steps to obtain information. When he was fully informed on the subject he would state his impression as to whether there was any necessity for future legislation.

INDIA—FURLOUGH REGULATIONS.

QUESTION.

SIR ROBERT ANSTRUTHER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether the new Indian Furlough Regulations will not inflict hardship upon those civil servants who are now on furlough under the old regulations; and whether he will undertake that steps shall be taken to place those gentlemen, upon their return to India, in as favourable a position for obtaining appointments as they would have occupied had the new regulations not come into operation; and, should this be impossible, whether compensation will be awarded to those officers whose interests may be affected; and whether he will extend to military officers the privilege of drawing 50 per cent of their salary when on furlough; also, when the regulations will take effect?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, in reply, that it was, unfortunately, impossible to make alterations in the regulations respecting furlough that should not to some extent injuriously affect certain individuals, especially in the case of the present changes. The main difference, as the hon. Gentleman was aware, between the new and the old rules was this—that under the old regulations when an officer came from India he vacated his employment, and when he returned he had a chance of re-appointment to other employment similarly vacated; but under the new rules an officer would retain a lien on his appointment, and thus anyone now at home and going back to India would not, as formerly, find a vacancy to which he could be appointed. He would only be able to get an acting appointment. The only way in which that inconvenience could be mitigated was to make a further rule that officers now at home should have acting appointments on more favourable terms than they usually had; and the provision now made was that officers now at home should receive 75 per cent of the value of appointments held by them as acting appointments, and also receive subsistence allowance. That would be considerably in excess of the ordinary arrangements, and the difference would be paid from the general revenues of India. He therefore hoped no material hardship would be inflicted in any case. No doubt they would get the rules in a perfect state by the next mail. The regulations had been sent home for revision, and they had been returned with remarks desiring that certain alterations should be made in them. By last mail they arrived in an unsigned letter, which contained the main principles of the rules. He believed the new regulations came into force on the 1st of July.

ARMY—THE 36TH REGIMENT.

QUESTION.

Mr. OTWAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true that the 36th Regiment was sent from England in March last to Kurrachee in Scinde, where it arrived at the commencement of the hot season; whether the Regiment was then sent into barracks which had "been declared unfit for European troops;" and, whether, on one day in June last, nine men, women, and children of the Regiment died in those barracks from what was called heat apoplexy?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he was sorry he was not able to give as full an answer to the hon. Gentleman's Question as he could wish. In one respect, however, the hon. Gentleman seemed to be acting under erroneous information. The hon. Member stated that the 36th Regiment was sent to Kurrachee, in Scinde. The fact, however, was that the 36th Regiment went to India in 1863, and it was only a detachment that was sent in March to join the Regiment. Probably it was to that detachment the Question of the hon. Gentleman applied. With regard to the barracks, he must remind the hon. Gentleman that the War Office in England has nothing whatever to do with the barracks in India. It was, no doubt, a most painful statement to be obliged to make that nine persons, including men, women, and children died upon one day, from apoplexy caused by heat. The Question of the hon. Gentleman not having appeared upon the Paper until that morning, he (Sir John Pakington) sent for information to the Horse Guards, and also to the Medical Department of the War Office, but at neither place had news been received of anything of the kind. Until, therefore, further information had reached him, he could only say that no such facts were known in official quarters.

Sir Stafford Northcote

IRELAND—CONVICTS WARREN AND COSTELLO.—QUESTION.

Mr. VANCE said, he would beg to ask the hon. Member for Westminster, Whether it is true, as reported in the *Irishman* newspaper, 14th July 1868, that he wrote a letter to Mr. Nevin, dated the 2nd July, in which he objected to ask a Question concerning the convicts Warren and Costello, because he "thought that asking the Question publicly could do the prisoners no good, and would only enable the Government to claim and obtain credit for clemency."

Mr. J. STUART MILL: I believe, Sir, I am under no obligation to answer the hon. Member's Question, but I have not the smallest objection to do so. I have not seen the article in the *Irishman*, nor have I ever corresponded on any subject with that paper; nor, so far as I am aware, with Mr. Nevin. But I did write a letter to a friend of the two prisoners in question, which contained some words bearing some resemblance to those here quoted. Having been asked by a friend of the prisoners to put a Question concerning them, I thought it right before doing so to lay the case before the friends of the prisoners, in order that they might consider whether, from the point of view of the prisoners themselves, it was desirable or not that this Question should be answered. What words I used I cannot exactly remember; but the statement quoted conveys in two important particulars an extremely inaccurate notion of my sentiments. In the first place, it represents me as having been unwilling to ask the Question. I never was in the smallest degree unwilling, and, as the House is aware, I did ask the Question. Secondly, it represents me as unwilling that the Government should claim or obtain any credit. I desire extremely that the Government should both claim and obtain credit for everything meritorious that they have done.

Mr. VANCE said, that he had now before him a copy of the *Irishman* newspaper, which gave the statement in the exact words of the Question.

NAVY—CHAPLAINS.—QUESTION

In answer to a Question from Mr. Carnegie,

Lord HENRY LENNOX said, he was not surprised, knowing the great interest that existed out-of-doors on the subject of the pay and position of the Army Chaplains, that the hon. Gentleman should have put this Question to him. He was, however, unable to add anything to the answer he gave about a fortnight ago to the hon. Member for Windsor (Mr. Eykyn), namely, that in pursuance of a pledge given by the First Lord of the Admiralty, that the pay and position of the Naval Chaplains should be considered by the Board, they had come to the unanimous conclusion that the Navy Chaplains should be placed on an equality with the Army Chaplains. Owing however, to financial difficulties, the amount had not appeared in this year's Estimates, but he hoped that before long justice would be done to the Navy Chaplains.

ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS (*re-committed*) BILL—[Bill 239.]

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Sclater Booth.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, in moving that the House go into Committee upon this Bill, he proposed to give some explanation of what had transpired with respect to the Bill since it had been sent upstairs. When the Bill was before the House on the second reading no arrangement had been come to between the promoters of the Bill and the railway and telegraph companies. With respect to the telegraph companies, the promoters of the Bill had offered them the actual price paid up, and, in addition, what an arbitrator would give them for the prospective increase likely to occur in their income, and an additional sum for the compulsory sale. That offer was declined by the electric telegraph companies, and therefore when he proposed the second reading of the Bill no terms whatever had been agreed upon. But as soon as the Bill was read a second time, and referred to a Select Committee, the electric telegraph companies became much more amenable to reason, and before the Bill passed through the Select Committee the terms were virtually agreed to between them and the Government; the basis of which was a twenty years' purchase at the present net profits. There were some minor points of difference with respect to some of the companies; but those were the terms upon which the agreements generally were based. With regard to the railway companies, before the labours of the Committee had proceeded very far those companies entered into an arrangement with the promoters of the Bill and withdrew their opposition to it. It would be recollected by the House that when the Bill was last under discussion it was urged that the Government were not dealing equitably and fairly with the telegraph companies; whereas now the accusation of some of the opponents of the Bill was that the Government had acted too liberally towards those companies. In his opinion one assertion was about as well founded as the other, because the Government had always intended that the companies should be equitably dealt with, and that the terms now agreed upon, although very liberal, were not more so than the companies ought to receive under the circumstances, and did not offer more than an arbitrator would have given had the matter been left to an open arbitration. Some urged that instead of a twenty years' purchase of the net profits it should have been a ten years' leasehold interest, and those who took that view in the Committee were very soon satisfied on examination that such a purchase could not be maintained. It was perfectly true that some of the companies had only a few years' agreement to run; but others extended over a considerable period, and the average duration of the agreements might be taken as twenty-six years and two-thirds taken by the mile line, and twenty-five and a half years taken by the line of wire, consequently they had not given twenty years' purchase for ten years, but a twenty years' purchase for a twenty-five or twenty-six years' leasehold interest. The terms of the agreement between the railway and the electric telegraph companies were such that it was perfectly impossible on most of the lines for the railway companies to oust the telegraph companies and turn adrift the present lessees; and therefore, as in the case of old leasehold interests, they might be considered as perpetual, the lessee having the equitable right, and could practically exercise the right of renewing the lease. Under the circumstances, he thought they had offered to the companies a very liberal amount for their property. Another point to which he wished to direct attention was that the twenty years' purchase was to be calculated on the amount of the present net profits, whereas the profits of the telegraph companies were increasing at the rate of 10 per cent per annum. He was satisfied that the more the House looked into the matter the more they would be satisfied with the bargain that had been made. He did not mean to say that some Members of the Committee were not of opinion that those terms should be reduced, because, in fact, one hon. Member below the Gangway had moved that the terms should be reduced from twenty to sixteen years' purchase; but only two other Members of the Committee adopted his view of the question, and he (the Chancellor of the Excheque) was certain it would not receive the attention of the House any more than it did the support of the Select Committee. With regard to the railway companies, on the other hand, they appeared to have a *bonâ fide* apprehension that, under the Government management, they would have some difficulty in transacting their business by telegraph. On the occasion of the second reading of the Bill he had stated that that point was capable of adjustment, and that the Government would be willing to render the railway companies every facility for the due working of their lines by means of telegraph communication along them. As soon as the Government had agreed with the telegraph companies, the railway companies one by one began to find that such a thing was possible. First the Scotch railway companies agreed with the Government, and it was well known that the Natives of that part of Great Britain were by no means deficient in shrewdness and practical knowledge of their affairs. The example set by the railway companies North of the Tweed was speedily followed by the companies on the South of the Tweed, and before that Committee had been many days engaged in their labours, the whole of the railway companies had made agreements with the Post Office as to the terms for the future. It was agreed that there should be a severance of the wires used for the telegraph purposes only and those used solely for the purposes of the railway companies; and while the railways consented, where such a course was advisable, to their posts being used for the wires of the Post Office, the Post Office, on the other hand, where such was needed, consented to their posts being made use of for the wires of the companies. There was also a pecuniary compensation to be made to the companies for the loss of telegraph property so far as their interests in the wires were concerned. Now, there were certain railway companies who had wires for their own use, and who were also in the habit of transmitting messages for the public, and they were to be considered in the light of electric telegraph companies. There were others who had arrangements with the electric telegraph companies for the despatch of railway messages, but not for the despatch of telegraphic business; and general clauses had been found to meet those particular cases. The compensation for the former was to be the same as in the case of electric telegraph companies, and in the case of the others they took the average from the average increase of the last three years, with an allowance to those who were under agreement to the telegraph companies for way-leaves. The amount of compensation under those heads was to be decided on by an arbitrator. It was thus impossible to form any very accurate opinion of the sum that would be required for the purpose of compensating the railway companies and the telegraph companies; and consequently it would not be possible at the present period of the Session to propose to the House any money Bill with a view to carry out these arrangements. Such a Bill could not be proposed until the arbitrator had concluded his labours, and as the number of interests concerned were very complicated and the work was very heavy, they could not expect any award to be made for a considerable time. It would be in the recollection of the House that when he formerly addressed the House on this subject he stated, although he was unwilling to go into the details of compensation, that he believed the expenditure required would be covered by £4,000,000. In the same way he was no more prepared to go into the estimate at the present moment. Some of the Members who inquired into the Bill were anxious to go into particulars; but the difficulty was this—If the interests concerned were estimated at certain sums, these sums would of course be referred to when the matter came under the notice of the arbitrator, and it would be impossible for the Government in any case to insist upon a lower sum than the one they had estimated, because as that sum would be known the companies concerned would refuse to take less. Mr. Scudamore, whose ability with regard not only to this but also to other matters, had been of great service to the Government, had, however, given considerable attention to this matter, and Mr. Scudamore believed that £6,000,000 would be the outside figure, and his calculations had been submitted to and approved by Mr. Foster, the principal finance officer of the Treasury. The House might possibly think that this was a considerable advance upon the original estimate; but that advance was easily accounted for. The Government was now proposing to buy a much larger and a much more valuable property than was contemplated when a rough estimate of £4,000,000 was made out. As soon as they had managed to get on good terms with the companies, they found that they were better able to get information, and the consequence was that they discovered that the property was more profitable than they had anticipated, and also that there were other matters for consideration which they had entirely overlooked. The former estimate was based entirely upon the inland lines; but now their estimate embraced telegraphy in connection with the Continent, from which a revenue of £45,000 a year was now derived. They had found it necessary to purchase the Continental cable, now worked by Reuter's Company, a purchase which was not at first contemplated, and in addition to that they had obtained perpetual and exclusive way-leaves over the lines of railways. The latter was a very valuable matter, about which there might be some difficulty hereafter, if it was not included in the present terms of purchase. It should, however, be remembered that the amount he had mentioned was an outside sum. But Mr. Scudamore had also made two estimates, one of revenue and the other of working expenses. These estimates had been checked by Mr. Foster, who had expressed his satisfaction with the figures. The starting point, or business in inland messages taken over by the Post Office on the 1st July, 1869, and arrived at by adding annual rate of increase, which was taken to be 10 per cent, to the number of messages (6,000,000) delivered in 1866, would be 7,500,000 messages. That formed the basis of the calculation. Of that number 55 per cent were at the 1*s.* rate, and would be unaffected by a reduction in the rates, 4,125,000; 30 per cent were at the 1*s.* 6*d.* rate, and would undergo a reduction of rate to the extent of 33 per cent, 2,250,000; 10 per cent were at the 2*s.* rate, and would be benefited by the reduction to the extent of 50 per cent, 750,000; and 5 per cent would be benefited by the reduction in the rate to the extent of about 70 per cent, 375,000. The total expenditure was as follows:—the starting point of expenditure was taken to be the combined expenditure of the telegraph companies—namely, £330,000; from this was to be deducted for the saving which they could effect if they amalgamated, £55,000 — leaving £275,000; £10,000 in consequence of no cost being any longer incurred for working Reuter's cable, and working and maintaining cables to Holland. The working expenses would thus be reduced to £265,000. To that would be added £26,500 for working and maintaining Post Office extensions, and 33 per cent, or £87,450 for the cost of meeting the estimated increase of business. This would give a total expenditure of £378,950. That would leave a net revenue of £301,050, to which must be added £12,000 for Press messages, and £45,000 for Continental messages, leaving a total net revenue of about £358,000. By deducting one amount from the other we had £358,050, Mr. Scudamore's maximum estimate, which some might think excessive; but it had been framed in accordance with the principle which governed all estimates, and which had guided the House on many previous occasions. The Government, however, did not intend to proceed upon the basis of this maximum estimate. Mr. Scudamore had framed a minimum estimate also. Taking the business as it stood in 1866, he had deducted from the revenue the expenses of working Reuter's cables and all other charges as before, and making no allowance for increase of business, except the average increase which the companies themselves might reasonably expect if the business remained in their hands, he found the result was £203,000. Mr. Scudamore had then taken the mean between this maximum estimate of £358,050 and the minimum of £203,000, and fixed on £280,500 as a safe basis on which to proceed. Valuing money at 3½ per cent, £280,000 a year represented £8,000,000; but Mr. Scudamore had estimated the purchase money at £6,000,000, so that taking even the mean estimate as the basis, the proposition showed a balance in favour of the Government of £2,000,000, and if the maximum estimate were taken the balance would be £4,000,000, because £10,000,000 could be raised on an income of £358,000 a year. Under these circumstances he presumed the proposition made by the Government would be regarded as satisfactory in a financial point of view. The way in which the money should be raised would be matter for consideration when it was known what would actually be required, and what were our available resources; at present he contented himself with showing that the estimate would stand any amount of examination by the House, as it had stood very careful scrutiny by the Committee, and that for the Government to carry out the scheme would not only prove safe but profitable. The Select Committee had not only to consider these matters, but other matters especially referred to them under the Instructions of the House. There were several matters which it was thought had not been sufficiently illustrated. One was whether the Post Office should possess a legal monopoly in the transmission of messages. When the Bill was first introduced the Government thought it inadvisable that the Post Office should have a legal monopoly; but it was believed that if we obtained all the undertakings of the telegraph companies we should have a practical monopoly; because, as long as the Post Office conducted its business properly, and availed itself of all new inventions in telegraphic science for expediting the transmission of messages, and kept the rates at the lowest possible figure, there would be no chance of any competition. The Select Committee had endorsed the views of the Government on that subject. It was suggested in the Committee by the right. hon. Member for the City (Mr. Goschen) that with lower rates, within certain limits in large towns, it might be possible to have effective competition with the Post Office, who, under the Bill, would have a uniform rate. The question, however, was examined, and the Post Office witnesses thought there would be no occasion for a competition, because as soon as possible the Post Office would reduce their rates, and that no private company could compete with them. Moreover, it was thought not desirable to establish the monopoly, because this would get rid of the stimulus which would otherwise prompt the Post Office to salutary action. The result was that on a division the "Ayes" against the monopoly were 6 and the "Noes" 1. The next point was as to whether it should be left to the discretion of the Postmaster General to make special agreements for the transmission of messages or news at reduced rates. During the discussion which arose on the Motion for the second reading it was alleged by some critics that the Post Office would have a monopoly of the news to be sent, and that the Government for the time being would favour their adherents by transmitting their speeches earlier or in a more perfect form than they would transmit those of their political opponents. Arguing on this presumption, it was urged that a Government Department should not be invested with such powers. In the question of Press messages, several newspaper proprietors gave evidence, and they should certainly be regarded as the best judges of the matter. They felt no alarm at the prospect of the Government having control of the transmission of messages, and expressed great dissatisfaction with the present arrangement, because the telegraphic companies had not only a monopoly of transmission but a monopoly of collection of news and sent only what news they chose. Beside this, they had actually threatened their customers if they did not take a particular line respecting this Bill. The arrangement proposed under this Bill if it became law would secure that the Post Office should not collect but only transmit news; the whole duty of collection would rest with the newspapers themselves, and he believed the newspaper proprietors had already formed themselves into an association to collect the news, and it would become the duty of the Post Office to transmit this news at rates not higher than certain charges named in the Bill. Clauses had therefore been put into the Bill enabling the Postmaster General to make special agreements with newspaper proprietors for the transmission of news, and upon this point the Committee came to the following conclusion:—

"That it should be left to the discretion of the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Treasury, to make special agreements for the

> transmission of certain classes of messages at reduced rates; but that any such special agreements should be laid upon the table of the House of Commons as soon as conveniently may be."

The object of this was that if the Post Office made a favourable arrangement with one newspaper or one news-room, it should be obliged to make an equally favourable arrangement with any other. Provisions were also made for enabling a newspaper proprietor to have the exclusive use of a wire on certain terms. The next subject on which the Committee was engaged was the question of secresy. It was supposed, why he could not say, that the clerks of the Post Office would be more likely to violate their pledge of secresy than the clerks of the telegraph companies. He was of opinion that, as the Post Office was a great Department of State, any misconduct of this nature would more speedily be exposed than if it had arisen among the *employés* of any commercial company. It was said that the wires could be "milked" or "tapped," and that a Government messenger could ascertain the whole of the telegraphic correspondence which was going on. But this was represented to the Committee by the witnesses to be a complete chimera. It was admitted that it was possible; but it was clearly shown that the practice could not go on for many minutes without being discovered. However, to satisfy all scruples which might by possibility be entertained in respect of the preservation of secresy, the Committee had adopted a Resolution which made the violation of secresy in the transmission of messages a misdemeanour. In the General Telegraphs Act such violation of secresy was punishable by a penalty; but in this Bill it was made a misdemeanour. Then there was a point which, though not included in the Instructions, the Committee had taken into consideration. It had been suggested that the privilege of priority, to be enjoyed by the Government, might be abused by the officers of Departments in obtaining priority for messages not on Government Business, but sent for private purposes. In order to give the public a security against anything of that sort it had been arranged that all messages for which priority was claimed should bear the word "priority" stamped upon them, and that they should be filed in the Post Office for a year. It would therefore be observed that any such abuse as had been suggested would be exposed by the production of the message. The fourth and last point which the Committee had been instructed to consider was what arrangements ought to be made by the Post Office for working submarine cables to foreign countries. This matter was one which had offered some difficulty to the Government, and in order to meet it a clause had been inserted in the original Bill to empower the Government to lease any part of the cables which might come into their possession. It had been found on inquiry that in respect of those cables there were existing agreements between telegraph companies at home and other telegraph companies abroad; and it was thought that some confliction of rights or some confusion in respect of agreements might arise if the Government took up the working of the cables while those agreements continued to exist. Under these circumstances it had been the intention of the Government, if the Bill passed in the original shape, to lease the cables. Since then they had made an arrangement to lease to the Submarine Telegraph Company any cables of which they might become the owners. The Committee approved the notion of a plan of that kind; but in their Resolution on the subject they did not shut out the possibility that at a future time the submarine cables might be worked by the Post Office itself. He believed he had now gone through the salient points of the Bill; but perhaps he might be permitted to make some observations in reference to the objections put forward on the part of the telegraph companies when the second reading of the Bill was under discussion. On that occasion it was said, "You are going to carry the telegraph system into remote districts where the experience of the companies shows that it cannot pay." He believed that some hon. Members had been impressed with that argument; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City (Mr. Goschen) had been desirous—and he thought properly so—to call the managers of the telegraph companies to learn what was their opinion on the subject. Some of those gentlemen were examined before the Committee, and they admitted that the object of the pamphlet put forward by the telegraph companies was to make as good a case as they could against the Bill; and that when they said it would not pay to extend the telegraph into districts to which the Government proposed to carry it that statement had reference to the position of the companies. They had not viewed the matter in the light of what might be of advantage to the public, or what would pay the Post Office. They felt bound to regard the question in a purely commercial light; they were expected to pay a dividend and a good dividend, and they had to reject what might ultimately pay if its immediate effect would be to injuriously affect the amount of the dividend. Again, an extension of the system under the companies would have involved very considerable expense for new offices and additional clerks; whereas in the remote districts to which it was proposed to bring the telegraph the Government had Post Offices and they had clerks who would perform the necessary duties in connection with the telegraphs for some addition to the salaries which they at present received. He thought those admissions entirely did away with the objections urged against that portion of the Government plan. He need not enlarge on the advantages which would accrue to the entire country if the Government should be enabled to carry out the scheme proposed in the Bill. He might, however, mention that instead of the telegraph offices being on the outskirts of important towns, they would be brought into the centre of those towns, and that in remote districts the telegraph would be extended to every place in which there was a money-order office. In addition to the advantage which the public would gain by a reduction in the rates for transmission, porterage would be included, without additional charge, to a much wider extent than that allowed under the companies. He could not but think that, by having the telegraphic communication of the country under a great Department which had shown itself competent to discharge the important duty of carrying letters and papers, and had, he believed, earned the gratitude of the public for the punctual and exemplary manner in which it performed that function, greater accuracy and increased expedition in the transmission of messages would be achieved. He confidently recommended this Bill to the House not only as one which would confer great advantages on the commercial interests and conduce to the comfort of private families, but as one which would bear a searching examination in a financial point of view.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would admit that the Select Committee on the Bill had curtailed their inquiry as much as possible, considering the magnitude of the interests involved. He had seen a criticism to the effect that time had been wasted, but the inquiry lasted only nine days, while the proposed outlay was £6,000,000 sterling. Besides, the inquiry had been carried on under great disadvantages. An opposition, organized by private interests, had been changed into an organization of warm supporters of the Bill pending the inquiry. Before the Committee there appeared counsel representing the promoters, and, at first, counsel representing the original opposition to the Bill; but in consequence of the change in the views of the opposition who during the proceedings became friendly to the Bill, there was no counsel present to cross-examine the witnesses. Consequently, in the interests of the public, and in order that all the facts might be brought to light, Members of the Committee had to discharge the duty of cross-examining the witnesses. The same causes led to the result that the witnesses produced were all on one side, and it was only just that he should bear testimony to the ability with which Mr. Scudamore had brought forward his views and stood any amount of cross-examination in defence of those views. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had mentioned that he, as a Member of the Committee, had been desirous that some gentleman connected with the companies should be examined. The result had justified his wish. Considerable light had been thrown on the subject by their evidence. Now in the first place he wished to state it as his opinion that the evidence brought before the Committee was such as on many points to modify the hostile views which might have been entertained in some quarters with regard to the Bill. One of these objections he might allude to, though it was not much pressed before the Committee. It was contended that the present telegraph companies had a responsibility upon them for any loss or damage that might result from the sending of inaccurate messages, but that no such responsibility would be upon the Government, and that thus the commercial classes would lose a certain amount of security for the accurate transmission of their messages. That objection was examined into, and it was found that there was little force in it, for this reason, that no instance could be adduced of anybody having ever got anything out of a company for such a default. The witnesses who were brought forward on behalf of the commercial classes attached little importance to this point, and certainly in his own experience he never recollected of any compensation being paid in this way. There was a celebrated case of a mistake having once been made of 400 for 4,000, which caused an enormous loss, and even the ruin of the firm; but he never heard, either in that case or any other, of compensation having been paid by the companies. He, therefore, thought that the transfer of the telegraph wires from the companies to the Government was not in this respect a move in a wrong direction. The second point was that of secresy. He agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that, on the whole, the evidence showed there was not much to fear on that head. Witnesses from various Chambers of Commerce were called, and were examined very fully upon this head, and they stated very forcibly, though vaguely, that the general feeling of the towns from which they came was in favour of the transfer of these lines to the Government. As to the question of the scale of charges to be levied, and the mode in which the telegraph ought to be made to pay, the commercial witnesses, being unacquainted with the price proposed to be given by the Government, could not speak with any authority. One commercial witness said he thought the system ought to be self-supporting, and that if 1*s.* a message would not pay it ought to be raised to 1*s.* 6*d.* Another witness said that if 1*s.* would not pay a sum ought to be advanced temporarily from the Consolidated Fund till the system had time to work its way. He did not think, however, that much importance was to be attached to the evidence of these witnesses on points on which they had no peculiar information. On the question of secresy they were competent to give an opinion; and he, as representing a commercial community, was bound to say that neither from these witnesses nor from his own constituents had he heard a single doubt or suspicion that the commercial interests of the country would suffer from the transfer of the lines from the companies to the Government. They would sooner have their business conducted under the eyes of the Government than under the eyes of the directors of the companies. The case was somewhat different with regard to the political questions to which the right hon. Gentleman alluded. He thought, however, the general feeling was that those political occasions on which the Government might abuse their power were comparatively rare, and he must state the general feeling of the public ran in the direction that they were not afraid to trust the Government with the perusal of their messages. Another question arose as regarded the railways. It had been suggested that it would be impossible for the Government to conduct the messages for the railways with a due regard to the public safety. But that impossibility had been got over, as other difficulties were got over, by a very liberal outlay indeed; and the railways having been bought over, and overpaid too, that difficulty was removed. There was another point on which they had a good deal of interesting evidence — the facility with which the Post Office officials might be taught to work the telegraphs. The evidence on that head was very satisfactory. A police officer explained how he had taught policemen in a short time the use of the cryptograph, and the evidence generally went to show how quickly young boys and inexperienced people would acquire the art of telegraphy. It appeared to him that, upon the whole, the administrative difficulties connected with the system were not so great as might be anticipated; and he did not think that they afforded any reason for opposing the transfer of the telegraph system from the companies to a Government Department. Holding that view, he had voted in favour of the Preamble of the Bill, and he had voted against a Motion that further inquiry was necessary before passing to the clauses. But he wished now to say a few words on the next important point—if it was not the most important point—the probable financial results of the measure. As regarded the financial results, he admitted that Mr. Scudamore had shown himself to be a skilful financier; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had explained how he had arrived at the results which were now submitted to Parliament. As the right hon. Gentleman put it, there was a minimum and maximum estimate. Mr. Scudamore's estimate of the number of messages appeared to him to be very liberal indeed, and he would show the House why he thought it was too liberal. Mr. Scudamore started with the year 1866, when the number of messages was 6,000,000; and assuming that the messages would show an annual increase at the rate of 10 per cent, he calculated that by the month of July 1869, when the lines would come into possession of the Government, the number of messages would then be 7,500,000. But since Mr. Scudamore gave his evidence they had got the data for the year 1867, and they knew the total receipts of the telegraph companies for that year. Now, Mr. Scudamore told the Committee that the average receipt of the telegraph companies was 1*s.* 11*d.* for each message, and it appeared to him (Mr. Goschen) that if they divided the total receipts by 1*s.* 11*d.*, or roughly by 2*s.*, the number of messages sent was not, as Mr. Scudamore calculated, 6,600,000, but only 5,500,000. Now he wished to point out to the House that if Mr. Scudamore was in error on this point to the amount of 1,000,000, that error involved another, because there was not only this difference of 1,000,000 on the wrong side, but the corresponding decrease on the additions which Mr. Scudamore expected to obtain in 1868 and 1869, and his estimate that the number of messages would reach 11,000,000 would prove incorrect. According to his calculation, estimating the number of messages by dividing the total receipts by 2*s.*, the average price of a message, he estimated that there would be a deficiency of from £80,000 to £100,000 on Mr. Scudamore's estimated receipts. He put this forward as the result of his own calculations based on figures given by Mr. Scudamore for what it was worth. But there was another test. Mr. Scudamore had referred to the case of Belgium and France, and to the telegraphic system in operation there. Now in France the cost of telegraphing was higher than the Government here proposed to charge—it was 2 francs, or 1*s.* 8*d.* a message—though it was lower than the companies' present rates. But in France the number of messages was only 2,500,000 in a population of 37,000,000; while Mr. Scudamore estimated that in England there would be 11,500,000 of messages in a population of 30,000,000. He (Mr. Goschen) admitted that there was far more telegraphing in England than in France; but making all allowance for that, the difference still struck him as enormous. But how did the case stand with Belgium? Belgium was essentially a telegraphic country; and there they had a 6*d.* rate, which was considerably lower than that proposed by the Government. In Belgium there were about 1,000,000 of telegrams per annum for a population of 5,000,000. In England, with a rate twice as high, nevertheless, we were to expect the number of telegrams sent to be 11,500,000 to a population of 30,000,000; which was far beyond the Belgian proportion. Mr. Scudamore proceeded in his statement on this footing — There was to be no increase in the 1*s.* messages, but in the 1*s.* 6*d.* messages there was to be an increase of 33 per cent. Why? Because in Belgium a similar reduction gave a similar result. But the lower down they got the greater was the chance that the reduction would lead to increased telegraphy, and it did not follow that the same reduction on a higher scale of charge would lead to the same increase. In his opinion, Mr. Scudamore was sanguine in his estimate of 11,500,000 telegrams. He started from 6,000,000 messages, and brought up his estimates too high; and he should not be surprised if there was a deficiency at the end of the year of £100,000. In his estimate of expenditure Mr. Scudamore also appeared to too sanguine. He took the aggregate amount of the four companies and reduced it by £55,000 which would be saved by amalgamation. But he did not think because the companies would save that amount by amalgamation, it followed that the Government would conduct the business of the Department as economically as private companies. Assuming, however, that the Government would conduct the business as economically as the private companies under a state of things resembling amalgamation, and that the expenses of the directors would be saved, it should be remembered that the Department must undertake business from which the telegraph companies would have shrunk as unremunerative. The telegraph companies would not carry their wires into districts where the charges must be heavier than the receipts would meet, while the Government must, and he was sure would, consult the public convenience by bringing the telegraph into districts which the companies would not have undertaken, looking at the matter in a commercial point of view. He thought, therefore, that on this head Mr. Scudamore had made a too sanguine estimate. When he looked at the expenses of other countries, he felt justified in coming to the same conclusion. It was calculated that in Belgium every mile of wire cost £5 10*s*., in France every mile cost £5 to work. Now, admitting that the English Government would conduct their business as economically as France or Belgium, yet £5 a mile upon 80,000 miles of wire would cost £150,000 more than Mr. Scudamore's estimate. There was another result to which he wished to invite the atttention of the Committee. Mr. Scudamore, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer informed the House, had taken for the basis of his expenditure the aggregate expenditure of the four companies; but he had not taken into consideration the sums that were laid aside by the Electric International Company as a reserve fund. According to a witness before the Committee this sum was not a mere surplus dividend, but was intended to meet general casualties, and especially the losses on the submarine cable. Now, it was true that the depreciation on the land wires was not so great but that it might be met by the earnings of each half-year; but yet there was a time not long ago when a snowstorm caused an outlay of £20,000. He contended that Mr. Scudamore had made no allowance for reverses such as these. Now, if he was right on these points, it was clear that Mr. Scudamore had not left a sufficient margin for expense, that his estimate was £50,000 too low, and if they added that additional £50,000 to the £100,000 by which he believed the revenue was returned too high, they would get a difference of £150,000. This would reduce Mr. Scudamore's minimum estimate from £300,000 to £150,000, and it would reduce his maximum estimate from £380,000 to £230,000. It might be said that £150,000 would still render it safe to go on with this bargain. Well, he did not say that the Bill ought not to proceed; but he contended that it ought to be carefully examined, and to be looked at from every point of view, so that the taxpayers of the country might not be led to take too sanguine an estimate of the advantages that were to be derived from it. He admitted that even if the profits were reduced to £150,000, it would meet 3½ per cent upon £4,500,000. On the other hand, if the maximum estimate were reached, it would cover an expenditure of £6,000,000. He was afraid the country was now pledged to the Bill. But he would ask, was it a proper way to go about the purchase—that they were content to give any amount that could be afforded without actual loss irrespective of the actual value? He knew it might be said that the property was worth holding, and that if we got what we wanted we need not mind the terms. Why should we begrudge the giving a handsome sum to the telegraph companies if we were to do so without loss to the country? But he would ask was that the proper thing for Parliament to do? The Chancellor of the Exchequer had wisely said nothing as to the amount of the assets they were about to acquire. The witnesses estimated their assets at £2,200,000, and it was admitted that if the Government were about to start fair, and begin the system for themselves, the wires could be constructed for less than £2,000,000. They were therefore about to pay £4,000,000 more for the good-will, for the buying up of interests, and he might say, for the eagerness to do the thing in a hurry. In the first instance, arbitration had been proposed, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that arbitration was looked upon as confiscation by the companies. For his own part, he did not wonder at that, because the arbitration clause contained an extraordinary provision that the arbiter was to be appointed by the Board of Trade, so that the companies had a right to say, "You are buying us by means of an arbiter of your own appointment." He (Mr. Goschen) asked Mr. Scudamore in Committee if the companies had asked for twenty-five years' purchase instead of twenty would you have given up your Bill? Mr. Scudamore said, "No; he should then have thought it fair to revert to the principle of arbitration." Now, if the Government thought twenty-five years was so extravagant a charge that they would have insisted on arbitration rather than accede to these terms, or leave them in possession of a monopoly, it was open to those who thought twenty years' purchase an extravagant sum to say the same. Let him show to the House in what a different position the companies stood as soon as the Government departed from the idea of arbitration. The shares of the companies rose 50 per cent as soon as arbitration was departed from and the present terms accepted by the

Government. It appeared to him that that was *primâ facie* a strong argument that they were paying too high terms. Mr. Scudamore stated in his evidence that he would have paid the companies upon the highest value their shares had ever reached, which was then £150 per share, to which 15 per cent should be added for the compulsory sale. But even these terms would not amount to the £207 at which the shares of the companies stood now. Let him approach the matter from a different point of view. The terms of twenty years' purchase were defended because twenty-five years' purchase was inserted in the Railway Bill of 1846. Therefore the telegraph companies maintained that, standing upon the same footing, they had made a concession of five years. But there was no analogy between the railways and the telegraph companies, for though they were both exposed to competition, the competition with railways would not be so imminent as with telegraph companies. And then, further, by a little slip in drawing up the contract, the terms were calculated on the profits of the present year up to the 30th June, 1868, so that they agreed to pay on the profits of the companies, six months of which were not yet before them. If they had taken the profits for the year 1867, they would have had the advantage of having all the accounts placed before them; but in the present year they might be sure that the companies, having this prospect of a transfer before them, would increase their profits by keeping down their expenditure to the lowest point. He held that the Government ought not to have taken the profits of one year at all. They ought to have taken the average of the last three years. The bargain was not only bad in itself, but it was a source of danger as a precedent. These terms would be quoted against the country on future occasions; and if the Government were called upon, for instance, to deal with the Irish railways, he had no doubt that these clauses would be quoted as a precedent in the matter. Why did he say that twenty years' purchase was too high? For this reason; putting aside the admission of the proprietors themselves—that telegraph property was liable to constant depreciation—he said that there was not a business of any kind in the country, yielding a profit of 15 per cent, that was worth twenty years' purchase. A business that yielded only 5 or 6 per cent might command twenty-five years' purchase; but to give twenty years' purchase for a business that yielded 15 per cent was most improvident. Was it to be supposed that a business yielding 15 per cent would not be liable to competition from those who would be content with 10 per cent? Why, there was a witness brought before the Committee by the Government who stated that he had a project for a new system of telegraph, and that he had a prospectus for the formation of a company to work it in his pocket, and that he was only deterred by the present depression in the money market. He (Mr. Goschen) was bound to say he did not think the gentleman would succeed, but there was a proof that the monopoly of the companies might at any time be interfered with. But then it was said there would be no competition, because they had the command of the railways. Now, he was surprised to find out in Committee that they had not the command of the railways — that the property would revert to them, and after the Government had paid twenty years' purchase to the telegraph companies they would probably have to pay half as much again to the railways. It was true that with the Great Western the companies had a long lease, amounting almost to a perpetuity; but in the case of the North Western the lease expired in seven and a half years, and the North Western system comprised 9,000 miles of wire, or about one-eighth of the whole system. The railways felt their power so much in the matter that they pointed out to the Committee that they would not only be entitled to an increase in the rate which they now received as soon as the leases were expired, but they would also be entitled to an indemnification, for the loss they would sustain in not being allowed to put the screw on the telegraph companies. It was true that the leases did not all expire at one time; but suppose that one district were free—namely, the district between London and Liverpool—it would be competent for the railway directors to insist on much higher terms than the company at present paid, or to start a new company. It was, therefore, impossible to say that these terms could be justified because the companies were in the enjoyment of a practical monopoly. He felt very strongly on this matter because he was convinced that it was impossible to find an instance of any private enterprize which, while it returned a profit of 15 per cent to its shareholders, enjoyed a monopoly for any great length of time. He did not, perhaps, think that at that period of the Session they could disturb the bargain which had been made, but he could not help feeling that from whatever point of view they approached the question, and whatever the profit or advantage that would ultimately accrue to the country, the precedent they had now set was one attended with great danger. The disadvantage in which the Government had been placed resulted entirely from their having commenced negotiating at the end of a Session instead of at the beginning. The Committee was deeply impressed with the fact that if it dissented from any of the arrangements come to between the Government and the companies the whole scheme would come to an end. So great was the Committee's fear in this respect that he had been unable to gain the simple point of substituting the 31st of December instead of a day in July as the end of the term for calculating the profits. But if it were true that the Committee sat there only to register the contracts of the Government, if it were true that the Committee considered all the complex details of the scheme only to reject them, or accept them as a whole, without power to modify them, it had sat to very little purpose. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had omitted to call attention to one important point, which greatly re-assured him respecting the Bill. The Money Bill would not be introduced until next Session, and until that had been sanctioned the contract would not be binding on either the Government or the companies. But it was held to be necessary to pass the Bill under discussion in order that the questions of compensation might be settled by the arbitrators, and the House might next year know exactly what the country would have to pay. Fearing that the faith of Parliament would be regarded as pledged if this Bill was passed, he had asked Mr. Scudamore in Committee, before the representatives of all the parties concerned, whether the passing of this Bill would be regarded as tantamount to a promise to pass the Money Bill next Session—as, in fact, a pledge to accept the whole scheme. Mr. Scudamore answered—

> "I do not say you should rest satisfied with my statement, but that is all I can say. During the vacation the whole amount to be paid will be ascertained, and then it will come before the next Parliament to confirm it, and Parliament will then have an opportunity, even if this Bill be passed, of saying that we shall not buy, and the Bill will then be inoperative."

He trusted the Government would make it known in the most explicit manner that the passing of this Bill did not bind the Government or the shareholders of the several companies. This declaration was required in justice to the shareholders, who should know that if they thought proper they had power to demand higher terms than those offered. The agreement could not be concluded except with the consent of two-thirds of the shareholders of each company and the passing of the Money Bill next Session. The hon. Member for Kingston-on-Hull (Mr. Norwood) brought this out very clearly when he referred to the last clause of this Bill, which says—

> "In case no Act shall be passed during this or the next Session of Parliament, putting at the Disposal of the Postmaster General such Monies as shall be requisite for carrying into effect the Objects and Purposes of this Act, the Provisions contained in this Act or in the Agreements hereby confirmed relating to the Arrangements with Railway and Telegraph Companies, and all Proceedings thereunder, shall become void."

It was clear, then, that the matter would still be left open, although this Bill passed. Had he not occupied so much of the time of the House he would have defended his proposition to give the Post Office a legal monopoly in the right to transmit messages; it had been found necessary in the case of letter-carrying, and he believed it would be found necessary some time in the future, if the present Bill became law, to give the Department a monopoly in this case also.

Mr. LEEMAN observed that he had moved in Committee a Resolution to the effect that the imperfect information on the subject of cost, as well as the uncertain amount of revenue to be derived, would not justify the prosecution of the Bill until that information should be laid before Parliament. He fully concurred in what had been stated as to the position in which the Committee were placed. On the 18th June, when the Bill was discussed, the whole of the telegraph and railway companies were petitioners against the Bill; but between that moment and the time when the Bill came before the Committee the whole of these interests had been bought up by the Government. The Committee were placed in a most invidious position. They had to take the place of counsel for the purpose of bringing out the information which was now before the

House. As he had stated on a former occasion, he entertained a decided objection to the Government undertaking the management of the lines, and would not now enter into that matter. He would confine his remarks to the financial part of the question. He contended that anything more imprudent than the arrangement come to by the Government could not be conceived, and the way in which they had gone about making the financial arrangement was one which he hoped would never be followed by any other Government. Mr. Scudamore, who was what he had been already described to be—a most able man—had not known up to the time of the second reading of this Bill what were the existing arrangements between the telegraph companies and the railway companies; and, subsequently, while still without the requisite knowledge on that point, he went and agreed on the part of the Government to buy the interest of the telegraph companies at twenty years' purchase — not according to their rates of dividend, which were not allowed to exceed 10 per cent, but on twenty years' purchase on their gross receipts, less the working expenses. In addition, it was to be remembered that the railway companies had reversionary interests which would come into operation after the comparatively short time for which their arrangements with the telegraph companies were to continue. In July, 1866, Mr. Scudamore estimated the necessary outlay on the part of the Government at £2,400,000. In February last another officer of the Government was requested to report on the subject, and he raised the estimate to £3,000,000; but it was not until the Bill came before the Committee that Mr. Scudamore said £6,000,000 would be required. He admitted that the original estimate of £2,400,000 did not embrace all that was included in the estimate of £6,000,000; but there was not sufficient difference between what the two estimates did embrace respectively to account for the difference of £3,600,000 in amount. He undertook to say that Mr. Scudamore was as wide of the mark in his estimate of £6,000,000 as he had been in his estimate of £2,400,000. At the expiration of their agreements with the telegraph companies several of the railway companies would have it in their power to compete with the Post Office for the transmission of telegraph messages. No doubt, this fact would be brought under the notice of the arbitrators when the value of their reversion was being considered, and at what price would the arbitrators value this reversionary power of competition? Had Mr. Scudamore made any estimate on the subject? Owing to the position in which Mr. Scudamore had placed the Government, the railway companies had demanded terms in respect of their reversion which he, as a railway man, now said it was the duty of any Government to have resisted; and yet he thought that Mr. Scudamore's highest estimate could not be depended on. When asked during the inquiry by the Committee what amount would be sufficient, Mr. Scudamore replied, "I believe £6,000,000." When asked whether he would undertake to say that £7,000,000 might not be required, he repeated he believed £6,000,000 would be sufficient; and when asked whether he would undertake to say that £7,000,000 might not be required he again gave the same answer. Therefore, if they assumed that £6,000,000 would buy up the telegraphs they were proceeding on very fallacious data. Then as to the revenue to be derived from the working of the telegraphs by the Government. Nearly 60 per cent of the present receipts of the telegraph companies were obtained from the 1*s.* messages; but Mr. Scudamore expected that from the reduction of the higher-priced messages an increased income would be produced; and he quoted the cases of Belgium, Switzerland, and France in support of his views. Now, between the case of Belgium and that of England there was no analogy, because, while the charge for a telegram in Belgium was down to half a franc, or 5*d.*, the rate of postage there, on the other hand, was 2*d.*; and under such circumstances a person might often prefer to pay 5*d.* for a telegram instead of 2*d.* for a letter; whereas if the telegram cost 1*s.*, and the postage rate, as in this country, was only 1*d.*, he might prefer to send a letter. Moreover, the utmost distance they could send a telegram in Belgium was 120 miles; but in Great Britain it might be sent 700 or 800 miles, from one extremity of the island to another. Much the same thing held good in Switzerland as in Belgium, in reference to the comparative rates of telegraphing and postage: and, moreover, in a very mountainous country like the former it was easy to conceive that the telegraph might often be preferred to the post, with its uncertainties and difficulties. Then, as to France, the whole of its telegraphic system had not cost that country, with its 37,000,000 of population, more than £952,000. Why, then, was this country, with its smaller population, to give £6,000,000 to the holders of the present telegraphs, when it was perfectly clear that by means of the facilities we enjoyed through the railways we could surely do what they did in France? Moreover, as the Post Office was not to have a legal monopoly, where would be the difficulty of the railways or other persons starting a telegraph at 6*d.*, and running the Post Office off the road? With regard to Mr. Scudamore's notion of extending the telegraph wires largely into the remote country districts, what practical man, he asked, believed that into every village into which a money-order went there would necessarily spring up a strong desire to send 1*s.* telegrams? The existing telegraph companies had been endeavouring for a long time to carry their wires into the remote districts; but with what result might be judged of from the fact that 75 per cent of their entire receipts were obtained from fifteen towns, and one-half of them from London. The experience of France was much the same, one-third of the entire revenue from telegrams being received in Paris. Therefore, the notion under which the House and the country were asked to embark in an enormous expenditure — namely, that they could excite a hunger and thirst among the agricultural population for telegrams at 1*s.* each, when they could send letters for 1*d.*, seemed to him, he confessed, most absurd. At the same time he was glad to hear from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that all the House was now asked to do was to assent to the principle that the Post Office might with advantage work the telegraph; and he hoped that the considerations which he had suggested in the course of his remarks would receive the careful attention of the Government and of the subordinate officers concerned in the framing of their scheme.

MR. KARSLAKE said, he had been strongly opposed to the original Bill, regarding it as a measure of confiscation; but the House having affirmed the principle that this change should be made, there seemed to him a great advantage in proceeding with the measure. If it passed this Session the companies would be bound to the agreements into which they had entered, although their profits were steadily increasing, while it would be open to Parliament to re-consider the matter; but, in the event of its not passing, these agreements would become null and void. He thought that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) afforded, when taken as a whole, the most cogent reasons why they should pass this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that he considered that it had been proved to the satisfaction of the House that it was desirable that the Government should work the telegraphs in connection with the administration of the Post Office, and that there was no force in the objection which had been urged against the Bill on the score of "tapping" or "milking" of the wires, as it was called. The difficulties in the way of tapping the wires would be be almost insuperable, and there was a clause in the Bill making it a misdemeanour. The measure might, therefore, do some good, and could not possibly do any harm. As to a combination between the railway companies to carry on telegraphs in opposition to the Post Office, the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Leeman) should remember that if, without the sanction of Parliament, railway companies ventured to misappropriate their funds and turn telegraphers, they would speedily be stopped by injunction. [MR. AYRTON said, railway companies were entitled by Act of Parliament to carry on telegraphs.] He should be glad to learn what Act had given them any such authority. Moreover, the existing agreements between the railways and the telegraph companies would expire at irregular intervals, one of them having as long as fifty years to run; and until all those agreements had expired no such combination would be possible. As to the terms of purchase, he did not regard them as too liberal. That they were advantageous to the companies was only fair, it being usual to pay liberally when property of any kind was taken for the public service, and it being clear that the profits of these undertakings were rapidly increasing. Even educated men had to learn the use of telegraphing; but when once acquired that use immensely increased, and he had known persons who, having originally a great dislike to telegrams, ultimately employed them almost as extensively as post-letters. He did not, however, believe that people generally would use the telegraph as commonly as the post, and he was not for calculating future profits on such an hypothesis. He presumed it would be at the discretion of the Post Office, as of the companies, to avoid incurring considerable loss by extending telegraphic communication to out-of-the-way villages; but, whereas the companies naturally looked for a dividend, the State would wish to accomodate remote districts provided it entailed no serious loss. As to the rise in value of the Electric and International Company's shares, this was no proof that the terms offered them by the Government were too liberal. Those shares were held as investments by investors rather than by speculators, and, as the rise commenced long before the agreement was entered into, he attributed it to the attention which the discussions in Parliament and in the Press had drawn to the highly remunerative and sound financial position of the undertaking. Difficult as it was to find secure investments, people had naturally thought they could not do better than buy shares in that Company. He was happy to find that they had arrived so near to a conclusion of this matter, and that they would go into Committee on the understanding that the Bill would pass this Session. Though he could not conceive any better terms than those which had been referred to, he should not forget the important observation of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Leeman) that next Session they would have a right to consider whether more advantageous terms might not be obtained for the public.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he anticipated that the Bill would pass into law, and, as far as he was concerned, there were several motives which induced him to wish that it should not be delayed. The first motive was one to which he had alluded on a former occasion — namely, the manifest weakness and defects of the present telegraph system; for, whatever might be said of those who had led the way in this useful enterprize, the telegraph was an instrument which, as regarded the great mass of the people of this country, was very feeble, and was, in the hands of the Government, susceptible of great improvement. He likewise felt that the very great authority attached not only individually to the judgment of so able a public servant as Mr. Scudamore, whose mind had been employed upon this subject, but to the Department of the Post Office at large. He attached very considerable authority to the opinion of that Department when he considered upon how many great and seemingly doubtful enterprizes it had entered during the last thirty or thirty-five years, and how much the results of those enterprizes had tended to sustain the judgment of those by whom the public mind had been led. His third reason for wishing the Bill to pass was that it appeared to him that until the Bill had gone forward and the investigations contemplated under it had been made it would be impossible to know the ground on which they stood, or to have a certainty as to the sums with which they were dealing, or the relation between those sums and the property they were to acquire. Upon those grounds he wished the Bill to go forward, although he regretted that the unfortunate delay which had taken place in the discussion of the Bill until a late period of the Session should have placed both the Government and the House in a position of disadvantage. He did not propose to make that delay a subject of censure on the Government or the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because everyone who was conversant with the conduct of Public Business must know how very difficult it was so to adjust the great mass of questions that demanded the attention of the Legislature as to bring them forward at the time that was best for the public advantage. The Chancellor of the Exchequer himself must be sensible of the disadvantage of the delay, not only on account of the natural desire of the right hon. Gentleman to have his name attached to the measure, but also with reference to the public interests. He was quite disposed to concur with his right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen), and to put aside—so far as that discussion was concerned—what might be termed the administrative difficulties of the question. With respect to the monopoly of the telegraph in the hands of the Government, he did not propose to raise any question under present circumstances. He would merely say that, as far as he had been able to examine it, his mind was by no means entirely satisfied that it would be found practicable for them to take permanently into the hands of the State the telegraphic communication without assuming a monopoly of the same character that they possessed with regard to the conveyance of letters. But it was not absolutely necessary to settle that question now. The utmost inconvenience that might arise would probably be in case there should be poachings on the best part of the manor of the Government, and purchases upon disadvantageous terms might have to be made. But that would be an inconvenience within very narrow limits; and it was perfectly plain that the Government would be able, at any time the House might see fit, to assume the exclusive privileges which at present it had not been thought necessary by the Government or the Committee to advise. He never attached the slightest importance to the rumour that went abroad, or to the apprehension that was entertained, that Her Majesty's Government had devised under the form of this Bill an ingenious scheme for assuming into their hands previous to and in preparation for the General Election a vast quantity of additional patronage. He was never so sanguine as to think that they would be able to entertain so diabolical a plot, or that it would be possible for them with all the ingenuity that this world or the nether world could supply to carry it out. With regard to the terms of purchase he did not at all lose his confidence in the right hon. Gentleman opposite, or those by whom he was advised, nor was he by any means prepared to assert dogmatically opinions contrary to theirs. But he must say that no man could have listened to the speech of his hon. and learned Friend who had spoken last (Mr. Karslake), or still more to his right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen), who went through every detail of the case—without having serious misgiving—not leading them to censure the Government, taking into consideration the time they had to act—whether they, as representatives of the people, were justified in giving, if called upon to give, a final judgment upon the high price they were asked to pay to carry out this project. He believed £4,000,000 was the sum the Chancellor of the Exchequer had adverted to on a former occasion as likely to be required.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: What I said was this—that I did not think it for the public advantage that I should name the precise sum, but I thought it would not be beyond £4,000,000. I thought that the outside sum.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he supposed the right hon. Gentleman mentioned £4,000,000 then in the same sense as he mentioned £6,000,000 now. He thought his right hon. Friend the Member for the City made clear the principle on which such a purchase should be made. Again, he wished to point out that their duty in that House was to consider what was best for the public, without implying any censure on what the right hon. Gentleman had done. But it was impossible not to observe the great difference of the method which was proposed to be observed in that Bill from the method usually adopted in the compulsory acquisition of property for the public good. The manner in which Parliament proceeded when it wished to purchase land for the public good was that the terms of the purchase should be settled either by law or by arbitration. Now, neither of these methods was proposed by the present Bill; but the property of the telegraph companies was to be taken on the terms proposed in the Bill, provided the companies accepted the terms. Then he must point out, because his hon. and learned Friend who had last spoken had not been very successful in dealing with this part of the case, that it was perfectly natural that there should be a rise in price in the prospect of purchase by the Government. But let the difference in the cases be observed. On the 2nd of January, 1868, he presumed the telegraph companies had no great knowledge of any proceedings of this nature.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: They had notice.

MR. GLADSTONE said, that at all events, at that time the companies treated the proposed purchase as a disadvantage. The price of the Electric Telegraph Company's shares was then £153; on the 23rd of June, just after the reference in Committee, the shares had risen to £165. The rise might be taken to represent the normal, fair, and legitimate improvement in the value of the property connected with the approximate realization of the plans of the Government. But what were they to say when, instead of a rise of £12 between the 2nd of January and the 23rd of June, they found a rise of £41 between the 23rd of June and the 21st of July? And would the reasoning of the hon. and learned Gentleman account for that? He had set up an ingenious theory, that there was something so delightfully scientific in the possession of telegraphic property that it attracted to itself, quite irrespective of vulgar calculation, what was known as a *pretium affectionis*; but he was afraid that the change which had occurred during the last few weeks must be attributed to considerations of a different character. The Electric Company's shares were £153 on the

2nd of January, £165 on the 23rd of June, and £206 on the 1st of July; and the Magnetic Company's shares were £115 on the 2nd of January, £125 on the 23rd of June, and £150 on the 21st of July. In the former case the increase was one-fourth, and in the latter it was one-fifth between June and July. Comparing the case of the telegraphic companies with that of the landed proprietors, he could not see any reason for a deviation from the established practice of resorting to arbitration. In the case of railways we could not do without the land required for them; but we could do without the property of these telegraph companies, and it was not necessity, but it was equity and policy, which led us to think it necessary to acquire them. It was only a sense of equity that prevented the State competing with the companies, as it was open to private persons to do at any time. Therefore, he did not see any ground of a high order for foregoing arbitration in the case of these companies. The position was undoubtedly an anomalous one. It was the misfortune and not the fault of the right hon. Gentleman that the House was called upon to give something in the nature of an assent to a presumptive bargain made by the Government, and which had received the Parliamentary sanction of a Committee at a time when it was impossible for the House to complete the operation by passing another Bill—first, because they did not know the facts, and, second, because the right hon. Gentleman would not under the circumstances enter upon such a financial operation. That would be a matter of comparative insignificance if the question were to be considered by the same body next year; but unfortunately a dissolution intervenes, and the case must be referred to an entirely different tribunal. The hon. and learned Gentleman stated that the new Parliament must come to a free and unfettered judgment with regard to the terms. Now, there were certain occasions in which, while Parliament was not legally bound, it was bound by the strictest laws of honour; and this Parliament had no right to put the Members of the new Parliament in the position of having it said to them, "You are not free; you are bound by the assent of those who have gone before you." The new Parliament would not, could not, and ought not to admit that it was bound. It must have not only a legal but a moral freedom of choice. No doubt it would give due respect to the authority of the Government, of the Department, and of any vote of the House; but these would come before it as the elements of the case for its final decision, and not as laws determined beforehand. It was of the greatest importance it should be thoroughly understood that this Parliament was not attempting to fasten on the new Parliament an obligation that would be *ultra vires*, and it was desirable that this should be placed on record by the unequivocal declarations of Members of Parliament. Feeling great difficulty about the terms proposed to be given to the companies by the Bill, and being convinced that discretion and good sense would govern the proceedings of the shareholders, and that they would not attempt to drive matters to extremities, he could not be satisfied without placing on record an expression of opinion that we should have acted more circumspectly and safely if we had adhered to the ordinary method of arbitration, and therefore he was glad the hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) intended raising that question on the 4th clause. The right hon. Gentleman would see there was every disposition to support the policy of the measure, as far as possible, and his own wish was that, under the auspices of the right hon. Gentleman, the measure might be successfully carried through.

Mr. NORWOOD said, that although the Select Committee laboured under difficulties which were not diminished when the opposition to the Bill disappeared, they did not fail to examine every point involving the interest of the country. Their chief difficulty was that they had before them a scheme the receipts and expenditure of which could not be exactly ascertained; but having a maximum estimate which showed a net revenue of £358,000, and a minimum estimate which showed a net revenue of £203,000, they adopted the mean of £280,500 as the revenue that might be reasonably calculated upon. Mr. Scudamore gave to the Select Committee the strongest assurance that all the rights and property of the telegraph companies could be purchased for £6,000,000, and a financial officer of the Treasury fully confirmed those figures. As to the bargains with the telegraph companies and railway companies he was not satisfied with them. These companies, he thought, were about to receive a very large sum indeed. But the Select Committee were placed in this position—they could not modify the arrangements made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and at that late period of the Session were obliged either to sanction the proposal in its entirety or to reject it. As the Government intended that every money order office in the kingdom should have telegraphic wires, there would be about 4,000 telegraphic stations, instead of a little over 2,000, and no one who perused the evidence could doubt that as the Government possessed a staff to work the telegraphs, they could afford much more and cheaper accommodation than the telegraph companies could. As to a legal monopoly, he did not think one was demanded by the circumstances of the case. The Post Office authorities would practically have a monopoly; but he saw no reason why, if a private company should be able to transmit messages at a cheaper rate, the public should not have the benefit of the competition. As to the profits of the undertaking, he was sanguine enough to believe that Mr. Scudamore's maximum estimate was not too high an estimate for the future. The proposed reform would be of inestimable benefit to the country—and next to the penny postage would be the greatest boon and blessing conferred on the people in recent times. In the course of a few years a rate of 6*d.* might not improbably be fixed for messages to every part of the kingdom, and the advantageous results of such cheap telegraphy could hardly be over-estimated.

Mr. LEVESON-GOWER said, it appeared to him that neither the House nor the country sufficiently appreciated the enormous importance of this question. He thought that that importance could scarcely be overrated, not merely as regarded the question itself, but likewise in reference to its furnishing a precedent for future legislation. This proposal was a step in a direction quite new to the Government of the country—an undertaking founded upon an opposite principle to that which had been hitherto acted upon by them—namely, the principle of leaving all such operations to private enterprize. Although he admitted there might properly be exceptions to that rule, still, as far as he knew, this was the first time the Government had offered to purchase from private individuals large commercial concerns with the view of carrying on the business of them themselves. He therefore thought it was a measure which ought not to be passed without the greatest deliberation. It appeared to him that the many considerations connected with this question had not as yet received attention. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced it in a speech of ten minutes, and moved the second reading in a speech of twenty minutes. He might remark, moreover, that early on the evening when the second reading was agreed to, the House received a positive assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that the measure would not be proceeded with. The breach of that promise ought not to be passed by unobserved.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he did not quite understand the hon. Gentleman, who would, perhaps, explain his meaning more fully.

Mr. LEVESON-GOWER said, that early in the evening in question the right hon. Gentleman assured the House that after twelve o'clock the Electric Telegraphs Bill would not be proceeded with. He was aware, however, that the proceeding with it after that hour was justified on the ground that some understanding had been entered into between some of the opponents and the promoters of the measure. He maintained that that justification was not a sufficient one. Great inconvenience would result if those who were opposed to a particular measure felt they could not safely leave the House even after an assurance had been given by the Government that the measure would not be proceeded with that evening. Although he (Mr. Leveson-Gower) had a high opinion of the ability of the Gentlemen who formed the Select Committee to whom the Bill was referred, he could not say so much in favour of their impartiality, for with one exception—that of the hon. and learned Member for York (Mr. Leeman)—he believed they had all been favourable to the measure. Nearly the whole of the time of the Committee was occupied with the consideration of the amount of money that ought to be paid to the companies, whilst the many bearings of the question were wholly ignored or disregarded. It was desirable to ascertain what occurred in other countries; and he understood that in the United States the telegraphic communications, which were entirely in the hands of private companies, were acknowledged to be remarkably successful. Another question, which was not alluded to, was that of the improvements that were now going on in the telegraphic system of the country. After considering those improvements, it ill became the public or their representatives to throw dirt upon those companies. It was argued that great improvements would be effected in the system if the whole management were placed in the hands of the Post Office authorities. But why had not those authorities sought to co-operate with the companies in order to effect those improvements? After many discussions upon this scheme, whilst the question of its policy had been hardly touched upon, the House was called upon to inaugurate a new state of things fraught with the most serious consequences. He confessed he did not like to see large public companies, after declaring their opposition to a measure on great public grounds, withdrawing their opposition merely because they were to receive a large sum of money for their shares. He thought there was great force in the observation that the Irish railway companies or other undertakings which the Government would be likely to purchase would point to the present measure when estimating the value of their property. It was a great pity that this Bill should be pressed forward at so inopportune a time, when the difficulties of coming to an arrangement with the companies were necessarily greatly aggravated. In his opinion it would have been better if the Government had instituted a full and searching inquiry in the first instance, which he believed would have removed all the objections that could be raised against a scheme of this kind, and rendered subsequent legislation on the subject comparatively easy.

Mr. E. POTTER, having had much experience in the telegraph department of business, felt satisfied that the evidence given by Mr. Scudamore was sound and practical, and that it rather under-stated than over-stated his case. He believed that a 6*d.* telegraph would be three times more valuable than a 1*s.* one, and would prove a far more successful measure. Looking at the marvellous increase in the revenue of the Post Office within the last ten years, he considered that if the telegraph companies had reduced their terms in proportion that the proceeding would be attended with the same, or even better, results. He hoped that the Government would pass this part of the Bill that Session; and he felt satisfied that the next House of Commons would complete the arrangement by giving such a price for the property as would meet with the approbation of all parties concerned.

Sir JOHN GRAY said, he had listened with much interest to the discussion that had taken place, and was gratified to observe that the principle of the Bill was substantially accepted by hon. Members who had addressed the House from both sides. He felt that Ireland was largely interested in the promotion of the measure, and an hon. Member objected to the Bill as forming a precedent for the purchase of Irish railways not on its intrinsic merits. He (Sir John Gray) thought that the fact of its forming a precedent was no solid objection to a measure which would confessedly prove to be a first step towards increasing the commercial activity of that country. He saw in the details given in the evidence of Mr. Scudamore that only 5 per cent in number of the telegraphic messages that passed over the entire telegraphic system of the United Kingdom represented the telegraphic intercourse between Ireland and Great Britain. Every man who understood the commercial transactions of Ireland knew that the present trade of that country was principally a cross-Channel trade; and while the inland telegraph intercourse was represented by 95 per cent, the whole Irish cross-Channel trade was represented by only 5 per cent. This was admitted to be owing to the high tariff—which was from 3*s.* to 4*s.* per message—3*s.* to the coast of Ireland from London, and 4*s.* to the interior. In fact, there was a prohibitory tariff; and thus the growth and development of trade which resulted in other countries and in this from telegraphic facilities had absolutely no existence in Ireland. He therefore, as an Irish representative, watched the progress of this measure with special interest, as one the realization of which must be of great commercial advantage to Ireland. The leading points submitted to the consideration of the House by the Bill now before them he conceived to be these—The first point suggested was the propriety of placing the system under the control of the Post Office. That was conceded by every Member save one who addressed the House, and by none, he was happy to say, more cordially and more ably supported than by the leading Members of the front Opposition Benches, who, while objecting to the details of the agreements with the several companies, quite endorsed the principle that the public interest demanded that the

Government, as representing the public, ought to obtain the management of the telegraphs of the kingdom. The next question was the question of price. He would not assume to be as good a judge of the price as the hon. Member who had preceded him (Mr. E. Potter). He felt, however, that all men who dispassionately considered the subject must admit that when a Government, acting on behalf of the public, and for the benefit of the public, assumed forcible possession of the property of a private individual or of an incorporated company for the public interest, the public were bound to give not only a good but a full, and even more than full price. The hon. Member who addressed the House last but one observed that the price given to the companies was too large, and added that it would be used as a precedent for giving an extra price hereafter for the Irish railways if the Government should determine to buy those railways. Now, he (Sir John Gray) hoped that it would have that effect. He hoped that if the principle of purchase laid down in this Bill were taken as a precedent, that on that precedent the Government would have to give a large price for the Irish railways, for if the price to be paid amounted to a large figure computed on a basis identical with the basis of this Bill —that of actual profits realized by working—and if the price were to be proportioned to the profits, then a large price given for the Irish railways would indicate increased activity, commercial progress, and the growth of wealth in Ireland. He (Sir John Gray) regretted to have to say that he did not think the right hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) did justice to the financial statements laid before the Select Committee by Mr. Scudamore. That gentleman, in his very valuable evidence, gave, as stated, his estimates of the minimum and of the maximum returns. The minimum assumed that there would be no increase of messages as to number, and even on that he showed a profit of more than £200,000 a year over the maintenance charges and the working cost, taking the working cost to be the same as it was at present, modified only by the diminution resulting from amalgamation. With this estimate the right hon. Member for London did not deal. Instead of dealing with the minimum estimate as to returns, he entered into a computation with a view to show that the number of messages in 1867, which Mr. Scudamore deduced from the total number of 1866, with the average increase added, was not so large as Mr. Scudamore estimated the number to be. He knew he (Sir John Gray) was treading on dangerous ground when he ventured to dispute the calculations of so great a master of figures as the right hon. Member for the City of London; yet he must, with all deference, dispute the soundness of the basis of his calculations and with them the result arrived at. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he tested Mr. Scudamore's figures by taking the total earnings and dividing the total sum by 2*s*., which he took as the mean cost of the messages. He (Sir John Gray) ventured to think that this was a most fallacious mode of arriving at the gross number of messages. The evidence showed that of every 100 messages sent fifty-five were charged at 1*s*., thirty were charged at 1*s*. 6*d*.—thus showing that 85 per cent of the whole number were under 1*s*. 6*d*., and only 15 per cent at 2*s*. or more; yet the right hon. Gentleman, in order to refute figures that had no essential bearing on the question, took 2*s*. as the main cost of each mileage, though only fifteen of the 100 reached 2*s*. The right hon. Gentleman had also made an error of some importance as to the cost of working. Mr. Scudamore took the cost of working at its present cost as a basis. The right hon. Gentleman argued that Mr. Scudamore's deductions as to the cost of working must be in error, because he found that the cost of working in Belgium was £5 10*s*. per mile of line, in France, £5 per mile; and that would be for the Irish and British lines about £53,000 more than Mr. Scudamore said would be the cost of the working if the system were combined with the Post Office. The fallacy lay in this—The French lines are worked as a distinct Department and are not connected with the Post Office. The proposed system would connect the Post Office and the telegraph under one roof, in one office, and divide the cost of office and service equitably between them, causing a saving to both. As to the idea of giving the Post Office a monopoly, he (Sir John Gray) was opposed to that idea, for it would stop progress, stop improvement, and induce the monopolists to be content with matters as they found them. The joint-stock companies could not be induced to adopt the most improved instruments of Professor Wheatstone, because they had a practical monopoly. That distinguished electrician had invented a transmitter which would send from seventy to 100 words a minute, without possibility of error; yet, though several years invented, it was only recently tried. The right hon. Gentleman referred to a case in which 4,000 was inserted in by error for 400, and the error led to the ruin of a respectable house. That could not occur with the Wheatstone transmitter; and he (Sir John Gray) being anxious that the Government should be in a position to be bound to test all improvements and adopt them if real improvements, objected to giving them a monopoly.

Mr. PHILIPS objected to the Post Office having to work the telegraphs of the country. The Postal Department was well conducted; but that was no reason why it should undertake duties that it did not understand, and which did not belong to it. Who were the parties that chiefly used the telegraph? — merchants, lawyers, and betting men, and they were well enough able to pay for their messages. The rate of messages might be reduced to 1*s*., or 6*d*., or even 3*d*.; but if any deficiency arose, the English taxpayer must make it good. As a merchant he objected to any such favour from the taxpayers, and he objected to its being done for the benefit of lawyers and betting men. Then, again, Irish railways were very likely to be dealt with on the same system, and he, for one, must object to these great industries being placed under the surveillance of the Government. He hoped at the next Election the whole of this important question would be impartially and seriously considered by the different constituencies. He was decidedly opposed to the Bill.

Mr. Alderman LUSK wished to know if the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken into account the depreciation in the value of the plant which he was about to purchase? He had seen, while travelling on a railway a few days ago, a number of telegraphic posts in a partially rotten state, and he had been informed that they would want renewing along the whole length of the line in two or three years. New machines were constantly being invented, and would be frequently required. Another point which should not be forgotten was that the Committee had sat only nine days, their Report filled 250 pages, 110 of which were taken up by the evidence of Mr. Scudamore, and therefore it was likely that the evidence would be one-sided. The reputation which the Government had acquired as shipbuilders was not encouraging, when it was proposed to give them the management of a great commercial undertaking. He warned the Government against entering into competition in business with the public; they would never succeed unless they had a monopoly, and he urged further discussion before the Bill was passed. Already the compensation had increased from £4,000,000 to £6,000,000, and probably the next sum named would be £8,000,000.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 3, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Power for Postmaster General to purchase Telegraphs).

Mr. CHILDERS moved to amend the clause by inserting the words—

> "That the price to be given for each undertaking shall be decided by arbitration in the manner hereinafter to be provided,"

in lieu of the words beginning in line 40 to the end of the clause. This alteration would bring the Bill back to the form in which it stood before it went to the Selec Committee. He had been referred to before the Committee as having carried through a similar Bill in another country; and therefore no one would suspect him of being opposed to the principle of the Bill. He did not think that either the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer or Mr. Scudamore had in any degree exaggerated the prospects of the increase likely to arise in the use of the telegraph. On the contrary, while they had placed the number of messages likely to be sent out at 6,000,000, with an annual increase of 10 per cent, he estimated the number at 12,000,000 per annum, the proportion of messages sent to the population in the colonies, where this system was in force, being one message to every two and a half inhabitants. While giving the Bill his best support, however, he objected to the unusual proposal it contained, that the terms upon which the purchase of private property was to be made were to be settled between the Government and those whose property was to be purchased. What was the state of things before the Bill went into Committee? The right hon. Gentleman, as the promoter of the Bill, was opposed by the telegraph companies, who alleged that the Bill was one most injurious to the public interest. Each side was represented by counsel, and so long as there were two opposing parties concerned it was probable that matters would be fairly adjusted; but as soon as an arrangement was come to the opposition was entirely withdrawn, and the opponents of the Bill, having received money to support it, discovered that, instead of being opposed to the interests of the public, it was an admirable Bill. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for York (Mr. Leeman) was opposed to the principle of the Bill; but on the question of price, there was no one on the Committee to examine witnesses and endeavour to bring out facts but his right hon. Friend the Member for the City (Mr. Goschen). There really was no evidence that twenty years' purchase was a fair price, and the mode in which the price had been fixed in this case would be a bad precedent. The Government should not have fixed upon any number of years' purchase; but should have inserted in the Bill the usual compensation clause, and allowed the price to be fixed as it was in all analogous cases. He should therefore propose to introduce the common clause relating to arbitration and referring to the Consolidation Acts under which the arbitration would be made. As to the allegation that in this Bill the precedent of the Railway Act of 1844 was followed, he must say that in the case of that Act it was perfectly right to fix the number of years' purchase at which the railways which might be brought under its operation were to be purchased, because that Act passed before the Acts incorporating the companies to which it referred. That Act had only a prospective operation, and the Legislature was justified in saying that if railways, which were not at that time in existence, should under certain circumstances have certain advantages, they should also be subjected to certain disabilities; but this Bill was retrospective in its effect, and in the case of the purchase of an existing property the invariable custom had been not to fix the number of years' purchase, but to leave that to the arbitrator. There was nothing in the evidence to support the principle of a twenty years' purchase. He moved that all the words after "successors" in the clause should be omitted, in order to insert "and the price to be given for such undertaking and property shall be decided by arbitration."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Childers), but would take the Bill as it had come from the Committee. He thought his hon. Friend was mistaken as to the provisions of the Land Clauses Act. Under that Act the parties were, in the first instance, to endeavour to agree upon a rate of price. It was on their failure to so agree the aid of arbitration to fix the rate was invoked. In this case the parties had come to an agreement; so that the Government had adopted the first alternative in the Land Clauses Act, and they came to Parliament and stated what the agreement was. He thought that on the second reading he stated to the House that the Government had offered terms, and even mentioned what those terms were. No one then objected or stated that in having offered terms the Government had acted improperly. Now, as regarded what had been said about the extravagance of the price, he hoped the Committee would bear in mind that the transaction was one in the nature of a compulsory purchase. The Government had always regarded it in that light. It was quite clear that the parties with whom they had to deal were commercial companies which had been struggling during the earlier stages of their existence, but had arrived at the position of making a considerable profit of the undertakings. Now, if the Government went to arbitration on the question of the rate of purchase there could be no doubt that under such circumstances the companies would get liberal terms. He had never asserted that the terms which the Government had agreed to were not liberal. What he had asserted was that they were not too liberal. He doubted very much whether, if his hon. Friend succeeded in his Amendment, the companies would not get better terms. He was not prepared to give the figures, because, if he did so, he might prejudice the case of the Government in the arbitration on other points; but he had gone into calculations which induced him to believe that, in the interests of the public, it was better to pay twenty years' purchase than go to arbitration on the question of the rate. As to the comparison that had been made between the price in this case and that provided in the case of the railways by the Act of 1844, the Committee would remember that under the provisions of that Act the Government were enabled at the expiration of twenty-one years after the completion of a line of railway to take it into their own hands. But this provision only applied to railways constructed after the passing of the Act of 1844; and, consequently, the parties who made those lines did so knowing that they were liable to have that Act put in operation as against them. Those parties had therefore no right to complain; but there was no such Act as that of 1844 applying to telegraphs. The persons who constructed railways after that Act knew that the undertakings might be taken up by the Government, and yet they were to have twenty-five years' purchase on a three years' average. Again, as to competition, there was nothing in the Act of 1844 to prevent the railways from being subjected to competition; nor was there anything in any Act referring to railways of which he was aware which laid down that the Government must not compete in railways. It was said that the Postmaster General might obtain an Act to enable him to transmit telegraph messages, and otherwise to carry on the business of a telegraph company without purchasing the interests of the existing companies. No doubt he might; but would not the whole House come down and resist such a proposal did any Government venture to make it? Let him take the price of the shares in those companies. At the time when this bargain was made the price of the shares of the principal company was, he thought, £172 10*s*. He believed that was on the 25th of May, though he was not quite sure. Now, he did not think the arbitrator would give less than the price of the shares in the market, and certainly he would add something on account of the purchase being a compulsory one. The compensation would be twenty years' purchase of the net profits of the companies, and the question as to what the net profits amounted to would be decided by the arbitrators, who would, of course, take into consideration the depreciable nature of the property and the sum laid by for repairs. Mention had been made of the immediate rise in the price of the shares as soon as the negotiations had assumed a definite shape. But the certainty attaching to a Government offer almost amounting to a Government guarantee, coupled with the establishment by a Parliamentary Committee of the soundness of the various undertakings it was proposed to purchase, would naturally cause an immediate and no inconsiderable rise in the price of shares. A great deal had been said as to the extraordinary nature of the agreement between the Government and the telegraph companies; and the hon. and learned Member for York (Mr. Leeman) said they would have to dip their hands into the Consolidated Fund if this Bill should be carried out; but to show how ill-founded these fears were he read a letter from a very eminent firm of capitalists in the City, dated the 21st of July, as follows:—

> "I beg to inform you that we shall be glad to guarantee to the Post Office a yearly income of 4 per cent on the capital proposed to be raised under the provisions of the Bill now before Parliament, for the purpose of purchasing the property of the different telegraphic companies, on the understanding that we are to receive the net income from the telegraphs for fifteen years. We are ready to deposit with the Bank of England such guarantee as may be necessary."

He hoped this offer of 4 per cent would tend to allay any apprehensions existing in the minds of hon. Members. He did not wish to detain the Committee any longer, although it had been said by the hon. Member for Bodmin (Mr. Leveson-Gower) that his speeches upon this matter were too short. That was not a common complaint in the House of Commons, and he thought he might venture now and then to indulge in brevity, if only for the sake of example.

Amendment *negatived*.

Clause *agreed to*.

In reply to an hon. MEMBER,

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER explained that the Government had agreed to grant liberal compensation to those officers of the telegraph companies who were not re-employed by the Post Office.

Clauses 5 to 14, inclusive, *agreed to*.

Clause 15 (Postmaster General to make Regulations for Conduct of Business, and to fix Charges).

MR. AYRTON objected to the clause, on the ground that it was really not appropriate to the present Bill, but properly belonged to the Money Bill which was to be introduced next Session. Besides, at present messages were forwarded from one part of the metropolis to another for 6*d*., and if this clause passed in its present form it would be tantamount to charging the people of the metropolis for the benefit of the rest of the country. He moved that at the end of the first paragraph the following words be inserted:—"Except for the transmission of messages within the limits of the metropolis." This would allow the rate of charge for the metropolis to be in the hands of the Postmaster General, and he hoped that official would keep the price as it was at present—namely, at 6*d.*

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, although the messages from one part of the metropolis to the other were only charged at the rate of 6*d.*, yet in most cases the companies charged porterage, and the price was thus brought up to 1*s.* Now under the Post Office system no porterage would be charged, therefore the people of the metropolis would be in no worse position than they were at present. The hon. and learned Member forgot that if they left out this part of the Bill they would leave out the consideration to the public. The Select Committee had considered the matter, and their decision might be taken.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, that messages were carried from one part of the metropolis to another for 6*d.*

MR. NORWOOD observed that the only company he found to carry them at that rate was the Electric and International.

MR. AYRTON said, as the clause stood the Postmaster General could not make an exceptional rate for the metropolis. He wished to have power given to the Postmaster General to do so.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that there was no compulsion on the Postmaster General in respect of the price to be charged, further than that 1*s.* was to be the maximum. The Post Office attached great importance to uniformity of charge. He was aware that the nominal price for the transmission of messages from one part of the metropolis to another was at present 6*d.*, but porterage brought the price up to 1*s.* in most cases. It was desirable that no change should be made which would alter the financial bearing of the Bill.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS objected to an increase of 100 per cent being put on the charge for local messages in the metropolis.

MR. LABOUCHERE complained that the metropolis, like the Jews in the Middle Ages, was looked upon on all occasions as a fair object of plunder. He protested against its being taxed for the benefit of Scotchmen and Irishmen. There was no doubt that under the clause metropolitan messages might be charged 1*s.*, and he objected to such a system being introduced. He desired to forward his messages for 6*d.*, as he was able to do at present. He hoped his hon. and learned Friend would divide upon his Amendment.

MR. KARSLAKE hoped that hon. Gentlemen would bear in mind that 1*s.* was to be the maximum price.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN called attention to the fact that the metropolis was not the only place where a message could be forwarded for 6*d.*, because you could send a telegram from Dublin to Bray, or Dublin to Kingstown, for 6*d.*, and he should not like to see that charge increased.

MR. LEVESON-GOWER said, he was anxious that telegraphic communication should be made cheap to the entire country; but he did not think it would be fair to raise the price paid for the transmission of messages in the metropolis.

MR. TURNER believed that the 6*d.* rate in the metropolis was charged in very few instances compared with the 1*s.* rate. Uniformity of rate was so essential to the success of a measure of that kind that he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed. If, however, it was pressed, he must vote against it. The benefit which the tradesmen as well as the merchants of London would derive from that Bill would be very great indeed; and he did not think the metropolis would lose anything by it.

MR. CANDLISH said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman would do well to consider the question of a reduction of rate for short distances as applicable to towns.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he held in his hand the rates of porterage charged by the Electric and International Telegraph Company for the delivery of messages. Those rates were as follows:—Under half a mile, no charge; over half a mile and under one mile, 6*d.*, and by express messenger, 1*s.*; over one mile and under two miles, 1*s.*, and by express messenger, 2*s.*; over two and under three miles by messenger on foot, 1*s.* 6*d.*, and by express messenger 3*s.* Under that Bill the people of London would in all cases get their messages porterage free. He could not consent to depart from the principle of uniformity of rate.

MR. WATKIN said, he thought that the principle of the reduced rate ought to be applied to all those large towns in which it was at present adopted.

Mr. AYRTON said, he was willing to have the scope of his Amendment extended so as to embrace all other places besides the metropolis, which now enjoyed the advantage of the 6*d.* rate.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he could not concur in the objections urged to the uniform rate by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets. Still he confessed he was one of those who believed they would ultimately come to a uniform 6*d.* rate, though at first it might be expedient to charge 1*s.* The argument now was precisely the same as that used against Mr. Rowland Hill's Post Office Reform.

Mr. E. POTTER appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consent to a reduction of the rate to 6*d.*, which would at once settle the question of uniformity.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he was a great believer in the 6*d.* rate, and so also was Mr. Scudamore, who might be said to be the author of the Bill. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) thought that they must ultimately come to it; but that it would not be prudent to begin with so great a reduction. They ought to afford themselves an opportunity of seeing their way in that matter, and they ought not to make too great and sudden a jump.

Amendment *negatived.*

Amendment proposed, in page 13, line 27, after the words "part of five words," to insert the words—

"Provided always, That for messages sent and delivered within the limits of all corporate towns and all cities having a population of more than thirty thousand, the rate for the first twenty words shall not exceed six pence."—(*Mr. Watkin.*)

Mr. BAZLEY said, he saw no just ground for making a distinction in this matter between persons living in a town or city above 30,000 inhabitants, and those residing in a city or town with a population below that number. He cautioned the Committee against establishing any such system of discrimination.

Colonel SYKES feared that a 6*d.* tariff would result in a burden being imposed on the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. MONSELL recommended the immediate adoption of a 6*d.* charge, the examples of France and Switzerland having shown that a reduced price led to a great increase in the number of messages.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Watkin

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 25; Noes 68: Majority 43.

Clause *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 16 to 21, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 22 (Postmaster General to pay Rates, &c.).

Colonel BARTTELOT said, it was proverbial that both railway companies and electric telegraph companies had either never been assessed, or the assessment had not been carried out and was still pending. He wanted to know whether it was the intention of his right hon. Friend to leave things as they were or to have the property assessed, though such assessment had not been made up to the present.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that it was intended to have the property pay the rates on assessment as Government property.

Mr. HENLEY pointed out that the clause would require amendment, otherwise this property would enjoy a permanent exemption.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he would look to it.

Mr. BAZLEY moved to leave out in line 6 the words "the passing of this Act," and insert "such purchase or acquisition."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 23 *agreed to.*

Clause 24 (Providing for Payment of Costs to Railway and Telegraph Companies if Objects of Act not carried out).

Mr. AYRTON asked how contracts entered into by the telegraph companies would be enforced against them when the telegraphs were vested in the Crown?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he would consult the Attorney General on the subject before the next stage of the Bill.

Mr. AYRTON said, that a similar question had arisen when the Government undertook to grant annuities. The proper course would be to have the Postmaster General liable to be sued as a subject in any place where the contract had been made or damage had arisen in violation of the contract.

Clause *agreed to.*

Schedule and Preamble *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

POOR RELIEF BILL.—(*Lords.*)—[BILL 186.] COMMITTEE. [*Progress July* 17.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 4 (Consent of Meeting of Guardians sufficient for the Formation of a School District).

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, he wished to make an appeal to the Secretary of the Poor Law Board against proceeding further with the Bill. It contained several objectionable clauses, which had been repeatedly brought forward, and as often withdrawn. They had now come to the fag-end of the Session, sitting till three o'clock in the morning, the only object seeming to be to hurry through Business in a manner which would certainly bear bitter fruits hereafter. There could be no satisfaction in going on with this Bill at this period of the Session, and it was most remarkable that the Government should now change their tactics on the Bill, and attempt to rush it through the House, simply on the ground of the House of Lords having made some supposed improvements in it. He would suggest that it should be withdrawn, and brought forward early in another Session, when it might receive due consideration. He should move that the Chairman report Progress.

MR. KINNAIRD reminded the Committee that the Scotch as well as the metropolitan Members strongly objected to the Bill, and expressed a hope that the Government would not prolong the Session by pressing forward so obnoxious a measure.

MR. SYNAN hoped the Bill would be proceeded with.

MR. T. CHAMBERS said, the Government had felt, on former occasions, that the objections urged against the clauses were such as they could not resist, and had therefore withdrawn them. These objections remained in full force, and why should not the Government then give way? The Bill introduced entirely new principles into the administration of the Poor Law. Was it to the credit of the Government that those clauses should be introduced within five days of prorogation, and that the Bill should be pressed forward in such a state of the House as this, when half the Benches were empty, and every Member who took an interest in it had left town?

VISCOUNT GALWAY appealed to the Government to withdraw the Bill; and said he must support the Motion to report Progress, although it was with great regret that he opposed a Bill which had come from the Lords, and had been carried through the Upper House by the noble Earl at the head of the Poor Law Board (the Earl of Devon). This House had in former Sessions rejected the obnoxious clauses of the Bill.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, it was too late in the Session to discuss these religious clauses.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH explained that last year certain portions of the Poor Law Bill were withdrawn because there was not time for their discussion in the other House, although they had been discussed in this; but in the present Session the Bill had gone through the other House first, so that there was not the same reason for withdrawing the Bill that there was for withdrawing part of last year's Bill; and there was only one recommendation of the Select Committee embodied in this Bill upon which the House had not already expressed its opinion.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he hoped the Committee would not be led away into reporting Progress on an occasion which did not call for it. Already half an hour had been wasted in fruitless speaking. The Bill did not relate to Scotland; but it involved an Imperial question on a subject that had been carefully considered by a Committee which sat three years, and which agreed upon clauses mainly to the effect of those before the Committee. The circumstances of past Sessions had prevented clauses being discussed in this House in time to get a Bill through the other House; and therefore the Department had wisely begun this year in the other House. There was abundance of time for the discussion necessary now, and therefore he hoped Progress would not be reported.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, it was admitted that there had been a deviation from the regular course of proceeding, and that this Bill came cut and dry from the other House at a time when there was not a fair opportunity to discuss it in this. The Act which brought so much credit to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. G. Hardy) was discussed in this House first. He must continue to offer such opposition as he could to the progress of this Bill, against which the Guardians of his borough had petitioned.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, the clauses objected to were before this House in 1865; they had been well-considered, and nothing had been said on the subject now that had not been said before. The only object of the clauses was to provide a means of giving effect to the law, which had been evaded. The arguments for reporting Progress were used three years ago, and no doubt would, if the occasion should arise, be repeated three years hence.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, that there were many useful provisions in the Bill, and he hoped that no obstruction would be offered to its consideration.

Motion *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 5 *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (A separate Creed Register to be kept in every Workhouse and Pauper school).

Mr. T. CHAMBERS moved the omission of the clause. The professed object of it and of the following clauses to Clause 12 was, he said, to secure religious liberty in workhouses and workhouse schools. If the present law did not secure that religious liberty, he, as a strong Protestant, would desire to see the law altered; but the change now proposed would interfere with religious liberty. Already adequate protection was given by law to the religious liberty of the inmates of workhouses, whether adults or orphans. In the Act of last Session additional provision had been made for the education of orphan children according to the religion of the parents or guardians. And as regarded adults, every person who went into a workhouse, or who was on the relief list, was entered as of a particular form of religious persuasion. Was not that a Creed Register? The provisions of this Bill were perfectly unnecessary. Even Dr. Manning himself declared in a letter to the poor Catholics of his diocese, which he caused to be posted on the chapel doors in Westminster, that the Catholic inmates of workhouses had their rights under the existing law of the land. It depended on themselves whether they should enjoy or be deprived of them. They had nothing to do but to ask for them. If they demanded them respectfully and firmly, those rights would not be refused. And what were those rights? Every adult in the workhouse might demand the visit of a Catholic clergyman and the ministrations of the Catholic religion. If that was so, what change was necessary as regarded adults? If they did more, they would not be protecting but interfering with religious liberty. If that was so, the adult Catholic inmates of the workhouse had no ground of complaint. Then with regard to the Catholic children, power was given for their removal to the Catholic school certified under the Poor Law. What more could be done? But a perfectly novel provision was made in this Bill, introduced for the first time into English law. If they desired to alter the law, let the Government bring forward their Bill at the beginning of the Session, when there was time to discuss it. For these reasons he asked the Committee to refuse at this stage of the Session to enter into the controversy which must ensue if the clauses were proceeded with.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, perhaps it would be convenient were he to state the reasons which had induced the Government to bring forward these clauses. The hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. T. Chambers) had stated that the Bill of 1834 contained a clause which provided that no persons should be compelled to attend against their will any religious service of a religion different from his own; but he had not stated that the order of the Poor Law Board, of which he approved, was identical with the clause in this Bill. That order provided that the religion of the father and mother should be that of the child, and that no orphan should be instructed in any religion against the wishes of its relatives. The hon. and learned Gentleman had also omitted to state that every impediment had been thrown in the way of that intention being carried into effect, while the clauses now proposed were the same as those which were approved by the Committee of 1864. These clauses did not merely apply to Roman Catholics, because they equally concerned paupers of every religious persuasion, although certainly a large proportion of the inmates of our workhouses were Roman Catholics. It was true, as was stated by the hon. and learned Member, that under an order of the Poor Law Board a register of the religion of every pauper was kept in workhouses; but that register was not open to public inspection, the Guardians alone being permitted to examine it. The fact was that the paupers frequently did not know their legal rights, and even those who did did not demand the consolations of religion according to their particular form of belief, unless they were perfectly sure that persons of their own religious persuasion would be likely to visit them, and, besides that, a fresh application was necessary on every occasion. These were the reasons why the religious Orders of the Poor Law Board had proved inoperative, and the clauses in question had been introduced into this Bill in order to meet the grievances complained of. With regard to children, it was in the power of the Poor Law Board to order children to be sent to schools of the denomination to which their parents belonged. In the case of orphans, when there was reasonable proof that they had been brought up in any particular religion the Poor Law Board had power to send them to schools of that denomination. He did not think that there was anything in those clauses to which a reasonable exception could be taken, and he trusted that the Committee would consider them, and, if necessary, divide upon them that night. He animadverted strongly upon the conduct of the Scottish Reformation Society in sending its agents to canvass hon. Members in the lobby of the House in opposition to the Bill, which he regarded as a most impertinent act on their part, and also upon their proceedings in putting forward petitions which contained inaccurate statements.

LORD EDWARD HOWARD complained that the hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. T. Chambers) had not stated the case fairly, but had used his powers of rhetoric to pervert the real facts. That hon. and learned Gentleman wished in that matter to make one law for the rich and another for the poor; for that was practically what his speech came to. Orphans born in a better rank of life had their guardians and next-of-kin to look after them and claim them. There was nobody to plead the cause of these poor persons, who could not understand the intricacies of the law, and did not know what their legal rights were in religious matters. In 1862 a Committee recommended more than was contained in the present clause. On that occasion witnesses made out grievances both for old and young Catholics. The hon. and learned Member had referred to Dr. Manning's circular, which showed that these poor people were ignorant as to their privileges. The noble Lord then proceeded to quote evidence to prove that the relations of Roman Catholic children in workhouses were not aware that they had any legal right to object to those children being educated as Protestants, and to insist on their being instructed in their own faith, and that, even assuming that they were conscious of those rights, many Poor Law Guardians were disinclined to facilitate their exercise of them, and disposed rather to throw every obstacle in the way of their doing so. Therefore, the ingeniously constructed edifice of the hon. and learned Member's argument fell to the ground. Having mentioned certain instances in which difficulties had been interposed when sick and dying Roman Catholic paupers required the ministrations of clergymen of their own Church, the noble Lord appealed to the Scotch Members—who had put him out of the world, politically speaking—if it was possible that a scintilla of mercy was left in their northern hearts, at least to show some of that mercy to those poor people. Those Gentlemen had come down to the House to impress the British public with their own exclusive and narrow views on that subject; and it appeared that they had sent their organs into the Lobby of the House to waylay hon. Members with their papers in a similar manner to that adopted by the Protestant Alliance in 1861. The great difficulty in these cases was to get the facts made known to the public. Once those facts were fairly known he had no fear that justice would not be done by the British public; but unfortunately they were hidden and smothered in blue books from year to year by the efforts of Scottish Gentlemen and others, who always met the demand for bringing them to light by the pretext that it was not the right time for doing so.

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, that those hon. Gentlemen who opposed these clauses would find it very difficult to show that they went beyond the law as it stood at present, at least in spirit and intention. The hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. T. Chambers), in his vehement attack on that clause, assumed that the Poor Law of this country, as it appeared in the various Acts and in the consolidated Orders of the Poor Law Board, and as it bore in practice upon the pauper population, was one and the same thing. But that assumption was contrary to the fact. He hoped that when the opinion of the Committee was taken the decision would be abided by; and, if beaten, that the hon. and learned Gentleman would not attempt to stop the further progress of the Bill by a factious opposition.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER contended that the people's rights did not, as a matter of fact, exist as long as they were ignorant of them or knew not how to enforce them. He thought that any Gentleman who pretended to be a friend of civil and religious liberty could not object to the simple provisions contained in those clauses for enabling the inmates of workhouses to obtain their unquestioned rights. The Catholic inmates of workhouses were afraid of offending the workhouse authorities, by demanding the enjoyment of their rights, and this Bill would put them in possession of their rights. He could not see why it should be opposed.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he was accustomed to the manner of the noble Lord opposite (Lord Edward Howard); he always appeared in the person of an aggrieved Catholic when he meditated aggression. It seemed to be agreed that under the present state of the law Roman Catholic children in workhouses had full religious liberty. It had been said that agents of the Scottish Reformation Society had been active in the lobby in reference to this Bill; but it ought to be known that Dr. Manning and Roman Catholic priests had for a good part of this Session been constant attendants in the House, in the lobbies, and in the tea-room. The object now was to abrogate the rights of individual Roman Catholics, on the plea that they did not know them, whilst it was admitted that Dr. Manning had done his best to make these rights known to those who possessed them, and also to secure that they should be enforced. By these clauses Dr. Manning would be enabled to employ the officials of the workhouse to coerce any Roman Catholics who did not wish to conform to the intolerant rules of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The object of Cardinal Wiseman was avowed, to form the Roman Catholics into a separate community, to be governed by different laws from the rest of the community. [Sir George Bowyer: No!] He would assure the hon. and learned Baronet that he had an authenticated copy of the Cardinal's address to that effect, and would produce it. The intention of the present law was to secure religious freedom, and he said it did it. The intention of the present clauses was to coerce the Roman Catholic poor into unwilling obedience to their priests, and therefore he would oppose them.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, he would confine himself to the 6th clause, which was now under discussion. He admitted, with the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Newdegate), that the present law was intended to secure religious freedom; but it was not sufficient, because it could be evaded. The only entry of the religious creed of the inmates was kept in the in-door relief list, and that was under the sole inspection of the officials, who had no interest in the question of the religion of the inmates. So that though a Roman Catholic clergyman might know that many of his own religion were in the hospital, he could not get access to them, because he had no means of inspecting the register. The present clause was intended to enforce a Creed Register, which should be open to the public, and the instant that was done he would say that religious liberty would be secured, and he was surprised that hon. Members should sit there till past midnight debating and opposing a proposition so reasonable. With respect to the memorandum of Dr. Manning, he regarded it as simply pointing out the defects of the present system, in order that they might be remedied.

Mr. BAINES reminded the Committee that the clauses would apply to Protestant Dissenters as well as Roman Catholics. For himself, he believed he was as decided a Protestant as the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, though he shook his head, only the hon. Member's tenets as a Protestant led him to deny religious liberty, while his tenets as a Protestant led him to assert it. He was ashamed to hear the hon. Member say that the object of this clause was that the priest might coerce the poor. Such a sentiment was most intolerant, and was unwarranted. The alleged intolerance of the Roman Catholic seemed now to be transposed to the religious Protestant. He was ashamed of it, and he would give his hearty support to the clause.

Mr. MAGUIRE, to disprove the assertion of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) that Catholic paupers had everything they required in the shape of religious instruction and consolation, instanced the case of a poor woman in a London workhouse who, requiring religious consolation on her death-bed, was only permitted to see her clergyman once until that clergyman had renewed his application for admission to the workhouse. He had great respect for the sincerity of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, but he regretted that he seemed to have a craze on this subject.

Colonel W. STUART contended that the clause would oftentimes act injuriously in the case of Roman Catholic paupers, instead of being attended with advantage to them. He thought the attack that had been made upon the Scotch Members was unjustifiable, inasmuch as none of them had as yet taken part in the debate. If this Bill was of the small importance that some hon. Gentlemen seemed to imply, it was strange that the other House of Parliament had retained it before them for four months.

Mr. WYLD contended that the present law afforded every opportunity that was necessary for the instruction of Roman Catholics in workhouses.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he could not admit the claim of the hon. Member for Leeds (Mr. Baines) to the title of a good Protestant. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Maguire) intimated that he (Mr. Newdegate) was hazy on this subject; but that was only equivalent to saying that the people of England were mad, and during 300 years there had been opportunities for them to consider this question. He was opposed to a measure which would imperil religious liberty.

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS said, that the Guardians of Marylebone gave every opportunity for the exercise of religious liberty.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 58; Noes 27: Majority 31.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (How the Religion of Children to be entered in the Creed Register).

Mr. NEWDEGATE moved that the Chairman report Progress.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH appealed to the hon. Member to allow the next two or three clauses to pass before the Chairman reported Progress. They related to the Creed Register, and were purely of a formal character.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he should persist in his Motion.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Newdegate.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 25; Noes 55: Majority 30.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (The Poor Law Board to decide Questions as to Correctness of the Register).

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, he could not understand why questions as to the creed of pauper children all over the country should be remitted to the Poor Law Board for determination.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH thought the Poor Law Board supplied an excellent machinery for the purpose.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, it was not a small question.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Creed Register to be open to Inspection of Ministers).

Mr. POWELL moved an Amendment, empowering ratepayers as well as clergymen to inspect the register.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Colonel W. STUART then moved that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 22, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Marriages Validity (Blakedown)* [250].
Committee—Hudson's Bay Company * [240].
Report—Hudson's Bay Company * [240].
Considered as amended—Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections [243]; Registration (Ireland) * [248]; Electric Telegraphs [239].
Third Reading—Registration (Ireland) * [248]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [241]; Inland Revenue * [207], and *passed.*
Withdrawn—Oxford and Cambridge Universities* [30]; Local Officers Superannuation (Ireland) (No. 2) * [120].

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

[BILL 243.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, he had heard that the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown had stated the other day, in reply to a Question of the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), that it was not the intention of the Government to do anything in respect to rescinding the decision come to on the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett), (providing that the expenses of the returning officers for hustings, &c., should be defrayed out of the county or borough rates) without due Notice of such intention being given to the House. He was surprised to see, in the face of that promise, a Notice on the Paper that morning that it was the intention of the Solicitor General to propose the omission of the clause in question. He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) would ask the Government whether there was not some mistake made in this matter?

MR. DISRAELI said, he had stated that it was quite impossible for the Government to come to any decision upon this clause until the Bill was printed and further considered. After the Bill was so printed it was thought important by the Government that the Motion referred to should be made. The moment that decision had been arrived at communications were made with those hon. Members who were in the confidence of the party opposite; and before the Notice was put upon the Paper it was well known by hon. Members opposite what the intention of the Government was. So far as the practice of the House was concerned, that, he believed, was the course which, under similar difficult circumstances, had always been adopted. He should have been glad to give a longer Notice, but it was impossible.

MR. WHITE said, he would suggest that, as the intention of the Government in respect to this clause was only made known to hon. Members on his side of the House at half past eleven o'clock last night, the Solicitor General might postpone his Motion for the omission of the clause until the third reading of the Bill.

MR. DISRAELI: Perhaps, Sir, the House will permit me to explain the course which the Government recommend it to take in regard to applying this measure to Ireland and Scotland. Her Majesty's Ministers have considered the subject, and they are advised that, on the whole, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to make this application by the adoption of one or more clauses. First, in regard to Ireland. Those whose advice has guided us on this subject are clearly of opinion that it would be quite impossible, by the simple machinery of the clause suggested, to apply this measure to Ireland. It will be necessary, in making the application of the measure to Ireland, to express that object throughout the whole body of the Bill. With that view we have printed, as a separate Paper, the alterations which we consider necessary. They are mere technical alterations; but, at the same time, if they be opposed it will be obviously impossible to pursue that course which we recommend; because in that case the Bill would have to be gone through again. But if the House, having had an opportunity of seeing those Amendments—which as I have said are all of a mere technical character, applying solely to Ireland—will accept them *en bloc*, the matter might be arranged in about half-an-hour. It will now be for the House to express an opinion upon this proposition. If there should arise a decided opposition to those Amendments we must in that case give them up as being involved in difficulties which, under existing circumstances, we feel we colud not surmount. In regard to Scotland, it is the opinion of the Lord Advocate that the application of the Bill to that country might be effected in a simpler manner; and he has placed in a separate Paper an additional clause which would effect that object. Those Amendments are now in the hands of the House; and if they assent to the scheme proposed in regard to the application of the Bill to Ireland and Scotland, it is the wish of Her Majesty's Government that the measure should be so applied. I was anxious to make this application in the simplest manner possible, and I wished the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Monsell) to be well-considered and examined, being determined to support it if there were no preferable means of making the Bill applicable to Ireland; but it having been reported to me by those to whose opinions I am bound to defer, that such an Amendment in the Bill would raise serious obstructions to its operation, and would not really work, we felt that we had no other means of satisfactorily accomplishing the object we desired than by those Amendments which we have placed upon the Paper.

MR. MONSELL said, that nothing could be more satisfactory than the statement of the right hon. Gentleman; and he concurred with him in thinking that the course he now proposed was much better than the one he (Mr. Monsell) had suggested.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he approved of the right hon. Gentleman's proposal. He had gone through the Amendments, and was perfectly satisfied that they were only of a technical character.

MR. HEADLAM said, that there was a general feeling on his (the Opposition) side of the House to support the Government in this matter; but he regretted the resolution the right hon. Gentleman had come to, to attempt the reversal of the decision on the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett), which had been arrived at in a much fuller House than that they had to-day.

MR. DISRAELI said, that the subject, which was decided not in a very full House, but in a thin House, would be dispassionately considered when it came on for discussion.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he thought that the course proposed by the Government was one which would entail considerable inconvenience. At the last moment, when they had nearly passed the measure through Committee, the Government suddenly proposed a series of clauses which they were asked to accept *in globo*, as there was no time for considering them in detail. With respect to the application of the measure to Scotland, there were scarcely more than two or three of the representatives of that country now in the House to consider the proposed clauses. The Bill was laid before them at the commencement of the Session, with a clause providing that it should not apply to Ireland and Scotland, and now they were so far to begin again *de novo;* so that on Wednesday, the 22nd of July, they had to examine this difficult and technical subject, involving matters which it required great legal expertness to decide—and that without the assistance of Members of the Scotch legal profession. He, however, would not object to making the Bill applicable to the whole of the United Kingdom, though he thought that the House ought to have kept the jurisdiction in this matter in its own hands.

MR. MELLY said, he had endeavoured to support the Government in almost every division on the Bill, and he thought that they deserved gratitude for making the Bill applicable to Scotland and Ireland as well as to England, but he regretted the course they proposed to take with regard to the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett). It was said that the clause was adopted in a thin House; but it ought not to be rescinded in a still thinner House. If the decision on that clause should be reversed, and if it should appear that that reversal was mainly due to the influence of the Members of the Government, he was afraid that his feeling of gratitude to the Government would be very much modified.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he approved the proposal to include Scotland and Ireland in the Bill; but he must enter his protest in as strong language as he could use against the unfair proceeding of the Prime Minister in not giving Notice sooner than at midnight yesterday of his intention to reverse the decision on the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett). It was monstrous, that when many Liberal Members had gone to different parts of the country, an attempt should be made to upset a decision deliberately come to; and he entertained so strong a feeling on the point that he would rather see the whole Bill thrown out than lose the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton. He could have no confidence in Gentlemen who professed to wish to put down corrupt practices, when they were going to sanction one of the most corrupt proceedings ever known.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, there was no doubt the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Serjeant Gaselee) had kept his word by using strong language; but the House was so accustomed to hear such language from him that they paid little attention to it when they heard it. When the hon. and learned Gentleman charged honourable men with something like corrupt motives, he (Mr. Hardy) would only remark that that which from other mouths might make some impression, from that of the hon. and learned Gentleman made none whatever. He (Mr. Hardy) had before expressed an opinion that the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) would not work—that it applied to a different state of things from that contemplated by the Bill. As, however, the consideration of that clause could not come on for some time, he hoped that in order to make progress with the Bill, the House would agree to proceed with other clauses upon which there was no difference of opinion. He repudiated the charge that the Government had sought to take an unfair advantage by the course they proposed. No notice had been given to hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House which was not also given to hon. Members on the other side, and in one of the Liberal papers he saw it announced in large type that the Government proposed to rescind the clause which had been referred to.

MR. M'LAREN said, he wished to mention that he had received Notice of the proposed changes in the Bill for the first time that morning. Having read them over carefully, he approved them as effecting a great improvement in the measure; for he thought you would establish a most unfortunate distinction between the different portions of the United Kingdom if you were to leave Scotland without the benefit of the Corrupt Practices Act. If any law is good for one portion of the United Kingdom, it ought to be good also for another. However, when it came to the question of regulations of the vote for appointing a Judge, he should have something to say on that point, because he thought an improvement might be affected in the provisions of the Bill on that head. There was one point on which they were entitled to some explanation from the Government. Notice had been given by the Solicitor General to leave out the Clause D 53, which had been considered, on the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton; and yet the 19th paragraph of the Lord Advocate's clause proposed to extend to Scotland the principle of payment for all those expenses of sheriffs and officers connected with elections included in the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett's) Motion. The Government surely could not mean to throw out a clause already carried in respect to England while, at the same time, they enacted it anew in respect to Scotland. He should certainly vote with the hon. Member for Brighton against rescinding his clause, and with the Lord Advocate's Notice, as it stood on the Votes, in favour of putting in paragraph 19—the principle of which he understood to be the same as that of the hon. Member for Brighton's Motion.

COLONEL SYKES said, he wished also to express his gratification at the proposition to extend the Bill to Scotland.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN admitted that it was desirable to get on with the Bill; but they were just then discussing, not the merits of the clauses, but the conduct of the Government. The clause of the hon. Member for Brighton was adopted in a House of 200 Members, including pairs, and on Monday the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) asked whether it was true, as rumoured, that the Government intended to propose rescinding the clause? The right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown observed, with great indignation, that the Question was unusual, un-Parliamentary, and inconvenient, and that nothing would be done without due Parliamentary Notice. Now, there was a difference between acting within the letter of a declaration and acting up to its spirit. It was true that Parliamentary Notice had been given; but they all knew that at that period of the Session the Government had enormous power, and it would not be a satisfactory proceeding if the Government now succeeded in reversing by a small majority a decision arrived at by 200 Members. The right hon. Gentleman had conducted the Bill through the House so far with the greatest courtesy, and he had honourably redeemed his pledge with regard to Ireland and Scotland; but he questioned if the Notice given by the Government with reference to this clause would be considered equally satisfactory by the House and the country.

MR. FAWCETT said, that the clause carried on two divisions on Saturday last had been on the Paper for more than three months, and therefore there had been ample time for the Government, as well as the House, to consider it; and as three leading Members of the Government argued against the clause on Saturday, it must be inferred that all the objections which could be urged against it were then stated. It was notorious that when the House met on Saturday at this time of the Session the Government had a great advantage, because all the official Members were in town, while the supporters of the clause had not the advantage of any party organization. The clause was, consequently, carried by the independent feeling of the House. The question was not in the least degree a party question, because the majority of 9 by which it was carried included nine of the most independent Conservatives. He had been written to by several hon. Friends who had left town to let them know if there was the slightest probability of the Government attempting a reversal of the decision of the House. The Answer given by the First Minister of the Crown to a Question on Monday completely threw him off his guard, and he felt that he could not take upon himself to bring Gentlemen up to London who were some 200 or 300 miles away. He came down to the House yesterday at an early hour, because he thought, if the Government intended to propose the reversal of the previous decision, they would then have given public Notice to that effect. It was only accidentally, at one o'clock in the morning, that he found that during his absence from the House Notice had been given at half past eleven that it had been decided an attempt should be made to reverse the the decision the Committee had arrived at on Saturday, He considered he had been placed under great disadvantage by the course pursued by the Government, and he hoped the House would abide by the decision of the Committee.

MAJOR PARKER said, he thought the Frst Minister of the Crown was entitled to the thanks of the community for determining to give the House an opportunity of re-considering the decision hastily come to on Saturday. He thought it not a little extraordinary that Gentlemen who were so much in the habit of calling out against any increase in the rates should, when the expenditure immediately affected themselves, be so ready to throw it upon the ratepayers. He hoped the House would not adopt the decision of the Committee.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he must remind the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) that the clause adopted on Saturday was not the same with that which had stood on the Paper for three months. Substantially there was a very great difference — great difficulty was found in passing the clause without some qualifying words for the purpose of preventing vexatious contests. Exception had been taken to the words of the proviso, and it was expected that on the Report some new qualification would be proposed. Another difficulty had presented itself. There were no means of carrying out the proposal for charging the rates of any particular division of a county with its share of the election expenses. The Government had given great and anxious consideration to both these matters, and it was only at the last moment, when the impracticability of the proposal became manifest, that, as the only solution of the difficulty, Notice was given for its re-consideration. The whole proceeding was entirely *bonâ fide,* and the present state of the House—the attendance on the Opposition side being much larger than on the Ministerial Benches—showed that no unfair advantage had been taken of the shortness of the Notice.

MR. W. E. FOSTER said, he could not help thinking it would have been much better if, when he asked the Question on Monday, the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown had given him some intimation of the difficulty which was felt by the Government, and had stated that the subject was under serious consideration, because that would have given hon. Members an idea that very possibly the Government would attempt to challenge the decision of Saturday last. He was induced to put his Question in order that hon. Members who were about to leave town should have an opportunity of knowing if it was probable that decision would be re-considered. The impression created by the right hon. Gentleman's Answer at the time was that it was not to be challenged, and that was the view which the *Standard,* the organ of the Government, put forward in their remarks upon the Question and Answer.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he could assure the House that there was no intention of unfairness on the part of the Government, and he thought that imputation had been made in some quarters a little too often. It had never been justified; there was no colour for it, and never had been. Those who were responsible for the conduct of Public Business were bound when any proposal was made by independent Members to consider how it should be carried out. Now, he would undertake to show that there were strong, irresistible grounds for declaring that the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) could not be worked consistently with the existing law. It had been his duty to consider the whole matter, and it appeared to him that there were no means by which it could be reduced to legislation at this time of the Session. It would almost require an Act of Parliament to enable them to carry out what the hon. Gentleman and the noble Lord the Member for Yorkshire (Viscount Milton) proposed. It would have been a gross dereliction of duty on the part of the Government to allow the clause to go forth without pointing out the difficulty that existed in regard to it. At all events, this Session it was impossible to do anything with the clause.

Mr. GILPIN said, he saw no ground for any imputation of unfair motives, and he hoped that hon. Gentlemen round him would consent to do one thing at a time. It would be impossible to get on with the Bill if they took a clause which was not at present before them, and discussed over and over again what was not regularly before the House. When the proper time came he should support the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett).

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, the Solicitor General had misunderstood what it was the Opposition considered unfair conduct on the part of the Government. No one dreamt of imputing unfairness to the Government in proposing to re-consider the decision of Saturday last; but what was complained of was that so short a Notice should have been given of their intention to rescind that decision. It was utterly impossible, when it became known long after post hour, to communicate with absent Members in time for them to attend in their places. He thought, after the indignant display of virtue on the part of the right hon. Gentlemen at the Head of the Government, when the question of his hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) was asked on Monday, they had a right to complain of the unfairness of the Notice given by the Government.

Mr. ADAM said, that he had received notice of the intentions of the Government from the hon. Member for Bridgnorth (Mr. Whitmore) about half past eleven last night, a few minutes after the hon. Member became aware of them. All he could do was to communicate the fact to those of his Friends who were in the House, and send out notice that morning to such as were absent and still remained in town. He thought it rather late to give such a notice; but he acquitted the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Whitmore) of any delay in the matter. The hon. Gentleman had treated him quite fairly.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL proposed a new clause; (Removal of disqualification on proof that such disqualification was procured by bribery).

Clause *added* to the Bill.

The Solicitor General

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he would propose the clause which stood in the name of his learned Friend for the application of the Bill to Scotland, leaving out the 19th paragraph of the clause (providing that election expenses should be apportioned to the different parishes, and levied with the poor rates of the year, or, as otherwise provided by the Act 17 and 18 Victoria, chap. 91).

Clause (Application of Act to Scotland) *brought up*, and read the first and second time; *considered* in Committee, and *reported.*

Paragraph 6 relating to the selection of two Judges from the Court of Session to be placed on the *rota* for the trial of Election Petitions, read.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he wished to explain the nature of the Amendment he intended to propose on the paragraph relating to the *rota.* There were two divisions of the Court of Session, with four Judges in each, and five separate Judges called Lords Ordinary holding separate Courts. The effect of the clause was to authorize the appointment of Judges of the Outer House for the trial of Election Petitions, but to leave them no voice in the appointment. It was only the eight Judges of the Inner House who were to have such a voice under this clause — each division of the Inner House consisting of four members to elect one. In case of a difference of opinion the Chief Judge was to have a casting vote, so that virtually the clause gave the appointment of the Judge who was to try Elections to the Chief Judge of the division. Under these circumstances he proposed that alterations should be made to the effect, first, that all the thirteen Judges should have votes in the appointment; secondly, that the giving a casting vote should not be necessary (it would not be necessary when there was an odd number of votes); and thirdly, he would suggest that Judges of the Outer House should not be selected for the trial of Petitions, but that the Judges should be taken from the Inner House, whose members had sat for five or six years, and by that time had forgotten their connection with politics, if they ever had any.

Amendment proposed to leave out Paragraph 6.—(*Mr. M'Laren.*)

Question proposed, "That Paragraph 6 stand part of the Clause."

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, he had framed the clause as much as possible on the model of the English Bill. By that Bill there was to be a vote of each Court, and with six Judges there might be an equal division, requiring a casting vote.

MR. M'LAREN said, he must complain that the Judges of the Outer House, whose status and salaries were equal to those of the Inner House, were excluded from voting, and that no Judge in England was excluded from voting. He would move the omission of the clause.

THE LORD ADVOCATE thought it of no consequence.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause amended as follows :—

"The members of the Court of Session shall, on the first day of the winter Session every year, select by a majority of the votes two Judges of such Court, not being Members of the House of Lords, to be placed on the *rota* for the trial of Election Petitions during the ensuing year."

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, he had no objection of principle to the Amendments suggested by the hon. Member for Edinburgh, and would consent to amend the clause accordingly.

Clause amended.

Paragraph 19 relating to the Payment of Election Expenses.

Moved to omit the Paragraph.

MR. M'LAREN said, he strongly objected to the omission of the 19th paragraph, as now intended by Government, after it had been framed and proposed by themselves, the principle of which would, he believed, give immense satisfaction to the people of Scotland. Even if there were some technical objections to the application of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett's) clause to English counties, they had no bearing in the case of Scotland, because the same divisions of counties did not exist; and he therefore moved as an Amendment that the 19th paragraph be added to the clause.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Clause, to add the words—

"19. At every Election for any county or burgh in Scotland, the expenses lawfully incurred by the sheriff or other returning officer, or the sheriff clerk or town clerk, for the provision of hustings, poll sheriffs, poll clerks, polling booths or rooms, and any other necessary requisites, for the conduct of the Election, shall be ascertained and fixed by the commissioners of supply in counties, and by the magistrates of burghs, as the case may be; and the said commissioners or magistrates, as the case may be, shall cause the amount of such expenses so ascertained and fixed to be apportioned upon the parishes within such county or burgh respectively according to the yearly rent or value thereof; and the same shall be assessed and levied, along with the assessment for the relief of the poor for the current year within such parishes respectively, or they shall cause such amount, along with such reasonable sum as they may deem necessary to meet the expenses of collection, to be assessed and levied and collected in some other of the modes allowed by the Act seventeenth and eighteenth Victoria, chapter ninety-one: Provided always, That no county or burgh shall be liable under this Act for any expenses heretofore defrayed in exchequer, or which, under the provisions of this Act, may come in lieu of such expenses."—(*Mr. M'Laren.*)

MR. BOUVERIE said, he should vote for the rejection of the Amendment. With many on the other side of the House, he entertained a very sincere objection to the proposal to placing that portion of the election expenses hitherto paid by candidates in boroughs and counties upon the rates. He also objected to the deposit of £100 which it was intended to require from every person who was proposed as a candidate at the hustings. That was opposed to the ancient constitutional right of Her Majesty's subjects to propose any person whom they might think fit to represent them in Parliament. It was well known also that gentlemen were occasionally proposed not for the purpose of contesting the election but merely to have the opportunity of making a speech.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the Government was placed in an awkward position by the attempt to raise the question at that moment. It was quite clear with what intention it was done—to get a vote in support of the English clause, though in reality the proposal as regarded Scotland stood on entirely different grounds, as the circumstances of the two countries were different. If the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) intended to persevere with the clause as it stood, it would create a difference between the law of England and the law of Scotland on this head.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he thought that if the House would agree to the Amendment it would place Scotland in the same position as England.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House *divided :* — Ayes 71 ; Noes 83 : Majority 12.

Clause, as amended, *added.*

VISCOUNT MILTON proposed to insert the following clause after Clause D 53:—

"In case the county for which the county rate is made shall be divided into two or more parts for Parliamentary representation, then the said expenses shall be charged upon and defrayed by and out of the county rate levied within and for that part of the county for which such Election shall take place; and the clerk of the peace for the county shall apportion such expenses amongst the parishes, townships, and places only in that part of the county in and for which such Election shall have so taken place, as nearly as may be in proportion to the number of persons whose names shall appear on the register of county voters for such parishes, townships, and places respectively; and the clerk of the peace, in issuing his precept for the county rate, shall add thereto the proportion payable in respect of such expenses by each of the last-mentioned parishes, townships, and places, and the same shall be recoverable in like manner and as part of the county rate."

Clause (Levying of county rate where county is divided,)—(*Viscount Milton,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL was not surprised that the noble Viscount should have failed in solving the very difficult question he had undertaken to deal with. By the 53rd section of the Bill the expenses of every election for a county were ordered to be defrayed out of the county rate, and for a borough out of money to be raised under the 6 *Vict.* c. 18, s. 55, which enacted that all expenses incurred by any town clerk or returning officer for a city or borough should be defrayed out of money to be collected for the relief of the poor from all the parishes within such city or borough. The 15 & 16 *Vict.*, c. 81, which appointed the manner in which the county rate was to be made, empowered the Justices of the county sitting in Quarter Sessions to impose a rate to be paid by all parishes in the county; and therefore if the rate were to be made upon a portion of a county only it would be invalid. Under these circumstances he did not see how they could agree to the first part of the noble Viscount's clause, seeing that there was no "county rate levied within and for that part of the county for which such election shall take place," out of which the expenses were to be defrayed. The second part of the clause said that the clerk of the peace for the county should apportion the expenses among the parishes and places only in the part of the county for which the election was held, but the clerk of the peace had nothing whatever to do with apportioning the rate. Again, the clerk of the peace did not issue his precept for the county rate, because under the Act that duty was to be performed by the justices. It was evident, therefore, that the noble Viscount's attempt to solve the question had entirely failed, and the difficulty could only be overcome by machinery being established for the purpose of raising the money for defraying the election expenses different from that by which the county rate was raised. To effect that object, however, it would require legislation of too extensive a character to be commenced during the short remainder of the Session. These were the difficulties he had foreseen, and had pointed out as likely to arise if the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton were carried; and even if they could be overcome by legislation, still the injustice of the principle of the clause would remain. The question was one which required the gravest consideration, and therefore the matter should, in his opinion, be postponed. With regard to the boroughs they were in this difficulty — that the parishes sometimes ran into two counties, and sometimes were partly within and partly without a borough; and, therefore, it would be most unjust to levy these expenses upon the whole of such parishes. He did not mean to say that it was not possible to overcome all the difficulties to which he had alluded by legislation, but it was clear that it would be impossible to expect Parliament to enter upon such legislation this Session.

MR. LEEMAN said, the Solicitor General had endeavoured to combat the proposition of the noble Viscount on mere technical grounds, and had contended that the proposition of the noble Viscount could be carried into effect. He (Mr. Leeman) hoped that the House would not listen to the objection of the hon. and learned Gentleman. The difficulties could be got rid of by the insertion of words in the clause. When the precept for the rate was sent out, a calculation was made respecting the portion payable by each parish, and no difficulty could arise on that point. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that what was proposed by the noble Viscount could not be done by law. Why, this clause was proposed to enable it to be done by law. The country rate for the North and West Riding was levied respectively on each of these divisions, and where was the difficulty in apportioning on each parish in each division the rate payable by it? If they could deal with this question in the future, as was admitted by the hon. and learned Gentleman, why not now? The clause was only a repetition for counties of what had already been done for boroughs by the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett). Where there was a will there was a way.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he would be glad to know the exact mode in which the hon. and learned Member for York (Mr. Leeman) proposed to carry out the clause. He could not see how it was to work. How was the money to be provided, and on whose authority were the precepts to be sent out? The magistrates assessed the county rate on certain estimates of the money required for roads, bridges, police, and other county expenses. Were they to make a new and prospective estimate for the possible expenses of a Parliamentary Election, and a limitation of the rate to the particular parishes which were situated in the division in which the election might take place? If not, in what manner was the money to be provided supposing the expenditure for other purposes to come up to the full amount of the estimates. Did the hon. Member propose that the clerk of the peace should be able, of his own motion, to increase the county rate sufficiently to cover such election expenses.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he wished to point out as a question of Order that it would be better if the clause of the noble Viscount were postponed until after the new clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) had been discussed, as then hon. Members would know what they were doing.

MR. SPEAKER said, if the House desired to do so, they could permit the present clause to be postponed and brought up again as an Amendment upon the clause to be proposed by the hon. Member for Brighton.

MR. FAWCETT said, he felt himself placed in some difficulty upon this question, because, if the Government succeeded in striking out his clause, everything would fall into confusion. He thought it would be better to discuss the proviso first, on the understanding that his clause was in its entirety in the Bill, and that, if the clause fell through, the proviso would fall with it.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he thought it undesirable to discuss bit by bit the Amendment which had been proposed by the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett). If the noble Viscount the Member for the West Riding (Viscount Milton) would withdraw his clause for the present he could move it as an Amendment before the question was put on the Motion of the Solicitor General to omit Clause D. 53.

MR. HENLEY said, that, in spite of all that had been said by the hon. and learned Member for York (Mr. Leeman) he believed the clause to be perfectly unworkable. It would be impossible to collect a rate from the owners of tenements when that rate would frequently amount to a fraction of a penny, or the fraction even of a farthing. The principle was no doubt a just one, but if it were put into practice at all it would be much more simple to allow the clerk of the peace to pay the amount out of the gross rate of the riding.

SIR ROBERT COLLIER said, that if the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) were rejected this question would not arise. It would, therefore, be better to discuss the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton first.

Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

VISCOUNT MILTON gave Notice that he would move it as an Amendment on Clause D 53.

MR. BERKELEY said, he rose to move the insertion of a new clause with a view to the better prevention of personation at elections. The clause provided that at the annual registration the Revising Barrister should fix the parish in which non-resident freemen shall record their votes, and that they should vote on one qualification only. He could conceive no objection that could be offered to the clause, which, if it did no good, could certainly do no harm.

Clause (For the better prevention of personation at Elections,)—(*Mr. Berkeley,*) —*brought up*, and read the first time.

MR. HEYGATE said, he believed the first part of the clause was quite unnecessary, inasmuch as it was now competent for the returning officer in any borough to assign one or more polling booths specially for non-resident freemen to vote at, and such had always been the practice at Leicester and other boroughs in many parts of England, while the second part, in which the hon. Member desired to prevent an elector from claiming to vote in respect to more than one qualification, was unjust, and directly contrary to the spirit of the practice which had always hitherto been sanctioned, because an elector who selected what he regarded as his best qualification would find, if his claim on that ground were rejected, that he had lost all right of voting whatever.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that while he was as anxious as the hon. Member to prevent personation, he did not think the method proposed in the clause was the best one. To the second part of the clause he had the strongest objection, on principle, for it had always been the rule that persons should have the right of voting on different qualifications. If the House thought it desirable, the first part of the clause might perhaps be reduced into a practical shape; but for his own part he was of the opinion that no good could result from the attempt to prevent in this way the practice of personation. It would be better at some future time if they found personation to be very frequent to seek some more effective mode of dealing with the evil.

MR. NEATE said, he believed that the most effectual way of putting an end to personation at elections would be for the Law Officers of the Crown to do their duty and prosecute the offenders, where such a course was rendered advisable by the gravity of the offence.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Clause be now read a second time," put, and *negatived.*

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he rose to move the insertion of a clause, the effect of which would be to prohibit the payment of expenses for conveying voters to the poll in counties and in those boroughs which were treated last year as counties. Last year the prohibition was carried as regarded boroughs, but was not extended to counties. One objection that had been raised was that it would require so great an increase in the number of polling-places that the expense would be as great as that of conveying voters to the poll. He did not think that would be so; at any rate the objection was removed by the clause that was carried on Saturday (Mr. Fawcett's clause), and which he hoped would be retained. Another objection was that the new polling-places would be appointed by magistrates out of political motives. To remedy that he had another clause to propose, which would take the initiative out of the hands of magistrates, but would oblige them to appoint polling booths whenever and wherever they were called upon to do so by a certain number of electors. He held that the practice of conveying voters to the poll was in itself corrupt, and that it led to further corruption. At present the price of county elections was estimated at the rate of something like £1 per elector. The county constituencies having been largely increased by the recent Reform Bill, the costs would also be largely increased, unless they did away with the practice of conveying persons to the poll. He hoped, therefore, the House would support the clause.

Clause (Payment of expenses for conveying voters in counties and certain boroughs illegal,)—(*Mr. Labouchere,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he would appeal to the House not to enter into a discussion of this question, for the matter was fully debated last year, and as a compromise to meet all the different views expressed at the time, the present clauses in the Reform Bill were introduced, confining the operation of such a provision to boroughs. If they entered into a discussion of this proposal, several hours might be taken up, which at this late period of the Session would be to put a stop to the further progress of the Bill.

MR. W. B. BEAUMONT said, the appeal which had just fallen from the Solicitor General was the most extraordinary he had heard for a long time. They were asked not to disturb an arrangement that had been come to last year, and yet they were told they would be asked to disturb an arrangement that had been come to only on Saturday last, and which was affirmed by two successive majorities. He trusted that the hon. Member for Middlesex (Mr. Labouchere) would not withdraw his clause—unless, at all events, the Government withdrew their opposition to the clause which had been proposed by the hon. Member for Brighton.

MR. CORRANCE: Sir, I must agree with what has fallen from the hon. Member that no fair occasion has been afforded us of discussing this question in a manner either commensurate with its importance, or in connection with circumstances of no small or insignificant nature which should exercise an influence over our votes. Many of them have occurred since its introduction into the House. In proportion as I agree with that hon. Member, so do I emphatically disagree with the appeal to shelve such a question which has been made from the Treasury Bench. This question, as it now comes before us, has never been discussed. It is a very few days since I had reason to complain that, as far as the counties were concerned, no attempt has been made to decrease or limit county expense, and the same question re-occurs in this case. Now I am not going to vote with the hon. Member who has proposed this. The question has been rendered very complicated by the conduct of hon. Members on that side of the House. It cannot be permitted to extend to out-county voters, because you would not sanction the use of voting papers on their behalf, and I will not consent to disfranchisement, which, under the proposed clause, would take place. Nor can it extend to Ireland in consequence of the bad vote you gave the other night, in forbidding the clause concerning polling-places to pass. Some Amendments will be necessary to meet this. But as regards the voters within the limits of counties, I shall, if so amended, offer no opposition myself. In this instance, what we have to consider is this — Will our present provision for additional polling-places meet this case? Locality will have much to do with this; for instance, in my own county, where there are many small market towns, I think that no voter need live more than four or five miles from a polling-place. But this may not always be the case, and I must say that I shall defer my judgment until I hear what other Members have to say to this. This Bill should lead to disfranchisement of no sort. I agree with the hon. Member who has said that no party tricks should be played about this Bill at least. Our one object should be the free exercise of the vote, and the generous usage of a generous gift. No doubt there is the question of expense, and a very grave question, depend upon it, it will be to many of us. But to this we must be careful, at least not to sacrifice the right of the elector to the exercise of his vote. For that reason I shall vote against this clause.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, they were then discussing the principle of the clause, and they could discuss modifications in it afterwards. He, too, saw no force in the appeal of the Solicitor General; but he admitted the question was not a large one. The reasons for and against lay in a nutshell, and the House, therefore, might come to an immediate decision upon it.

VISCOUNT GALWAY said, he had not the slightest personal interest in the question one way or the other; but he must hold that the matter had been fully discussed, and he believed that all the difficulties of the case would be met by the appointment of a sufficient number of polling-places. He thought it would be better not to re-open the question, and for that reason he should vote against the clause.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the real question was whether hon. Gentlemen wished to pass the Bill this Session or not. The hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) had said there was not much to discuss with regard to this clause. His own experience was entirely opposed to this. A Bill had been brought in on the subject some time ago by the ex-Solicitor General, and had been largely discussed. He himself could speak for hours on the question, and he was certain it could not be disposed of without very considerable debate. If all the questions that were settled last year were now to be re-opened again, the House might as well make up its mind at once to put the Bill aside for the present Session.

MR. OSBORNE said, he could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer that those questions were settled last year; on the contrary, they were entirely unsettled. At the same time he thought that if they were now to go into all the clauses they would peril the Bill, and he would give the Government his support in carrying the Bill, even though he perilled these clauses. The Government deserved great credit for having pressed this Bill forward, and therefore he would support them in carrying it.

MR. FAWCETT said, the Government had answered their own question as to giving facilities to the passing of the Bill when they gave Notice that they intended to reverse the decision which the House came to on this clause on Saturday. Did they think they would facilitate the passing of the Bill by trying to rescind a decision already made? If the Government claimed consideration from private Members, then private Members had some right to claim consideration from the Government.

MR. DISRAELI said, he could assure the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) that no decision had been arrived at by the Government inconsistent with a sincere desire to pass the Bill this Session.

Without entering into the question referred to, as it was not before the House, he assured hon. Gentlemen opposite that, however uncharitably they might view his conduct respecting it, he had acted with mature deliberation, and in the belief that if he had not taken the course he had, the safety of the Bill would be imperilled. At the proper time they would undoubtedly exonerate him from any suspicion of surprise. He regretted that this Bill, which had dealt with a distinct and difficult subject, should be hampered by a number of irrelevant propositions, of great importance no doubt in themselves, but which, joined to the measure, were calculated to render its passage most hazardous. He therefore trusted the House, without allowing its votes to be construed into a rejection of the principle of the clauses that might be offered for its consideration, would vote against them simply as an expression of its determination to carry a Bill for the prevention of corrupt practices.

Mr. AYRTON said, he would suggest that if the pairing off of voters could be accepted as a legal practice, the clause would be a most desirable one, because it would end in the outlying voters pairing to a great extent with each other.

Sir FREDERICK HEYGATE said, the clause would practically prevent a large number of Irish voters from polling. He knew of an instance in which electors would have to travel some twenty or thirty miles over a mountain to register their votes.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 82; Noes 124: Majority 42.

Mr. W. B. BEAUMONT said, that after the decision which had just been come to, he believed he should best consult the convenience of the House if he withdrew the Notice he had placed on the Paper to move a clause prohibiting the conveyance of voters in the same county. It was clear the House did not desire to decide the question of the conveyance of voters in this Bill; but he understood no opinion to have been expressed on the merits of the case.

Mr. AYRTON said, in the absence of Sir Thomas Lloyd, he would move the adoption of a clause prohibiting the use, for election purposes, of premises licenced for the sale of drinks.

Mr. Disraeli

Clause (Prohibiting the use for election purposes of premises licensed for sale of drinks,)—(*Sir Thomas Lloyd,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Mr. DISRAELI said, that the House had declined to endorse the principle of the clause after a long discussion last year, when the hon. Baronet (Sir Thomas Lloyd) himself introduced the subject. The same objection applied to re-opening it which applied to the last clause; and he did not think the proposal would be a very popular one in the present state of the atmosphere.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE, in supporting the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, observed that he had himself placed a clause on the Paper identical with it, except in limiting the prohibition to cities and boroughs. He had done this from having observed that his hon. Friend the Member for Cardiganshire had left London, and not being aware that he had entrusted his clause to the hon. Member. He had made the alteration in the hope of more readily inducing the House to adopt the proposal; as the risk of ill results in counties was certainly less, while the inconvenience, if any, might be greater. For his own part, he would be glad to see the clause pass in either form. The Prime Minister had appealed to the decision of the Committee, having been adverse to the suggestion on the preceding year. But he had forgotten that, upon the hon. Baronet the Member for Cardiganshire first bringing it forward, it was virtually adopted by general consent in a Committee which had fully canvassed it. But unluckily the debate dragged on, and it was finally rejected later in the evening by the Members who came down about ten o'clock, who had heard nothing and cared as little for the question. The objections to the plan were summed up in the material inconvenience which it might at first occasion. No one denied that some inconvenience might result; but this was as nothing compared with the benefits which would accrue. Parliament was on its trial at the bar of public opinion; and unless some such drastic remedy as this were applied to the disease of electoral corruption, the verdict of guilty would be recorded. Every one who had had to do with a borough election, and who did not palter with his own conscience, must confess to the utter corruption connected with committees held at public-houses. There were committees of electors and committees of non-electors; and he could testify from experience that sometimes the committees of the rival candidates sat on the right hand and the left of the same public-house. It was absurd to talk of business being transacted at these places. Their object was to bribe the publican by the beer which he sold, and the electors by the beer which they drank, and to give the non-electors pot-valour to terrorize the constituencies. It was bribery of a worse kind than money payments, for those, at least, might help in the support of the voter's wife and children, while bribery by beer only turned him into a profligate sot.

MR. CLAY said, that though there were objections to the use of public-houses, he must vote against the clause. If it were passed, it would prevent him from addressing the electors of Hull from the window of one of the principal hotels in the market-place. He feared the clause would deprive many a candidate of power to use the only assembly-room in his borough. He had been in the habit of using the same hotel at his elections for thirty years, where he was to be seen every day; and if he left it his friends would scarcely believe that he was a candidate.

SIR RAINALD KNIGHTLEY said, there was no difficulty either in counties or boroughs in obtaining suitable rooms in private houses; and he hoped Parliament would put down this great source of expense and corruption.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he was in favour of reducing the expenses of elections, and therefore he should vote against the clause, because his experience was that the candidate could very often obtain rooms cheaper in a public-house than elsewhere. Why was it to be supposed that when rooms were engaged in such a place it was merely intended to bribe the landlord or his customers? Some hon. Members seemed to think that licenced victuallers were worse than any other class of electors; against that assumption he begged to protest.

MR. POWELL said, there were many towns—and the town he represented was one of them—where, if this clause were carried, it would be impossible to address the electors except in the open air, as there was no room in the town—with the exception of the Town Hall—where a meeting could be held, except in public-houses.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he was surprised that Liberal Members should advocate the use of beer-houses and beer-shops. There must be something behind which he could not understand. It was not only that they paid for the room, but for the treatment of people who came there—it was a complete system of bribery and corruption.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL asked, whether it was seriously intended that a candidate who innocently hired a room in an hotel was to have his election made void, and that he was to be disqualified from sitting in Parliament for seven years? An agent might, without the knowledge of the candidate, rent a room in a public-house.

MR. MELLY said, that as he had been in a manner appealed to by the hon. Member for Cambridge University, he might be allowed to say a few words. In a certain election in 1865 the advertised election expenditure of the two candidates amounted to £2,469 1*s*. 3*d*. ["Where?"] Now, was that fair? At any rate, let them wait to the end. He and his opponent polled on that occasion about 93 per cent of the constituency. At a subsequent election, in consequence of an understanding that he and his opponent came to on the subject of public-houses, the advertised election expenses of both candidates came to £109, and they polled only 1 per cent less of the constituency than they did before. They lived at hotels, but they did not use them as committee rooms. He therefore supported this clause, and he hoped the House would pass it unanimously, as that would have a great moral effect upon the country.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that as this clause was worded, if a candidate stayed at an hotel, and his agent visited him at breakfast and wrote a letter in his room on election business, the candidate would be guilty of corrupt practices.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that all the House was required to do was to vote on the principle of the clause; it could be easily amended afterwards so as to meet the objections of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he would recommend the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Melly) to repeat the arrangement he had described, and be independent of the clause. It seemed as if hon. Gentlemen wished to be saved the trouble of exercising moral courage, and, indeed, wanted to be made moral by Act of Parliament. He (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) did not believe in such a process.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The House *divided:* — Ayes 70; Noes 130: Majority 60.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, that after the division which had taken place he should not move his clause prohibiting the use for election purposes in cities and boroughs of premises licensed for the sale of drinks.

Mr. J. STUART MILL moved the following clause:—

"At the trial of an Election Petition under this Act the judge shall have power to receive evidence of corrupt practices which any elector who shall have voted at the Parliamentary Election to which the Petition refers may have committed at any Municipal Election within the same county or borough within two years before the presentation of the Petition, with the object of proving that the voter was corruptly influenced in voting at the said Parliamentary Election; and any special Commission appointed to inquire into the existence of corrupt practices shall have power to inquire into corrupt practices at Municipal Elections to the same extent and in the same manner as into corrupt practices at Parliamentary Elections."

As he had expressed his sentiments on the subject of the clause on a former occasion he would not again trouble the House with any observations upon it.

Clause (Corrupt practices at previous Municipal Elections may be inquired into,) —(*Mr. Mill,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he must oppose the clause for the same reason as he opposed it the other day—that this was not the time nor the occasion for dealing with the corruption at municipal Elections. If a voter was bribed at a municipal Election, on the understanding that that bribe should secure his vote at the next Parliamentary Election also, that was sufficient to constitute bribery at the Parliamentary Election; and by this Bill the Judge would have power to inquire into it without the clause proposed by the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill). But if the bribery at the municipal Election was independent bribery, which did not lead up to the Parliamentary Election, then it was a separate matter, and should be dealt with by a separate Bill.

Question, "That the said Clause be now read a second time," put, and *negatived.*

Mr. Gathorne Hardy

Mr. J. STUART MILL: Sir, I rise to move a clause declaring illegal the employment of paid canvassers, or paid agents other than the one appointed under the Corrupt Practices Prevention Act. The clause is directed against the greatest of all the sources of undue expense at elections, especially in counties and large towns. It is well-known that when a candidate presents himself to a large constituency, determined to carry all before him by dint of money, a great part of his outlay consists in hiring canvassers, and they are hired by hundreds, very often without any real intention that they should canvass, and many of them never do canvass. Up to last year, under pretence of payment for canvassing, any number of electors might, without any breach of law, be paid for their votes. A clause, however, in the Reform Act, which the country is indebted to an hon. Member near me for proposing, and to the Government for accepting, has struck a blow at this mode of bribery, by enacting that no one in the actual pay of a candidate shall be allowed to vote. Hereafter, therefore, a man can no longer be paid in this manner for his own vote. But he can still be paid for the vote of his father, or his brother, or his wife's father or brother; and, besides, there is such a thing as collective bribery — bribery of a whole constituency, by spending money freely in the place. Every petty tradesman in the town is virtually bribed by a man who flings money about lavishly on all sides, most of which comes back almost immediately to be spent at their shops. All expenditure by which electors profit is a kind of bribery; and, though it may not be feasible to put a stop to all forms of it, still, if there be a form which answers no useful purpose whatever — unless confining the representation to millionaires be a useful purpose — this at least ought surely to be put a stop to. Now, what useful purpose, at this time of day, is promoted by personal canvassing? A seat in this House ought no more to be obtained by private solicitation than by money payment. The use of canvassing, when there was a use, was to make the candidate and his pretensions known to the constituency; but this is now done by addressing them in a body, through the Press or at public meetings. It is from the candidate's public addresses, or from the newspapers, that the electors even now learn all that they ever do learn about the candidate; they do not want canvassers to tell them. If there is to be canvassing, it ought to be done by volunteers. Everybody who has any business to be a candidate has a sufficient number of zealous supporters to do all the canvassing that can be needful. Acquaintances may talk to acquaintances, and neighbours to neighbours, and win them over by persuasion and moral influence; but what moral influence has a man who is paid for his persuasiveness? And what would the electors lose if they could only be talked to by somebody who believes what he says, and cares enough about it to say it gratis?

Clause—

(Employment of paid canvassers or of paid agents other than the one appointed under the Corrupt Practices Prevention Act to be illegal.)

"It shall not be lawful for any candidate, or for anyone in his behalf, to pay any money or equivalent for money in consideration of services rendered or to be rendered in canvassing the electors or in soliciting votes at any Election, or to employ any barrister, solicitor or attorney, agent or sub-agent, clerk, or other person who may be paid, or to be paid, by or in behalf of the candidate for other purposes connected with the Election, in canvassing electors or soliciting votes; and any candidate or other person making payment for canvassing electors or soliciting votes, or employing for such purposes any person paid or to be paid by or in behalf of the candidate for other purposes connected with the Election shall be guilty of bribery within the meaning of the second Clause of 'The Corrupt Practices Act, 1854;' and any person receiving payment for such purposes, and any person paid or to be paid for other purposes connected with the Election, who shall canvass electors or solicit votes, shall be guilty of bribery within the meaning of the third Clause of the said Act."—(*Mr. Mill,*)

—*brought up,* and read the first time.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that the colourable employment of persons as canvassers who were not intended to canvass was bribery according to the existing law. This clause was therefore not necessary to prevent the abuse of canvassing. But did the hon. Member think it would be right to prohibit the payment of a man as canvasser who, not being an elector, gave up his time for the candidate? A subsequent branch of the hon. Member's proposal referred to the appointment of barristers, but he should hope that barristers did not act as canvassers. The clause would be unduly and unjustly severe in its operation, for if any paid canvassers were employed on behalf of a candidate at an election, even if they were not electors, that would void the candidate's election, and render him incapable of sitting in Parliament for seven years. This was a proposal to declare that what was really innocent should be considered a guilty act. The House ought not to make corruption of what was not corruption.

MR. NEATE said, he would support the clause; it was one of the worst practices at elections.

MR. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he had done as much canvassing as any Member of the House, and he believed the whole system of canvassing was one of the worst that ever existed, as it was intended by this result, that the man who chose to sacrifice his time or money to this mode of making himself known to a constituency had a chance which on other grounds he might have no title to whatever. The hon. Member for Westminster had told them that the proper mode of canvassing now was through public meetings or the public Press, and that mode had this plain advantage in favour of honesty, that under it a man could not talk double. Anyone who was at all acquainted with a large constituency knew what opportunities were afforded at every corner, under the canvassing system, for a candidate to suit his sentiments to the colour of the man he was talking to, and thus to acquire popularity under false pretences. He thought the penalties under the clause were disproportionate to the offence, and he hoped, therefore, that his hon. Friend would agree to amend that part of the clause which related to the penalty. He did not think that the imposition of high penalties was the surest mode of putting a stop to the evil. He should very gladly vote for the clause of his hon. Friend.

MR. CHILDERS said, the hon. Gentleman who had last spoken seemed to be under the impression that the proposal before the House was to make speeches serve the purpose at present served by canvassing. But that was not so. The clause only sought to prevent the employment of paid canvassers. Any candidate would be allowed to canvass for himself; but the question was whether he should or should not be prevented from employing for money other people to canvass for him. He believed that the real evil to be aimed at was the employment of solicitors in the borough or county, who were mixed up with the affairs of a large number of voters, and who consequently exercised an influence over these voters, thereby indirectly producing all the evil results of bribery. If it were possible so to frame the clause as to aim distinctly at that evil he should be happy to support the proposal, but as the clause stood at present it aimed at a totally distinct matter, and he saw considerable difficulty in giving it his support.

Mr. OSBORNE said, he had supported the Government in their efforts to pass this Bill, and should continue to do so; but he must give his support to this clause. He did not think the hon. Member, who represented the small borough of Pontefract (Mr. Childers), had had much experience in the matter. He (Mr. Osborne) had had the fortune to canvass very large boroughs, but he had never employed a paid canvasser in his life, although he had been opposed to wealthy pigeons who had been considerably plucked by that item in their accounts. If the House wished to strike at the root of corrupt practices they must support the clause of the hon. Member for Westminster. He knew of an instance in which an opponent of his employed 150 paid canvassers at 5*s.* each a day. He believed that the total of the bill for those canvassers amounted to exactly the sum for which he himself was returned at the election to which he referred. In Ireland barristers were paid for speaking at elections—not Q.C.'s, but aspiring barristers, and he believed that even on this side of the Channel rising barristers of seven years' standing would willingly give their services at elections without any sense of that virtuous innocence displayed by the Solicitor General. If they desired to strike at bribery altogether they must strike at paid canvassing.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he would support the second reading of the clause, but he thought it would require to be amended by making the penalty less severe.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The House *divided:* — Ayes 86; Noes 116: Majority 30.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, it would be useless, after the division which had just been taken, for him to move the next clause of which he had given Notice, which was a supplement to the one just rejected.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he would appeal to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Middlesex (Mr. Labouchere) not to take up the time of the House by moving the clause of which he had given

Notice, for providing additional polling-places in counties.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, that as the Ministry had an official majority in the House by which they could overthrow any clause they opposed, he should not move his clause.

Mr. AYRTON moved the insertion of the following clause, providing for the appointment of attornies of the House of Commons:—

> "The Speaker f the House of Commons shall from time to time appoint such number of attornies of the Court of Common Pleas as he may judge necessary to the office of attorney of the House of Commons, at the pleasure of the Speaker."

The present Bill proposed to repeal a very important statute, which directed that if any Election Petition should be improperly compromised and withdrawn, and a Committee should be appointed to pursue an investigation into the circumstances of that Election, then Mr. Speaker should be at liberty to appoint an agent to prosecute the matter before a Committee of the House, and the expense incurred by the act of Mr. Speaker should be re-imbursed to him out of the Consolidated Fund. That Act had not been very often acted upon; but having regard to the manner in which election cases were in future to be tried, he thought the power of appointing attornies of the House of Commons might in some instances prove exceedingly useful. When the Divorce Court was first established, grave doubts were expressed as to whether petitioners and respondents would not be able to compromise actions and to carry out ulterior designs of their own without the knowledge of the Court, and it soon came to light that that was so, and that petitioners and respondents in total violation of all the provisions of the Act, did obtain divorces to which they could have no possible right; and it was then found that the only effectual mode of preventing that was to give power to a solicitor, who should be at liberty to ascertain all that might be suggested from without, to investigate suggestions, to watch the trials in Court, and if he found any disposition to suppress important matters, to bring them before the Court, in order that the Judge might pronounce justly upon the whole matter. In that way many abuses were prevented. In the present Bill they were endeavouring to prevent the improper withdrawal and compromising of Election Petitions; but he did not think it would be effective as it stood, for it would be impossible to detect the contrivances that might be resorted to by the Petitioner and the sitting Member to compromise the Petition at almost every stage of the proceedings. There was only one way of preventing such things, and that was by following the example set by the Divorce Court. They should appoint an officer who could receive unofficial communications, and on whom would be cast the responsibility of verifying the truth of such communications, and taking them up if he thought proper, as instructions to appear in the case. They had a right to assume that such an officer would discharge his duties properly, and not intervene, unless he had adequate ground for believing it was necessary he should do so. Such an officer would be appointed as under the old statute by the Speaker; but instead of being merely an agent he would be an attorney, though not, as stated in the Notice, of the Queen's Bench, but of the Common Pleas.

Clause—

(Appointment of attornies of the House of Commons.)

"The Speaker of the House of Commons shall from time to time appoint such number of attornies of the Court of Common Pleas as he may judge necessary to the office of attorney of the House of Commons, at the pleasure of the Speaker."—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)

—*brought up,* and read the first time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he could not think that the hon. Member gave a correct account of the present Bill when he said that it would be ineffective in preventing the improper withdrawal or compromise of Election Petitions. An endeavour at all events had been already made to secure the object which the hon. Member aimed at. The 34th clause provided that no Petition should be withdrawn without leave of the Court and without Notice of the intended withdrawal being given in the county or borough to which the Petition referred. In the event of the Judge coming to the conclusion that the Petition was about to be improperly compromised, he could order a new Petition to be substituted for one originally named, and at the same time the security given by the latter would remain as security for costs incurred by the substituted Petitioner. Then at the trial, if the Judge thought facts were being withheld, he could, independently of the parties in the Petition, call any witness he pleased and examine him. This clause had been introduced into the Bill for the express purpose of preventing collusion. The only objection he had to the clause now proposed was that the Petitioners and the respondents would be frequently put to great and needless expense in the event of the attorney of the House of Commons intervening between them. They might have to stand by while that officer, his inclination and duty prompting him, was endeavouring to prove corrupt practices, in which endeavour he might fail. On the whole, he thought it would be better to try the Bill as it stood, for if experience showed it did not work well, a short Bill could be easily passed to amend it in a way similar to that now suggested by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, that the only fault which he found with the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) was, that it did not go far enough. His (Mr. Stuart Mill's) opinion was, that if they desired to put an end to corrupt practices they must provide a public prosecutor, and not rely upon the private interest of candidates and their supporters for proceeding against suspected individuals. They would never get rid of corrupt practices, unless they made it the duty of some particular person to inquire, not into compromises only, but into all matters connected with corrupt practices, and to institute prosecutions where evidences of corruption were found to exist. The proposed clause, however, was a good one as far as it went, and he should therefore give it his support. He hoped the Government would accept the clause.

Mr. THOMAS HUGHES said, he also hoped the Ministry would not reject the clause. Judging from the brief statement of the Solicitor General, the Government seemed to be perfectly at one with the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) with regard to the desirability of accomplishing the object desired by the hon. Member. He trusted therefore that the Government would show its sincerity by accepting the proposal. Everyone conversant with the practice of our Courts knew that, without some such officer as was proposed by his hon. Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets, it would be impossible for the Court to form any opinion as to whether there had been a collusive arrangement or not.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The House *divided* :—Ayes 102; Noes 110: Majority 8.

Mr. BONHAM-CARTER then moved the following clause :—

(Declaration by candidates.)

"The returning officer shall, in case of a contested Election for any county, city, or borough, require, at the time of nomination, every candidate to make, immediately after the nomination of the candidates, the following declaration :—

"I solemnly and sincerely declare that I will not, directly or indirectly, by myself or others, knowingly commit, sanction, or permit on my behalf at the ensuing Election any act of bribery, treating, or undue influence, or other breach of the Corrupt Practices Act (17 and 18 Vic. c. 102), and that I will not pay or otherwise discharge, except in the manner and through the persons provided by the said Act, any expenses of or connected with such Election, and that I will use my utmost endeavours to promote the observance of all the provisions of the said Act."

Clause (Declaration by candidates,)—(*Mr. Bonham-Carter,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Mr. DISRAELI said, that when the House was in Committee upon the Bill it had considered the subject of personal declarations, and had decided against adopting them. The declaration now proposed did not essentially differ from the one which the House pronounced against on a former occasion; and, in his opinion, it would be a mere waste of valuable time to re-open the controversy.

Motion made, and Question, "That the said Clause be now read a second time," put, and *negatived.*

Mr. POWELL moved a new clause—

(Treatment of Petition after presentation.)

"On presentation of the Petition the prescribed officer shall send a copy thereof to the returning officer of the county or borough to which the Petition relates, who shall forthwith publish the same in the county or borough as the case may be."

Clause *added.*

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, he rose to move the following clause :—

(Provision for expenses of trials and inquiries.)

"The expenses of all trials or inquiries held under the present Act, except such expenses as are hereinbefore provided for, and except such part as the court or judge shall impose by way of penalty upon either the Petitioner or the Respondent, shall be defrayed in the case of any county from the county rate, and in the case of any borough, out of the monies, and in the manner and proportions mentioned in the Act of the sixth year of the reign of Victoria, chapter eight, section fifty-five, with respect to the expenses of carrying into effect the provisions of that Act; and the account of such expenses shall be made, allowed, and paid in the manner provided in the said Act, unless the court or judge shall certify that there is reason to believe that corrupt practices do not generally or extensively prevail in the constituency, in which case the said expenses shall be charged upon the Consolidated Fund."

He desired to carry into effect what he considered was a true and sound principle—namely, to throw the expenses of all inquiries into corrupt practices upon the community who were implicated. He left to the tribunal to determine what portion of these expenses should in any case be laid, to the relief of the ratepayers, upon the persons who had been proved to be guilty of corrupt practices, or upon those who were shown to have brought frivolous and improper accusations.

Clause (Provision for expenses of trials and inquiries,)—(*Mr. Mill,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he would oppose this clause, having opposed one founded upon precisely the same principles which had been moved by the hon. Member at a previous stage. The proposal of the hon. Member was not a fair one, and he hoped the House would not adopt it. The ratepayers ought not to be called upon to pay the costs of a trial to which they were not parties. The costs should fall on the defeated party, as in the case of a law suit. The constituency might be entirely innocent, and therefore it would be unjust to put the expenses of these inquiries on them.

Mr. ROEBUCK said, he hoped that the Attorney General, who had, he thought, somewhat misunderstood the object of the clause, would re-consider his determination, and allow the clause to pass. He (Mr. Roebuck) thought it a curious fallacy to compare this, which was a public matter, with a private law suit. It was the interest of the constituency that the proper man should be returned.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he hoped the hon. Member for Westminster would divide the House on his clause.

Mr. BOUVERIE said, he had great objection to the clause in a practical point of view, because it would allow Petitioners to dip their hands into the public purse. That was a principle which it would be dangerous to sanction. If the clause passed, Petitions would inevitably be presented from every borough in England, Ireland, and Scotland.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he altogether differed from the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie). An inquiry of this kind was always a different thing from a private law suit, and the expenses of it ought, in his opinion, to be defrayed by the public. According to this clause the ratepayers might have to pay the expenses, and he thought the ratepayers would never get up a Petition simply in order that they might have the pleasure of paying the expenses of it. He might remark that when a constituency happened to get a good Member they ought to be proud of him, and do all they could to keep him.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 49; Noes 146: Majority 97.

MR. POWELL said, he should not move the clause of which he had given Notice (This Act to apply to municipal Elections), but he hoped the question to which it referred would be dealt with before long.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he rose to move that no new Judge be appointed under the Bill until the number of Election Petitions presented to the Court of Common Pleas be ascertained. The chief ground on which he moved this clause was, that if these new Judges were at once appointed, they would draw salaries four or five months before their services were required under the Bill.

Clause (That no new judge be appointed under the said Bill until the number of Election Petitions presented to the Court of Common Pleas be ascertained,)—(*Mr. Serjeant Gaselee,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

MR. DISRAELI said, the clause was precisely similar to one which had been moved by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), and respecting which he (Mr. Disraeli) pointed out at the time that it struck at the root of the Bill, and the Committee unanimously rejected it.

Motion made, and Question, "That the said Clause be now read a second time," put, and *negatived.*

MR. SCHREIBER said, he rose to move a clause providing that municipal Elections appointed by law to take place in November, should be postponed for one month in order that the intention of the House might not be frustrated. He feared that if the municipal Elections were allowed to be held before the Elections for Members of Parliament, bribery would be rife in connection with the former, as it was well known the municipal often decided the Parliamentary Election. Without his clause the Bill would be futile, because while the briber would abstain from bribery punishable under the Act, he would be most industrious in connection with the municipal Elections, where bribery might be practised with impunity.

Clause (Postponement of Election of municipal and local officers for the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty eight,)—(*Mr. Schreiber,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he could not accede to the proposition. While admitting that there was much force in what was said as to municipal corruption, he did not think it would be fair or reasonable to stop all municipal Elections in November on the ground that in some boroughs they might lead to bribery at the General Election. If the clause was agreed to the mayors throughout England would have to alter all the arrangements they had made for the municipal elections in November.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he could conceive nothing more stultifying than for the House, after having passed stringent measures for putting down corruption at Parliamentary elections, to allow perfect freedom of corruption in the case of municipal Elections. There could be no greater facility given to bribery at the Parliamentary Elections than to have the municipal Elections taking place just before them.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 75; Noes 100: Majority 25.

MR. DISRAELI: Sir, as it is now time to postpone the consideration of the Report, I propose that we have a Morning Sitting to-morrow, at two, for the purpose of proceeding with this Bill. Considering what was on the Paper we could hardly have flattered ourselves that we should dispose of the Report to-day, and I am bound to express my thanks to both sides of the

House for the diligent manner in which hon. Gentlemen have pressed on with the Business. I am still further reconciled to an adjournment because it will remove any misunderstanding about the absence of Notice of the Solicitor General's Motion. In case we do not exhaust the Morning Sitting by considering the Bill some measures promoted by the Board of Trade will be taken, and at nine o'clock we propose to take the Cattle Bill.

Further Consideration *deferred* till *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS BILL.

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

[BILL 239.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. SAMUDA, in behalf of Mr. Leeman, moved to substitute "fifty" pounds for "seventy-five pounds" as compensation to telegraph clerks.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER assented.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

And it being Six of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House till To-morrow, without putting the Question.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 23, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Electric Telegraphs * (282); Expiring Laws Continuance * (280); Inland Revenue * (279); Registration (Ireland) * (281); Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London, * (278).

Second Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3) * (255).

Committee—Public Schools (262-285); Colonial Shipping * (274); Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) * (268); General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment * (267).

Report—Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment * (252); Municipal Elections (Scotland) * (276); Larceny and Embezzlement * (277); Turnpike Acts Continuance * (253); Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) * (268); General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment * (267).

Third Reading—Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * (226); Vaccination (Ireland) * (254); Courts of Chancery and Exchequer (Ireland) Fee Funds * (171); Court of Session (Scotland) * (246); Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment * (256); Public Departments Payments * (264); Sir Robert Napier's Annuity * (265); Tain Provisional Order Confirmation * (242); Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation * (241); New Zealand Assembly's Powers * (247); Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland) * (261); Militia Pay *; New Zealand Company * (154), and *passed.*

PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILL—(No. 262.)

(*The Earl of Derby.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 to 4, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 *postponed.*

Clause 6 (Power of Governing Bodies to alter their Constitutions).

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE said, the time given by the clause to the Governing Bodies of Schools in which to reform themselves—namely, till the 1st of January next—was insufficient for the purpose. He was desirous of extending the period by another whole year, unless their Lordships thought a more limited extension would be preferable, and he would therefore propose to insert 1870 instead of 1869.

EARL STANHOPE said, that when the second reading of the Bill was discussed there was a general feeling that the period expiring on the 1st of January next, as fixed by the Bill was not sufficient. On the other hand, he submitted that it would be unduly prolonging it to substitute the 1st of January, 1870, for the 1st of January, 1869, as suggested by the noble Viscount. An extension of three or at most six months would, he thought, fully meet all the requirements of the case.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH concurred with his noble Friends in thinking the period fixed by the clause somewhat too limited. At the same time, it should be remembered that the purpose for which the Governing Bodies were to be called together was not one that would necessarily require long deliberation. They were not to frame statutes, but simply to propose a reform in the constitution of their own bodies. He suggested, therefore, that the 1st of May, 1869, should be inserted instead of the 1st of January, 1869; also retaining power to the Queen in Council to allow an additional three months, if that should be deemed necessary.

Clause amended by inserting the words "the First Day of May" instead of "the First Day of January."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 7 to 12, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (General Power to make Regulations).

Lord LYTTELTON moved an Amendment to leave out ("and with respect to the System of Promotion in the School").

On Question, That the said Words stand Part of the Clause? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 15; Not-Contents 36: Majority 21.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Amendment made.

CONTENTS.

Brooke and Warwick, E.
Chichester, E.
Nelson, E. [*Teller.*]
Stanhope, E. [*Teller.*]
Stradbroke, E.
Verulam, E.

Bolingbroke and St. John, V.

Hawarden, V.
Melville, V.

Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Denman, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Hylton, L.
Sondes, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Exeter, M.
Normanby, M.

Airlie, E.
Beauchamp, E.
De Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Devon, E.
Fortescue, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Granville, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Malmesbury, E.

De Vesci, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.

Sydney, V.

Churston, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Harris, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Houghton, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Northwick, L.
Overstone, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Stratheden, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)

Lord LYTTELTON then proposed to insert after "Boys" the words "not being boarders," with the view of restricting the operation of the Conscience Clause to day scholars. While agreeing that the parents of day scholars should be at liberty to withdraw their sons from the religious instruction of the school, he contended that it would be unfair to place a Master under this restriction with regard to his boarders, towards whom he stood *in loco parentis* for nine months of the year.

Lord HOUGHTON said, that in these schools the day scholars were so few that a Conscience Clause confined to them would be of no practical importance. He fully appreciated the value of common religious instruction and worship; but he had heard great regret expressed by Roman Catholic noblemen and gentlemen that they were unable to send their sons to our great public schools, because they would there be compelled to receive religious instruction of which their parents disapproved, and he thought a common education, irrespective of religious opinions, was so desirable that on this ground he must oppose the Amendment. He did not suppose that a large number of Protestant Dissenters would attend these schools.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, he must oppose the Amendment. He thought the object of his noble Friend might be attained without the proposed exception, which might seriously interfere with the number of boys at Eton and the other schools not in the metropolis. The object of his noble Friend, as he understood it, was not to interfere with liberty of conscience in regard to the general teaching of the school, but to remove any difficulties with respect to domestic arrangements in the houses of the Masters. Now, it was perfectly competent for a Master to make any regulations he pleased with regard to the religious instruction of those under his own roof, and he might very properly make it a condition with the parents that their sons should conform to the religious instruction given them.

Amendment (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Another Amendment made.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Lord LYTTELTON moved to insert after Clause 13 the following clause:—

> "All matters relating to the Studies, Discipline, and Administration of any School to which this Act applies, except such as are 'otherwise assigned in this Act, shall be left to the uncontrolled Discretion and Power of the Head Master.'"

There were two authorities, the Governing Body and the Head Master, and it was impossible to make an accurate limitation of what their powers should respectively be. When they had defined as far as possible the respective powers of the two authorities they must leave in the one hand or the other a general power. The Commissioners recommended that the Governing Body should be authorized to make arrangements for the general regulation and management of the School, except in matters specially reserved for the Head Master. Now there was no such reservation in the Bill. His belief was that it would be better to leave the large and important class of subjects embraced in the clause to the discretion of the Head Master, over whom the Governing Body would have sufficient control, seeing that they had in their hands the power both of appointing and dismissing him.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he could not accept the proposition of the noble Lord. What was proposed to do was this—to take away from the Governing Body and vest in a person who was their servant the power as to all matters relating to studies, discipline, and administration. That was inverting the natural order of things and making the Head Master the Governing Body.

Earl FORTESCUE said, the noble and learned Lord seemed to forget that the Governing Body had the absolute and uncontrolled power of dismissing the Head Master, which would be quite sufficient security that the Head Master would exercise the power proposed to be vested in him by the clause in a proper manner.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the reason advanced in support of the clause was the very strongest that could be urged against it. The proposition was to give the Head Master powers which the Governing Body could not control unless they dismissed the Head Master, who might be a very excellent Master in other respects, and whom the Governing Body might be very unwilling to dismiss.

Lord LYTTELTON said, that according to the fifth general recommendation of the Public School Commissioners the Head Master should have the uncontrolled power of making arrangements for the School, regulating the hours of school work, the holidays, maintaining discipline, and other such matters. If it was not the intention of the Government to give effect to that recommendation, he pressed them to say whether they would not admit the principle of reserving certain important powers to the Head Master.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, the Head Master was vested with the power of selecting and dismissing the Under Masters, and the Governing Body had given to them by the Bill the power of making regulations with regard to certain specified subjects upon which they were in the habit of consulting the Head Master, and giving him a full opportunity of expressing his views. To increase the power of the Master would be to reduce that of the Governing Body. It seemed to be mistakenly supposed that the Governing Body had an authority co-existent with that of the Head Master; but the Governing Body met, perhaps, only twice a year. It was a legislative body which made general regulations, and could not interfere in minute particulars. The whole executive power must necessarily be left to the Head Master. The effect of the proposed Amendment would be to define the provinces within which the Master would retain the executive power; but the inevitable consequence would be the clashing of the authority of the Head Master with that of the Governing Body, when the former found that he had statutory power to do certain things which were not specified and defined, but were merely implied in words of vague and general meaning.

Earl DE GREY and RIPON understood it to be alleged, on the one hand, that the Governing Body had all the powers of government which were vested in the Head Master; and, on the other hand, that the powers of the Governing Body were limited to those defined by the clause. There were many points not alluded to in the clause; and it appeared to be desirable that there should be a clear understanding—that it should be laid down who was to have the power in certain matters, and that it should be stated whether what was not reserved to the Governing Body was given to the Head Master. He thought that the Government should endeavour to bring up on the Report some clauses which should give certain defined powers to the Head Master in conformity with the recommendations of the Commissioners.

The LORD CHANCELLOR thought some misapprehension had arisen from the fact that the 13th clause specified, under ten different heads, the provinces in which the power of making regulations was reserved to the Governing Body; but it would have been wholly unnecessary to have given them those powers if there had been a *tabula rasa* before. The clause was obviously introduced because it might turn out that the existing statutes, charters of foundation, or other instruments might contain provisions as to regulations in conflict with the reservation of them to the Governing Body; and therefore it was to be enacted that notwithstanding any Act of Parliament, custom, &c., the Governing Body should have the power of making these regulations. The object was to clear the Governing Body of all antecedent rules as to the exercise of these powers, and therefore they were specified. It was impossible the Governing Body could control the Head Master in the matter of punishments, or the number of lines to be learnt by a scholar, and such minute details; and, unless everything to be done by the Head Master was to be defined, it was impossible to escape the conclusion that every power not given to the Governing Body was to be exercised by the Head Master. The 13th clause was not meant to describe all the powers of the Governing Body; it was meant only to remove particular statutes and instruments of foundation out of the way.

EARL GRANVILLE said, it was a circumstance which ought clearly to weigh with the Government that the Amendment embodied an unanimous recommendation of the Commission, who had all the facts before them.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, he could not undertake to consider what special powers should be left to the Head Master. The subject had been carefully and anxiously considered by the Select Committee. It would produce the greatest possible inconvenience to specify certain particulars which should be under the control and jurisdiction of the Head Master. The inclusion of one thing would be the exclusion of another, and in many respects there might be a clashing of authority between the Head Master and those who were practically his masters. It would be an unheard-of thing to give a statutory power to a servant liable to dismissal. If a clause were prepared and submitted he would consider it; but he could not undertake to do anything more on the part of the Government.

LORD LYTTELTON asked, whether the Government would consider the principle free from details?

LORD OVERSTONE pointed out the extreme importance of maintaining the influence and position of the Head Master of a School, and quoted the anecdote of the Head Master requesting the King to remove his hat in the School, and afterwards stating that he should lose all his influence over the boys if they supposed that the world contained a greater man than himself. The powers of the Head Master should be plenary and complete; and though no doubt some restraining power was necessary on the part of the Governing Body, it should be kept in the background as much as possible. He hoped the Government would take time to consider the reasonable and just views taken on this point by the noble Lord (Lord Lyttelton).

THE EARL OF DEVON said, he could not help concurring with his noble Friend (Lord Lyttelton) that both for the sake of securing the best possible man for Head Master and for the efficient carrying on of the School, it was desirable that some attempt should be made to carry out the recommendations of the Commissioners upon this point.

LORD LYTTELTON said, he was willing to leave the general powers to the Governing Body; but the Bill would work much better if certain things were left in the power of the Head Master. He would endeavour to embody his views in a new clause, and bring it up on the Report.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, the Government could not assent to the proposal to leave the residuum of the powers not mentioned in the Bill to the Head Master. He did not know what would be the definition attempted by the noble Lord; but the Government would not, of course, be pledged to consider it.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Clauses 14 and 15 *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Appointment of Commissioners).

LORD LYTTELTON proposed to add two names to the Commission — that of Canon Blakesley and Sir Roundell Palmer. Mr. Blakesley's name had been omitted from the clause in the House of Commons under a total misapprehension, and he had been treated with extreme injustice and want of consideration. As senior Tutor at Trinity College for some time, his name would have given weight to the Commission, and a great mistake had been committed in leaving out his name. No doubt the gentleman by whom he had been supplanted was able and competent; but he was not nearly so well known as Mr.

Blakesley was. He (Lord Lyttelton) therefore proposed the re-introduction of Mr. Blakesley's name, and could not believe that there would be any difficulty on the part of their Lordships in acceding to the Motion. It was thought advisable that the number of the Commission should be an odd number, and the most rev. Prelate said he had no objection to nine members. At present Cambridge was not adequately represented on the Commission, Oxford having more than two to one members. Moreover, there was at present only one clergyman upon the Commission, and in both these respects it would be well that Canon Blakesley should be added. The other name he should propose to add was that of Sir Roundell Palmer.

Moved to add the Names of Sir Roundell Palmer and the Reverend Joseph William Blakesley to the Commission to be appointed under the Act.—(*The Lord Lyttelton.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR agreed with the noble Lord that Canon Blakesley had not been well treated, and that the Commission was injured by the absence of his name from it. No person in the kingdom could be better fitted to serve upon such a Commission; but, unfortunately, other things had to be considered in this case. It was much to be regretted that in the other House of Parliament the question of the name of one of the Commissioners had been made the subject of personal feeling, and if that discussion were re-opened there would be considerable doubt as to the further progress of the Bill. This was the reason and the only reason why the Government was unable to accede to a proposal which in itself was very reasonable and even desirable. The interest taken by Mr. Blakesley in this subject and his feeling of self-respect would probably lead him to desire that no peril should arise to the Bill and that his name should not be the subject of personal controversy.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 29; Not-Contents 25: Majority 4.

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

Amendment *agreed to.*

CONTENTS.

Normanby, M.
Salisbury, M.

Airlie, E.
De Grey, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Nelson, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Verulam, E.

Lord Lyttelton

Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Sydney, V.

Calthorpe, L.
Churchill, L. [*Teller.*]
Denman, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L.
Harris, L.
Houghton, L.
Lyttelton, L. [*Teller.*]
Lyveden, L.
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Northwick, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Redesdale, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Stratheden, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll*

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Exeter, M.

Brooke and Warwick, E.
Devon, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Malmesbury, E.

De Vesci, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Strathallan, V.
Bagot, L.
Churston, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hylton, L.
Monson, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Sondes, L.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE said, that after the decision which had just been arrived at, the number required to constitute a Quorum ought to be increased. He should move that the number, instead of 3, should be 5.

On Question, That the Word proposed to be left out stand Part of the Clause? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 25; Not-Contents 28: Majority 3.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Amendment *agreed to.*

CONTENTS.

Normanby, M.
Salisbury, M. [*Teller.*]

Airlie, E.
Chichester, E.
De Grey, E.
Granville, E.
Nelson, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Verulam, E.

De Vesci, V.
Sydney, V.
Calthorpe, L.
Lyveden, L.
Monson, L. [*Teller.*]
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Northwick, L.
Overstone, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Stratheden, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Exeter, M. [*Teller.*]

Fortescue, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Leven and Melville, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Strathallan, V.

Bagot, L.
Churston, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Ebury, L.
Foley, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Houghton, L.
Hylton, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Redesdale, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Sondes, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)

Clauses 17 to 26, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 *agreed to.*

Clauses 27, 28, and 29 *agreed to.*

Clause 30 (Extension of Time for Governing Bodies to make Statutes).

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH, in consequence of the time within which the Governing Bodies might amend their constitution having been extended from the 1st of January to the 1st of May next, proposed a verbal Amendment limiting the power of further extending the time by Order in Council to one month instead of three months.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Further Amendment made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow;* and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 285.)

EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS IN WAR—THE RUSSIAN CIRCULAR.—QUESTION.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY: Your Lordships must have seen a short time ago in *The Times* and other public journals a Circular issued by the Russian Government in relation to the use of explosive materials in war. It is not now the time to argue this question, but it is a matter of very great importance, as coming from so great a military power as the Russian Empire; and it is still more important from the fact that, as we are told, the Prussian Government have come to the same conclusion, and that the French Government are not unwilling to take this new principle into consideration. This is no new principle among civilized nations, which have always adopted the principle of not employing poisonous materials in war. The principle laid down by the Russian Government is, indeed, exactly the same which civilized Powers have acted upon for so many years. Your Lordships will perhaps all agree that nothing should be done to prevent the shortening of the conflict in the day of battle, and the putting as many men as possible *hors de combat;* but we all feel that we ought to mitigate the horrors of war as much as we can, and that we should not do anything to promote unnecessary suffering after the hour of conflict. It is in that sense that I beg to put the Question of which I have given Notice—to inquire, Whether the Circular of the Russian Government in relation to explosive materials in war has reached Her Majesty's Ministers; and, if so, whether they are disposed to take it into their favourable consideration?

The Earl of MALMESBURY: It is quite true that Her Majesty's Government have received from the Russian Government a communication of the nature to which my noble Friend alludes, and that communication, I think, does the greatest possible honour to the Emperor of Russia. As far as my own feelings are concerned, I hold that nothing can show a more chivalrous nature than that communication from the head of a great military Power. The facts are as follows:—It appears that, among the many military inventions lately discovered, two very formidable projectiles have been submitted to the War Department at St. Petersburg. One consists of a rifle ball containing explosive and poisonous matter, with a cap fixed to it containing a substance which on striking the human body, and that of horses, explodes within them and infuses such a substance as prevents the possibility of their recovery after they have been so mangled. The other is also a projectile which is sent from a rifle, but is intended to perforate and blow up caissons. Now, the latter projectile is, I think, a perfectly fair and legitimate weapon of war; but the other I can only call a diabolical invention, and one which ought to be classed with the poisoned arrows of the wild Indians. That being the case, one can hardly wonder that a noble-minded Sovereign like the Emperor of Russia should have felt horrified at the possible use of such a weapon. It appears that on its being submitted to him by the Minister of War he instructed his diplomatic agents at the various Courts of Europe to propose to the different Governments that they should come to an international understanding that this horrible weapon of war should not be used. Baron Brunnow accordingly drew up a

Protocol, which he submitted to Her Majesty's Government, suggesting the form in which these communications should be made. In consequence of this the Prussian Government, I understand, have fully entered into the humane feelings of the Russian Government; but they submitted at the same time that, seeing the vast number of inventions now under the inspection of military Governments, it would be better not to confine the investigation to this one invention, but that a Military Commission should meet at St. Petersburg to consider the whole subject in the spirit which had animated the Russian Government. Her Majesty's Government have entered entirely into the feeling of the Prussian Government. Nothing has actually been settled as yet; but a Military Commission will assemble as soon as possible at St. Petersburg to consider the whole subject. I cannot give any information as to the views of the French Government; but I confidently hope that they will accede to this arrangement. At the same time, we must not take it for granted that these new military inventions and improvements in military projectiles necessarily occasion a greater destruction of life than formerly occurred. The fact is a curious one; but experience would go to show that since arms of precision and projectiles of long distance have been invented the actual number of lives destroyed in warfare has been far less than it was when men used to come to closer quarters. A French officer has put into my hands a statement from which it appears that during the great wars of the beginning of this century there was much larger destruction of human life than there has been since arms of precision and projectiles of long distances have been used. At the battle of Friedland the French lost 14 men per cent, the Russians 30 per cent, and the Austrians 44, or nearly half. At Wagram the French lost 13 and the Austrians 14 per cent. At the battle of Moscowa the French lost 33 and the Russians 44 per cent. At Waterloo the French lost 36 and the Allies 30 per cent. Forty years afterwards, and since these new weapons have been used, the French lost at Magenta 7 per cent and the Austrians also 7 per cent. At Solferino the French and Sardinians lost 10 per cent and the Austrians only 8 per cent. I do not pretend to explain these facts, but it may be presumed that troops do not come to such close quarters as formerly; and the result is that the percentage of men destroyed in war at the beginning of the century was very nearly double what it has been in recent engagements.

Earl DE GREY and RIPON said, that all must agree that it was the duty of all civilized nations to abstain from using weapons of a poisonous nature. He trusted, however, that any officers who might be instructed by Her Majesty's Government to represent this country at this Military Congress at St. Petersburg would act with great caution, so as to avoid the possible danger of checking further improvements in warlike materials. Our mechanical skill was one of our great sources of power in the art of war, and it was most important that, while we paid regard to the interests of humanity, we should not debar ourselves by this Commission from the full and unfettered application of the mechanical skill of the country to the improvement of its warlike materials.

THE CANNING STATUE.—QUESTION.

Lord CAMPBELL asked the Lord Privy Seal the date of the Division in the House of Commons which, as stated by the noble Earl on a recent occasion, sanctioned the present site of Mr. Canning's statue?

The Earl of MALMESBURY explained that the gentleman whom he sent to the Board of Works for the purpose of ascertaining the facts misunderstood the information he received, and consequently misled him. Although, however, there was no division on the occasion referred to, that did not affect the main question, for the discussion in the House of Commons was as favourable to the present position of the statue as that in this House was unfavourable. Lord John Manners subsequently proposed a Vote of £1,000 for the arrangement of the ground, thus giving the other House a full opportunity of giving its opinion had it been opposed to the present site. He might also mention that a background was necessary; the cloak and disposition of the drapery showed that the back of the statue was never intended for inspection, and when placed in the middle of the square the view from one direction was therefore very unfavourable.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 23, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—District Church Tithes Act Amendment * [246].
Considered as amended—Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections [243]; Hudson's Bay Company * [240].
Third Reading — Electric Telegraphs * [239]; Hudson's Bay Company * [240]; Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London, * [247], and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

METROPOLIS—THE NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE.—QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Under whose authority and responsibility the New Law Courts will be erected and the approaches to them formed, whether of the Treasury, or of the Commissioners of Works and Buildings, or of the New Courts of Justice Commission; from what funds is the whole expense of these Courts and approaches to be paid; and whether, before any contracts are made for executing any portion of the works, the House of Commons will have an opportunity of inspecting the plans, elevations, and description of the building, and the plans of proposed approaches?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, in reply, if the hon. Alderman would refer to the Act which regulated these matters he would find that the plans were to be settled by the Treasury with the advice of the Commissioners. With regard to the funds, the Act provided that £200,000 should be voted by Parliament in consideration of certain buildings now occupied as Law Courts on the western side of Westminster Hall to be surrendered to the Government; that £1,000,000 should be paid out of the Surplus Fee Fund, and the remainder was to come out of the fees paid by suitors other than those in the Court of Chancery, extending over a period of fifty years. With regard to the contracts he was unable to answer that part of the Question, for this very day there was a meeting of Commissioners to consider the question of the final plan; and therefore whether it would be possible to decide on the general plan before the meeting of Parliament he was unable to say.

INDIA—SALE OF GIRLS.

QUESTION.

MR. BAZLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether sales of girls take place at the Bazaar of Manickguage, situate within the Burdwan Zillah; and, in the event of such being the fact, whether the Indian Government will repress those sales, and prevent all tendencies to slavery in the Indian Empire?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, in reply, said, he could not find that any information has been received at the India Office to the effect that sales of girls take place at the Bazaar of Manickguage, in the Burdwan Zillah.

NAVY—REPORTS ON TURRET-SHIPS.

QUESTION.

MR. SEELY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, with reference to the extracts which he read on the 2nd and 13th instant, If he will lay upon the Table of the House Copies in full of the Reports and Letters of Captain Macdonald, Captain Vansittart, Admiral Ryder, and one of the Officers of the *Ocean*, Captain Chamberlain, of Admiral Warden, Admiral Yelverton, Captain Foley, Captain Hood, Captain King Hall, and Captain Willes, relating to Turret and Broadside-ships, with the Letters, if any, proceeding from any officer in the Admiralty to which any of those Reports and Letters were replies?

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, in reply, that he could only say that the Reports to which the hon. Gentleman alluded had been addressed to his right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, with whom he had communicated as soon as he became aware that the Question would be put, but as yet he had received no answer. He must, therefore, request the hon. Gentleman to repeat the Question tomorrow.

BRITISH FACTORY AT ST. PETERSBURG.—QUESTION.

MR. CLAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Is the British Factory at St. Petersburg recognized by Her Majesty's Ambassador or Her Majesty's Consul there; and, does Her Majesty's Government authorize the levying of a rate on British shipping at Cronstadt and St. Petersburg for the support of a Church which is only recognized by the Russian Government as a Chapel attached to the British Embassy?

LORD STANLEY, in reply, said, the Russian Company was an association created under a Royal Charter and an Act of Parliament, and it must therefore be recognized by the British Embassy and the British Consul in the same way that any other mercantile association constituted under British law would be. With regard to the charge in question, the rate levied at Cronstadt and St. Petersburg for the support of the Church there, it was matter, he understood, of private agreement among the British mercantile houses engaged in the Russian trade, and, as far as he could ascertain, was not raised under any British authorization. The British Embassy had no control over the collection or distribution of the funds. The whole matter had been inquired into about five years ago. He had received no information, however, on the subject since he took charge of the Foreign Office.

NAVY—SHEERNESS DOCKYARD.

QUESTION.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether the Government will give an assurance that they will take no steps during the Recess to reduce the establishment at Sheerness Dockyard; and, whether the Government will take into their consideration the propriety of extending the capabilities of Sheerness Dockyard as a fitting and repairing yard in connection with the new works at Chatham?

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, in reply, that the Question of his hon. Friend appeared to be based on the supposition that the Government had formed the idea of abolishing Sheerness Dockyard; but no such idea, so far as he was aware, was entertained. With regard to the second Question he need scarcely point out to his hon. Friend that the Admiralty could not expend during the coming year more money than had been voted, and no sum had been taken for the purpose stated. He might add, for the satisfaction of his hon. Friend, that Sheerness Dockyard had done good service during the year, both in the way of repairing and building ships.

ARMY—MANUFACTURE OF CARTRIDGES.—QUESTION.

GENERAL DUNNE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it be true that the manufacture of the Cartridge known as No. V. has been suspended (in the Government arsenals) by desire of the Commander-in-Chief on account of the accidents that have arisen by its use; whether the non-competitive Contract made with the Messrs. Eley for the supply of these same Cartridges No. V. has also been suspended; whether these Cartridges were the result of experiments made in the Royal Arsenal; whether Colonel Boxer, R.A., has taken out a patent for them; and whether he receives a royalty on his patent from those who manufacture them; and, whether a Contract for the manufacture of Cartridges, to be called No. VI. Boxer Ammunition, is to be made without competition, in the same manner as that for No. V. was made.?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply to the first Question of the hon. Member he had to state that the contract had been suspended, on account of the accidents which had lately occurred during practice at Aldershot, with a view to the substitution of a cartridge of a stronger make. With regard to the second Question, the contract had not been suspended, and his hon. and gallant Friend was mistaken in calling it non-competitive, because the parties had been invited to tender. In answer to the third Question, these cartridges were the result of such experiments, and Colonel Boxer had taken out a patent for them. Lastly, no such intention was entertained by the Government as was glanced at in the fourth Question, and the usual course would be pursued.

ARMY—ARTILLERY PRACTICE AT PORTSMOUTH.—QUESTION.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has informed himself as to the reckless Artillery practice at Portsmouth and Dover; and, if so, what measures he has taken to prevent a course so dangerous to the safety of Her Majesty's subjects?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that full inquiries had been made in regard to the artillery practice at Portsmouth, when it was found that the officer in command had acted in complete disregard of the strict rule laid down by the Commander-in-Chief in 1865—that no artillery practice of the kind should ever be continued after nine o'clock in the morning. He had therefore acted on this occasion in violation of orders, and had been reprimanded in consequence. But a further step had been taken so as to render such irregularities impossible. The firing would for the future be on the eastern side of Gosport. With regard to Dover, he could not give so complete an answer. The investigation was still going on. There was some discrepancy as to the evidence, and he was not yet in a position to give a final Answer to the Question.

POST OFFICE—THE WEST INDIA MAIL.
QUESTION.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the delay of the last West India Mail has been brought to the notice of the Treasury; whether any fine has been required or will be required of the Royal Mail Company in consequence; and, whether the steamer conveying such Mails was surveyed previous to her departure from the West Indies? In explanation of the Question, he had to state that the last vessel, the *Danube*, was five days overdue when it arrived. It was a vessel which had been employed in the intercolonial traffic, was wholly unfit for the purpose, and if it had not been fine weather would probably have gone to the bottom, in consequence of its being necessary to place 400 tons of coal required for the voyage on deck.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH, said, in reply, that it is not the practice to report to the Treasury delays which occur in the cases of steamers under contract; but he had made inquiries and found that the *Danube*, with the last West India Mail, was three days, or rather more, late at Southampton. Unless the delay arose from unavoidable accidents, a fine of £250 will be imposed. the *Danube* had been surveyed, but not immediately before her return to this country. She was an intercolonial steamer, and by special permission of the Postmaster General she was allowed to be sent home, in order to facilitate some new arrangements in the West Indies.

IRELAND—EEL WEIR AT ROOSKY.
QUESTION.

MR. W. ORMSBY GORE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, What steps have been taken to carry out the recommendation of the Committee on the Shannon River to remove the Eel weir at Roosky?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, in reply, that until the present lease had expired it would be impossible to remove the weir. The Shannon Commissioners were, unfortunately, in receipt of a very small income, and there would be some difficulty in carrying out the arrangement of the Committee. But he would take care that the matter was not lost sight of.

INDIA—THE BUDGET.—QUESTION.

MR. J. B. SMITH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India—seeing that another Session was coming to a close, and the India Budget was not announced—Whether he has taken into consideration the desirability of having the Indian accounts made up to such a period as would enable him to bring forward the Budget in the early part of the Session of Parliament, instead of, as heretofore, at the close; and whether he is prepared to name the day on which he intends to bring forward the India Budget?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, in answer to the latter part of the hon. Member's Question, he proposed to make the statement upon the India Budget on Monday next. With respect to the first part of the hon. Member's Question, he might mention that some two years ago the question as to the possibility of antedating the time for the closing of the annual accounts of India had been raised with the view that the India Budget might be brought forward in that House at an earlier period of the Session, and it was then ascertained that to antedate the closing of the annual accounts of India more than a month would result in great inconvenience to the Indian Government. At present the Indian accounts reached this country in April; it was necessary that they should then be examined here, and therefore there was no probability that under the present arrangement the accounts could be brought before the House at an earlier period of the Session. Even if the Indian accounts were ready at an earlier date it would be impossible to bring them on during a period of the Session when the House was occupied with matters of more pressing importance. The mere operation of laying the accounts before that House was to some extent of a formal character; but the opportunity thereby afforded enabled hon. Gentlemen to bring on a general discussion on Indian questions of interest. He thought there was no difficulty in the way of those who were interested in such questions being in attendance when the statement was made. He proposed to take that opportunity of moving that the Order of the Day for going into Committee upon the Government of India Act Amendment Bill and the Governor General of India Bill on the Paper for that night should be read, in order that it might be discharged.

SCOTLAND—BRIDGE AT DUNKELD.

QUESTION.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he wished to ask the Lord Advocate, If his attention has been drawn to the repeated disturbances caused by the demand of a money payment for crossing the Bridge over the Tay at Dunkeld, which charge the residents in the neighbourhood considered to be illegally made; and if he were prepared to state whether such charge was a legal one or not?

The LORD ADVOCATE: Sir, my attention has been drawn to the recent disturbances connected with the payment of tolls for crossing the bridge over the Tay at Dunkeld. These tolls were the subject of a Question put to me in February of this year by the hon. Member for Montrose (Mr. Baxter), and I must refer the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird) to the Answer then given by me. The right to exact tolls was constituted by Act of Parliament, which declares that the right should continue till the whole expenditure on the bridge and works therewith connected should be re-paid out of the tolls. As I formerly stated, the Postmaster General, Lord Canning, in 1853 took legal proceedings in order to show that the right to exact the tolls was at an end in consequence of re-payment of the expenditure out of the tolls; but he was satisfied, and judicially admitted that there were no grounds for his contention. I understand that legal proceedings have been taken since February, at the instance of certain residents in the neighbourhood, with the view of having a legal investigation into this matter; and I regret extremely that parties should have had recourse to violence in order to prevent the exaction of a toll which *primâ facie* is legal, and the illegality of which is at present the subject of proceedings in the Courts of Law. The Government have no interest in this question of the toll, and can interfere only for the purpose of preventing riotous proceedings and of preserving the public peace.

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET.—QUESTION.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question of which he had given him private Notice—namely, Whether the Government has entered into any further negotiations with the Corporation of the City of London with the view of inducing that body to agree to become the market authority under the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill? He wished to know also, Whether any offer has been made to the Corporation by which they are to have power, in the event of their accepting that responsibility, of raising the tolls in the Islington Market beyond the rate which has been fixed by Parliament; and, whether the right hon. Gentleman will put the House in possession of any inducements which may have been held out, or any terms offered to the Corporation of London to induce them to become the market authorities under the Bill previously to the Bill coming on again for discussion?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I am unable to put the House in possession of any further information than they are already possessed of, because if hon. Members will refer to the Notice Paper they will find that my noble Friend (Lord Robert Montagu) has put upon it an Amendment upon the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill, to the effect that if the Corporation of London shall become the market authorities under that Bill, and should suffer any loss arising from the construction of the proposed new market, they shall have power, with the consent of the Board of Trade, to raise the tolls of the Islington Market within certain limits to be prescribed. The only objection that the Corporation had to becoming the market authorities under the Bill was the fear that they might suffer loss. Under the circumstances, it is not unreasonable that those who are anxious for the construction of the new market, for the better protection of their flocks and herds, should consent to the raising of the tolls of their own market in the event of loss being occasioned by the construction of the new one. I believe that a Court of the Common Council of the City of London has been held this morning to take the subject into consideration, and should they agree to the terms all difficulties in the matter will be removed.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON: Then, at present, the right hon. Gentleman does not know whether the Corporation has accepted those terms or not?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am unable at the present moment to say whether those terms have or have not been accepted by the Corporation.

CASE OF JAMES AUSTIN.—QUESTION.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department as to the case of James Austin, Whether he has seen a letter in *The Times*, containing a distinct denial on the part of the accused of the statements made by the Superintendent of Police; and whether the statements in that letter are correct or not?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that he had received a communication from the clerk to the magistrates who committed James Austin to prison for applying at the tramp ward of the workhouse when he had money in his possession as described in the newspapers. It seems that he gave two names, that he was smoking in the ward, and denied that he had tobacco about him; that he had wrapped up his money in some rags in order to conceal it, and that all the circumstances tended to show that he was committing a fraud on the workhouse authorities.

NAVY—THE "RESEARCH" AND THE "ENTERPRISE."—EXPLANATION.

Mr. SEELY desired to say a few words on this subject by way of explanation. Since his remarks the other evening he had received the following letter—

"Admiralty, S.W., July 17.

"Dear Mr. Seely,—In the reports of your speech, both in *The Times* and *Morning Post*, which I enclose I find it stated as a matter of fact, not as a matter of opinion, that the designs of this (the *Research*) and her sister ship the *Enterprise* were submitted to the Chief Designer of Works, who reported against them, but, notwithstanding this adverse Report, the Admiralty adopted the designs, in consequence of which proceeding three of the most eminent officials connected with the Department resigned their situations. Now, the facts are these—Mr. Reed submitted the design for the *Enterprise* on April 9, 1862 (she was designed before the *Research*), with an alternative suggestion of wood or iron topsides. This design I referred to the Constructor's Department, and received a reply, a copy of which I enclose. Messrs. Watts, Large, and Abethell signed that paper, and, you will see, approved of the design, and did not condemn it. The resignation of Mr. Watts took place in January, 1863. Mr. Large's resignation took place in May, 1864, Mr. Abethell's in April, 1864, and cannot have been in any way influenced, as you suppose, by the adoption of a design which they approved. I hope that it will be in your power to rectify this mistake as to a matter of fact.—Believe me to be yours very truly,

"Rob. Spencer Robinson.

"C. Seely, Esq., M.P."

The Constructor's Report to the Controller, on the 16th of April, 1862, was as follows:—

"By your directions we have examined the plan proposed by Mr. Reed for the partial protection of ships of the *Rinaldo* class by armour-plating, and we are of opinion that the plan is perfectly practicable, and that it affords as much protection as can be obtained in ships of such comparatively small dimensions; but to secure this object we are strongly of opinion that the topsides should be entirely of iron, above the water line, before and abaft the armour-plating amidships to prevent the ship being set fire to by combustible projectiles; and from the conversation with Mr. Reed yesterday we find that he is of the same opinion.—(Signed by Messrs. Watts, Large, and Abethell.)"

He had written the following letter to Mr. Watts:—

"26, Prince's Gate, July 18.

"My dear Sir,—I enclose you a note I have received from the Controller of the Navy, together with a copy of your Report 'on the plan proposed by Mr. Reed for the partial protection of ships of the *Rinaldo* class by armour-plating.' Will you be good enough to favour me with your opinion thereon?—Yours very faithfully,

"Charles Seely.

"James Watts, Esq.,"

To this letter Mr. Watts sent the following reply:—

"6, Howley Place, Paddington, July 20.

"Dear Sir,—I never intended in the Report referred to to convey the idea that I approved the plan proposed by Mr. Reed for the conversion of small vessels of the *Rinaldo* class into iron-clads—my opinion was well known to be adverse to doing so—but merely to say that I, as well as my Colleagues, considered it quite practicable, in a mechanical point of view, and that of the two plans proposed that for the *Enterprise* was considered preferable for the reasons given.—Yours sincerely, "J. Watts.

"Charles Seely, Esq."

He had only further to say that in his statement that these three gentlemen had resigned in consequence of the Admiralty having adopted these designs, notwithstanding their adverse Report, he was in error, inasmuch as that had not been the sole cause of their resignation.

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.

(*Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

[BILL 243.] CONSIDERATION.

Further Proceeding on Consideration, as amended, *resumed.*

MR. AYRTON moved the insertion of a fresh clause (Applications to the Court respecting trials.)

Clause (Applications to the Court respecting trials,)—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, the first part of the clause enabled the Judge to reserve any difficult point of law and to take the opinion of the full Court before giving a final decision, and the object of the second part of the clause was in certain cases to give one of the parties a right of moving for a new trial. The House, however, had evinced a desire that these decisions should be arrived at as speedily as possible, and that when arrived at they should be final. The first part of the clause be should certainly recommend to the House if the hon. and learned Gentleman would consent to strike out the second part.

MR. AYRTON consented to the course proposed.

Clause amended, and *added.*

MR. NEATE proposed a clause (As to corrupt practices committed by voters), making the hiring or inducing any persons or person to disturb any meeting at which any candidate shall attend, or be expected to attend, a corrupt practice within the meaning of the 17th section of the Act.

Clause (Hiring persons to disturb meeting a corrupt practice,)—(*Mr. Neate,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

MR. DISRAELI trusted that the House would not consent to constituting mere noise a corrupt practice. [Mr. NEATE: The hiring.] The hiring would have to be proved.

Motion made, and Question, "That the said Clause be now read a second time," put, and *negatived.*

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE, in the absence of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Mr. Neate), moved the following clause:—

"Whenever any person or persons shall have been reported by the Judges to have been guilty of corrupt practices, the Attorney General shall institute against such persons or person such proceedings as the Law will allow."

Clause (Attorney General to prosecute persons reported guilty of corrupt practices,)—(*Mr. Neate,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL presumed the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Mr. Neate) had not moved the clause because he had discovered it was unnecessary. It would be observed that the Law Officers should be compelled to prosecute in every case, where perhaps the evidence was only that of a person bribed, and where no jury would convict.

MR. J. STUART MILL thought it very important that some official person should be charged with the duty of considering whether a prosecution was necessary or not.

MR. BOUVERIE thought it better that the House should be left to decide what action should be taken on the report of the Judge.

CAPTAIN ARCHDALL expressed his apprehension that the provisions of the measure would not be sufficiently stringent to prevent violence and intimidation in Ireland. The House would remember the successful opposition got up the other day to the proposal of his noble Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland to increase the number of polling-places, and they would also bear in mind the endeavours made a short time ago to pass a Bill which would have deprived the Government of the power of employing the military at the elections in Ireland. What the object in both cases was he would leave the House to judge. It was clear that if the polling-places were not increased, and the Government could not employ the military at elections, mob rule would prevail, and a free election would be in many cases impossible. Thanks to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire, there would be an unusual amount of party heat at the forthcoming elections in Ireland. It was too late now for a private Member to do anything to improve this Bill; but if he could he would make clerical interferences at elections in Ireland a misdemeanour, except in the case of the election in Trinity College. Further, he would make it compulsory on a Committee to unseat any Member at whose election there had been violence, intimidation, or clerical interference, because some recent decisions of Election Committees had created an impression in Ireland that those practices were not only sanctioned but approved by the House of Commons.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN moved, in Clause 23, line 30, after "deputy," to insert "and in Ireland a shorthand writer to be named by the Court." He said there were many competent shorthand writers in Ireland, and to send over members of Mr. Gurney's staff would be like sending coals to Newcastle.

THE EARL OF MAYO said, that as in these cases so much would depend upon accuracy, and as uniformity in the manner in which the Reports were to be presented to the House would be very desirable, he thought the Amendment ought not to be adopted.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said he would not press the Amendment, as the Bill was only a temporary one.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Motion made, and Question, "That the said Clause be now read a second time," put, and *negatived.*

MR. J. LOWTHER moved to add to Clause 43 words providing that any canvasser or agent who had been convicted by a competent tribunal of corrupt practices should, in the event of his procuring an engagement in a like capacity at any future Election, be held to be guilty of a misdemeanour, and be punishable accordingly.

Amendment proposed, in page 14, line 36, after the word "void," to add the words "and such canvasser or agent shall be guilty of a misdemeanour." —(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL, while disclaiming all sympathy with the class against whom the Amendment was directed, pointed out the inexpediency of punishing in too harsh a manner offences committed under the Bill. According to the Amendment, canvassers or agents who had been declared guilty of and been punished for corrupt practices would, if engaged again within a period of seven years, be liable to two years' imprisonment. Surely so severe a punishment was neither more nor less than injustice.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE supported the Amendment, being of opinion that punishment ought to be inflicted upon agents who prowled about for the purpose of taking in innocent candidates.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he hoped the House would divide, as the country would like to see the names of the hon. Members who thought it was too severe a course to punish an agent or canvasser who, having been guilty of corrupt practices in one election, procured similar employment in a subsequent election.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he was not afraid of voting against this proviso notwithstanding the observations of the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill). He should have had no objection to persons who had been directly convicted of corrupt practices by a jury being rendered incapable of employment at subsequent elections; but it would be nothing short of injustice to inflict such a penalty on a person who, perhaps, had only incidentally and in a rough and ready kind of way been found guilty by an Election Committee.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he thought the House ought to be extremely cautious in manufacturing new misdemeanours. He should vote against the Amendment.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 92; Noes 105: Majority 13.

MR. FAWCETT rose to move the following new clause:—

(Conditions of nomination.)

"That it shall not be lawful for any person to be nominated as a candidate at any such Election, unless he or some person on his behalf shall have paid to the returning officer the sum of one hundred pounds to be applied in the following manner (that is to say): where a poll shall take place at any such Election, the returning officer shall apply the monies so paid to him by any such candidate who shall not, at the close of the poll, have received a number of votes equal at least to one-fifth part of the votes received by the successful candidate if only one, or by such one of the successful candidates if there shall be more than one, as shall have received the smallest number of votes, in and towards defraying the lawful expenses of the returning officer relating to such Election; and after any such Election the returning officer shall forthwith repay to any such candidate who shall have been declared elected without a poll, or who, whether declared elected or not, shall have received a number of votes equal at least to such fifth part, the monies so paid by or for him as aforesaid."

The hon. Member said, his object was to prevent unnecessary expense being thrown upon localities by the nomination of candidates who presented themselves to constituencies for the mere purpose of obtaining notoriety and without any prospect of success. The object of this proviso was to protect the constituencies from being put to unnecessary expense by men of straw being proposed as candidates. He was perfectly willing to accept any alterations in the details of the proviso that might be made by the general wish of the House. If the sum of £100 was thought too small, he should assent to its being increased, and if it should be thought too large he should be equally willing that it should be reduced. He should also be willing that the candidate who was nominated, but did not demand a poll, should not forfeit so much as the candidate who, after demanding a poll, did not go to it. Then, with regard to what was a reasonable amount of support, he had come to the conclusion that it would be sufficient if the candidate obtained one-fifth of the votes that were obtained by the successful candidate who was the lowest upon the poll; but here again he was ready to defer to the opinion of the House, and to increase the proportion to one-quarter or one-third, or reduce it to one-sixth or one-eighth. He had no objection to the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for York (Mr. Lowther), nor to that of the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. W. B. Beaumont.) The proviso of the latter required that no money should be deposited in the first instance; but that if a candidate should not poll a reasonable number of votes he should pay his share of the expenses. He begged to move that the words of the new clause should be added to Clause 53.

Amendment proposed, in page 16, line 35, after the word "Act," to add the words—

"It shall not be lawful for any person to be nominated as a candidate at any such Election, unless he or some person on his behalf shall have paid to the returning officer the sum of one hundred pounds to be applied in the following manner."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir MASSEY LOPES said, he did not think the sum fixed by the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) was large enough. He thought that the amount of the deposit required should be increased to £300 in counties and £150 in boroughs.

Mr. W. B. BEAUMONT said, that the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton tended to infringe the right of every elector to propose and second any person whom he might deem worthy to represent him. They all must be anxious to prevent "straw candidates" from being proposed at elections at the last moment, which would entail an unnecessary expenditure upon the constituencies, and therefore he proposed that in the case of a candidate not polling a reasonable number of votes he should be liable to pay his share of the election expenses, as was the case at present. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 16, line 35, after the word "Act," to add the words—

"Provided, every candidate who shall not have polled one-fifth of the total number of Electors voting at any Election for a County or a Borough shall be liable (in the same way as if this Act had not passed) for his share of the expenses lawfully incurred by the returning officers for the provision of hustings, poll clerks, polling booths or rooms, and any other requisites for the conduct of the Election."—(*Mr. Beaumont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. CANDLISH said, he thought the proviso of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) would impose an obstacle to free election, and he hoped he would withdraw his Amendment in favour of that proposed by the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. W. B. Beaumont).

Mr. FAWCETT said, he would withdraw his Amendment in deference to what was clearly the general wish of the House.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE suggested the possibility of a person being nominated in his absence by those who wished to render him liable for these expenses, and proposed to amend the proviso by inserting the words "nominated with his own consent."

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he also wished to guard against persons being put to expense by being nominated without their consent. Unless a candidate polled one-third of the votes of the whole constituency he ought to be required to pay a share of the expenses. He therefore moved to amend the proviso of the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. W. B. Beaumont) by substituting "one-third" for "one-fifth." He thought there was very few constituencies in which a man could not obtain a fifth of the votes, and therefore he thought one-third would be the better proportion to fix.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 1, to leave out the word "fifth," in order to insert the word "third,"—(*Mr. James Lowther,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'fifth' stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

MR. GATHORNE HARDY remarked that in the event of the proposition of the hon. Member for York (Mr. Lowther) being adopted, if there were more than three candidates in a constituency of 9,000 electors they might all be fined, including those who were successful.

VISCOUNT AMBERLEY opposed the Amendment on the ground that it put the proportion too high.

MR. HEADLAM likewise considered the proposition objectionable.

MR. FAWCETT pointed out that the Amendment of the hon. Member for York proposed that each candidate, in order to escape paying his share of the expenses, must poll one-third of the whole constituency, whereas his proposition had been that the candidate should only be required to poll one-fifth of the number of votes polled by the successful candidate who stood the lowest on the poll.

MR. LOWTHER said, he could not see the force of the reasoning of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary; but he would withdraw his Amendment, in the hope that his so doing would lead the more certainly to the rejection of the original Clause 53.

MR. DODSON said, he hoped that before the House divided some Member who was acquainted with the facts would say whether a man nominated against his will would not be liable to pay under this amended clause, supposing he came within it.

MR. W. B. BEAUMONT, in order to meet that objection, proposed to add the words "that the proposer and seconder of a candidate who shall have been nominated without his consent shall be liable to pay such expenses."

Amendment to the said proposed Amendment and proposed Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, in page 16, line 35, after the word "Act," to add the words—

"Provided, That every unsuccessful candidate who shall not have polled one-fifth of the total number of Electors voting at any Election for a County or a Borough shall be liable (in the same way as if this Act had not passed) for his share of the expenses lawfully incurred by the returning officers for the provision of hustings, poll clerks, polling booths or rooms, and any other requisites for the conduct of the Election, and the proposer and seconder of such candidate (who shall have been nominated without his consent) shall in like manner be liable for such aforesaid share."—(*Mr. Beaumont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added.

MR. CRAWFORD informed the House that on one occasion he had been nominated for the city of London without his consent, when between 3,000 and 4,000 voters polled for him. He declined to pay his share of the expenses of the election; but had only escaped paying them after some difficulty.

MR. AYRTON said, the fact of a man not polling a reasonable number of votes was a tolerably good proof that he ought never to have been a candidate at all, and therefore he ought to pay the expenses to which he had unnecessarily put the constituency.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he thought the nominator and seconder of a candidate who did not poll a certain number of votes ought to be compelled to pay a share of the expenses of the election. The amount of the deposit required ought to be £300 for counties, and half that amount for boroughs.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL said, that by the clause to which this Amendment related they had thrown the expenses of the polling and the hustings upon the rates; but they were now in this difficulty, that everybody felt they ought to prevent persons coming forward and throwing the expenses on the rates, who in point of fact ought not to stand at all. The object of the Amendment was to prevent men of straw from coming forward; but what security did it afford against such a thing happening? They had no deposit and indeed no security of any kind. He therefore objected to the Amendment, because it afforded no sort of security whatever, and must, in his opinion, be entirely ineffectual.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, that according to his experience, polling-places constituted a very great and serious expense. He thought it hard that the returning officer should be mulcted for performing his duty, and that the ratepayers should have to pay for the hustings, while it was a monstrous injustice that the successful candidate should have to pay because another man wished to make a speech. It would be no consolation to any of these parties to learn that the man who came forward on the hustings and put them to all this expense was liable, if that man were, as he oftentimes might be, merely a man of straw.

CAPTAIN HAYTER said, the difficulty might be got over by making the mover and seconder as well as the candidate liable for the expenses. There would then be three instead of only one security.

MR. BOUVERIE said, he objected to the whole proposal, because they had by the clause which was in the Bill, and which they were going to discuss presently, thrown the expense upon the ratepayers. It was contended that these expenses ought not to be thrown upon a candidate, and no doubt a great deal might be said in favour of a proposition which was especially popular with candidates when a General Election was approaching. But then they had this bugbear. If they saved themselves, would not anybody who wished to enjoy a little fun, or, perhaps, from a feeling of strong opposition, spring up and land them in a contest for which there was no sort of reason or sense? He had heard it said that they ought, if possible, to prevent any opposition being made unless that opposition had a chance of success; but this doctrine, he contended, was unconstitutional. Indeed, it was the constitutional duty of a minority, if they felt discontented with the opinions of the favoured candidate, to bring forward a candidate of their own, irrespective of all considerations as to the proportion of the constituency that they were likely to poll. The House had no right to limit the choice of candidates as it was now proposed to do, by saying that a man should be fined unless he polled a certain number of votes.

MR. LABOUCHERE remarked that the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) might be constitutional; but they certainly could not be regarded as practical. It would be a great absurdity to allow a small number of electors to put the candidates and the other electors to great expense. The evident intention of the Solicitor General was to throw as many difficulties as he could in the way, in order to prevent the final acceptance by the House of the clause proposed by the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett), and which had been carried by two very large majorities.

["Oh, oh!"] He suggested that any difficulty which really existed might be met by providing that any person demanding a poll should, either by himself or by the person who nominated him, give good security for a certain sum.

MR. BONHAM-CARTER said, some such proviso as that proposed was absolutely necessary, because it frequently happened, as in the case of an opponent of his on a former election, that a candidate was thrust on the constituency. The candidate was unable to pay the expenses, and after the election was over he left; but he had, however, afterwards to pay on an actual arrest and imprisonment. Had the mover and seconder been liable there would have been a security.

VISCOUNT AMBERLEY instanced the case of a candidate in whose favour three votes were recorded. It was evident that there would be as much security for the hustings expenses from such a candidate under this clause as there was under the present system.

MR. REARDEN regarded this as an attempt to fine any working men who might come forward as candidates.

MR. NEATE reminded the House that the expenses of polling-pooths had been thrown on the candidate by the Act of 1832 as a compromise. Formerly the constituency bore the expense on the principle that the representative performed a public duty, but then the candidate paid heavily for carrying voters to the central polling-places.

MR. LOCKE KING suggested that words should be introduced requiring all the candidates to guarantee the payment of the expenses, so as to prevent men of straw from offering themselves as candidates.

MR. LEEMAN said, the object was to prevent the nomination of persons having no reasonable chance of being returned. He therefore moved, in substitution of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northumberland, a proviso requiring that any person demanding a poll should pay, or give security for, to the returning officer £100 in the case of boroughs, and £200 in the case of counties, which should be used towards defraying the expenses of the election if such candidate did not poll one-fifth of the votes registered.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to leave out from the word "every" to the end of the proposed Amendment, in order to insert the words—

"Candidate or other person demanding a poll at any Election for any County or Borough shall on demand by the returning officer pay or secure to his satisfaction one hundred pounds in the case of a Borough, and two hundred pounds in the case of a County, which shall be applied by the returning officer in aid towards the expenses of such Election, in case such candidate shall not poll one-fifth of the constituency." —(*Mr. Leeman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, it was but a repetition of an Amendment that had been withdrawn.

MR. HEADLAM hoped the Amendment of the hon. Member for York (Mr. Leeman) would not be pressed, as it was in reality simply the Amendment of the hon. Member for Brighton repeated. The object of the House was to press forward, and he did not think they could hope for a clearer proposition than the hon. Member for Northumberland's.

MR. J. STUART MILL thought the object which the hon. Member for York had in view would be sufficiently attained by the proposal of the hon. Member for Northumberland.

MR. NEWDEGATE thought the Amendment of the hon. Member for York (Mr. Leeman) a very reasonable proposal, though he did not think that £100 in the case of a borough, or £200 in the case of a county, would be sufficient, as there would be so large a number of polling-places under the new *régime.*

MR. LEEMAN said, he was ready to withdraw his Amendment, though he felt convinced that of the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. W. B. Beaumont) would not meet the necessities of the case.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question put—

"That the words 'Provided That every unsuccessful candidate who shall not have polled one-fifth of the total number of Electors voting at any Election for a County or a Borough shall be liable (in the same way as if this Act had not passed) for his share of the expenses lawfully incurred by the returning officers for the provision of hustings, poll clerks, polling booths or rooms, and any other requisites for the conduct of the Election, and the proposer and seconder of such candidate (who shall have been nominated without his consent) shall in like manner be liable for such aforesaid share,' be there added."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 110; Noes 119: Majority 9.

MR. MONK moved an Amendment to provide that one moiety of such expense shall be defrayed as heretofore by the candidate or candidates. ["No, no!"] He thought it would be a safeguard both to the candidate and to those who had to collect the rates.

Amendment proposed, in page 16, line 35, after the word "Act," to add the words—

"Provided always, That one moiety of such expenses shall be defrayed as heretofore by the candidate or candidates at such Election."—(*Mr. Monk.*"

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. WHITE said, the amount of expenses of returning officers in the whole of the counties of England and Wales at the last General Election was £15,655; in Scotland, £939; and in Ireland £2,239, making a total of £18,833. The expenses of the boroughs in England and Wales were £26,375; in Scotland, £1,206; and in Ireland, £1,004, making a total of £28,585. The aggregate total for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland was £47,418. These sums represented in England and Wales 6*d.* per county and 1*s.* per borough voter, and in Scotland 4½*d.* per county and 8*d.* per borough elector. According to the official electoral statistics and Poor Law Returns, the total expenses to be defrayed by the ratepayers would vary in counties from one-sixth to one-twentieth of 1*d.* in the pound; in boroughs from one-tenth to one-third of 1*d.* in the pound. In Brighton, if Parliaments were triennial and there were always a contest, the annual charge on the ratepayers would not amount to one-eighth of 1*d.* in the pound.

MR. DISRAELI remarked that this was merely the reproduction of an Amendment which had already been before the House, and in regard to which a decision had been arrived at either in form or in spirit. Now, although it was not desirable to check anything like legitimate discussion, yet he was certainly of opinion that the House ought to refrain from debating matters on which it had recently come to a decision. He should vote against the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman if it were pressed to a division.

MR. MONK said, he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Viscount MILTON moved the following clause:—

(Levying of county rate where county is divided.)

"In case the county for which the county rate is made is or shall be divided into two or more parts for Parliamentary representation, the same expenses shall be charged upon and defrayed by and out of the county rate levied within and for that part of the county for which an Election shall take place; and the justices or clerk of the peace for the county shall apportion such expenses amongst the parishes, townships, and places only in that part of the county in and for which an Election shall have taken place, and in issuing the precept for the county rate, shall add thereto the proportion payable in respect of such expenses by each of the last-mentioned parishes, townships, and places, and the same shall be leviable and recoverable in like manner and as part of the county rate."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he did not suppose that the noble Lord could understand the argument which he adduced on this subject the other day. ["Oh, oh!"] He merely meant that the noble Lord could hardly be expected to follow the bearings of an argument founded on the obsure and intricate clauses of a rating Act of Parliament. Without repeating that argument, he would merely remark that in his judgment the clause would not work, and was inconsistent with the existing machinery of the county rates. The Act under which alone the county rate could be levied said that it must be an equal rate — assessed equally upon every parish, and upon all the property in each parish of the county.

Mr. HEADLAM believed that there would not be the slightest difficulty in working a clause of this kind.

Mr. NEATE thought the Solicitor General ought not to have interposed petty technical difficulties. He wished to say a few words founded on common sense and justice—though he did not expect that the hon. and learned Gentleman would understand his argument, as it dealt with a matter of principle and not of detail. If the county magistrates could not assess the rate proposed, they had less administrative power than he gave them credit for.

Mr. HENLEY said, he was quite sure there would be no difficulty in working the clause as now amended, though that was altogether a separate question from the proposed Amendment. On the whole, he thought the fairest way would be for each division to pay its own expenses, and he saw no practical difficulty in it. The Under Sheriff would bring in his Bill, which would go in the usual way to the Finance Committee, by whom it would be audited.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, the Solicitor General had told him the same thing on former Amendments—that they were not workable—but there was no real difficulty.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL said, he had now to move to omit Clause 53. The House must feel that they had exhausted the question, and that the opinion of every man was already made up, and therefore he would simply make the Motion.

Amendment proposed, to leave out Clause 53, as amended.—(*Mr. Solicitor General.*)

Mr. LABOUCHERE rose to Order. The Bill as it now stood provided that the cost of the hustings, &c., should be borne by the whole of the ratepayers, and the Solicitor General's Amendment to omit the clause would throw the burden on a certain limited number of persons. He submitted that the Amendment altering as it did the incidence of taxation, could not now be proposed.

Mr. SPEAKER decided that it was quite competent for the hon. and learned Gentleman to propose the rejection of the clause, as the omission of the clause would have the effect of relieving the ratepayers of a charge which it was proposed to place upon them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL, in moving the rejection of the clause, said, he understood that the clause was supported on the general ground that the position of a Member of Parliament was one which it was a duty and not a privilege to occupy, and that therefore the ratepayers ought to pay the expenses as being a public charge. But he could not understand how a man, after going with his cap in his hand to an elector and saying, "If you vote for me, you will confer on me the greatest possible favour," could ask that man to pay his share of the expenses. If this clause were sanctioned, candidates would come forward merely for the purpose of creating expense —knowing that they would not be liable to pay anything themselves, but that all the expense would be thrown on the ratepayers. After all the fruitless efforts which had been made that morning to frame a proviso which would render the clause acceptable, he thought he was justified in moving its omission.

MR. FAWCETT said, the question really involved was one of far more importance than the acceptance or rejection of any clause in a Bill, and involved the position of independent Members of that House. Why did the Prime Minister say he would move the rejection of this clause? The Solicitor General thought he had a majority behind him, and he hardly deigned to offer a single argument; a division would be hurried on, and discussion, if possible, would be burked. If it had not been for the large attendance of Members who were waiting for another Bill to come on that evening (the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill), he believed he should, for a third time, have beaten the Government. After his clause was carried, he had consented to withdraw the proviso at the end, in reference to the deposit of expenses, in order to meet the wishes of Members and the convenience of the House; and he hoped that those who recollected the circumstances would not be deterred from voting with him. The clause was objected to on the ground that it would impose a heavy burden on the constituencies; but the fact was that a rate of half a farthing in boroughs and a quarter of a farthing in counties would far more than discharge these expenses, and a General Election occurred only about once in four years. By retaining this clause, they would interest the constituencies so much in economy that the necessary expenses would not be more than half what they were at present. If the constituencies had to pay for the hustings, they would either have the nomination in a public room or substantial hustings would be erected once for all, and the expense would not exceed £5, instead of probably being £150. It was said that the clause would be favourable to vexatious contests; but he utterly denied this. At present these were got up by a class of publicans and solicitors who had an interest in them from what they made by them; but under this clause the candidate would be brought face to face with public opinion, and would have no interest in resisting it. The working of the clause therefore would decidedly diminish the tendency to contests. The Solicitor General's representation of the position of a candidate was degrading to public men, and most humiliating. He should receive some compensation even if defeated, because this renewed discussion would tell the country in an unmistakable way what were the doctrines which induced the Government to seek to reverse the decision of the House. ["Divide!"] There was no expression of public opinion against the clause, and he could produce resolutions passed at twenty public meetings declaring in favour of the principle. If they reversed the decision already come to, it would more and more show that that House was becoming the rich man's House and not the poor man's. ["Oh, oh!"] If the House was properly to represent the country, each class in the country should be represented in it. He wished to see capital and labour represented there; and no one could effectually represent labour except a person who had been for some time himself a working man. He appealed to Members to remember what had occurred, and how he had carried this clause on two divisions. The Government did everything they could up to Tuesday night, at half-past eleven o'clock—he would not say intentionally—to induce the House to think that they would not seek to reverse the decision come to on Saturday last. Even a Member of the Government had given Notice of his intention—though he did not persevere in it — to introduce a similar clause with respect to Scotland. Therefore, he asked Members to support the clause, and in doing so to support the privileges of independent Members.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he did not often agree with the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett); but on this occasion he thought he was right, and therefore he should give him his vote. The Reform Bill would, no doubt, much increase the expense of elections. Though the expenses of the returning officer might not be larger, yet, in order to affirm the principle that Membership of that House imposed a public duty, he should vote with the hon. Member for Brighton; but he thought some addition ought to be made to the clause, to prevent men of straw being set up as candidates. He deeply regretted that the Amendment of the hon. Member for York had been withdrawn.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR supported the clause, and protested against the idea of the Solicitor General that independent Members went hat in hand to their constituents seeking their support, instead of offering their services when great public duties had to be performed. The constituents, entirely recognizing this fact, were ready to have the necessary expenses of elections thrown on their shoulders.

Mr. J. STUART MILL: If the Government were aware of the profound feeling of satisfaction that went forth through the country on learning that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Brighton was carried, they would, instead of imposing any technical objection in the way of the passing of the clause, introduce a Bill, if necessary, for the purpose of giving it effect, and pass it through both Houses, as they could easily do, within a week. The representative of an extensive constituency remarked to me that the adoption of the clause marked the commencement of a purer era, and would bring forward more eligible candidates.

Colonel B. KNOX protested against being rated for the purpose of saving the pocket of the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. J. Stuart Mill).

Mr. MELLY reminded the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel B. Knox) that no legislation could affect the expenses incurred at the election of the hon. Member for Westminster, inasmuch as the hon. Gentleman had been returned, and would be again, at the expense of his friends and supporters.

Question put, "That Clause 53, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 97; Noes 115: Majority 18.

Mr. NEATE moved the adjournment of the debate. His hon. Friends on the Liberal side of the House were as guilty of connivance at corrupt practices as those on the other side. ["Oh, oh!"] He did not wish to include all the Liberal party in that denunciation. His object in moving the adjournment of the debate was that those who wished to introduce purity and economy at Parliamentary Elections might have an opportunity of doing so.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the further Consideration of the Bill, as amended, be adjourned till Monday next."—(*Mr. Neate.*)

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he hoped the hon. and learned Member did not include him in his denunciation. He trusted his hon. and learned Friend would not persevere in his Motion. At the same time, he would say that the hon. and learned Member could scarcely himself attach more importance than he (Mr. Gladstone) did to the subject on which they had just divided; and no person could more cordially feel with him than he did. If the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) chose to try the question again, he could do so; and the question was, whether they should lose time in pressing forward a Bill which they must all feel was necessary.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter after Nine o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 24, 1868.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections * (287).

Second Reading—Electric Telegraphs (282); Expiring Laws Continuance * (280); Inland Revenue * (279); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4) * (273); Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation) * (266); Registration (Ireland) (281).

Committee—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3) * (255).

Report — Public Schools (262-285); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3) * (255); Colonial Shipping * (274).

Third Reading—Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment * (252); Municipal Elections (Scotland) * (276); Larceny and Embezzlement * (277); Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) * (268); General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment * (267), and *passed*.

ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS BILL—(No. 282.)

(*The Duke of Montrose.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Duke of MONTROSE, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, its object was to place the telegraphic communication of this country under the Government and in the hands of the Post Office. When that proposal was first brought forward there certainly was a great expression of feeling on the part of many persons that the arrangement was a very undesirable one, being very contrary to our general habits, which left almost everything to private enterprize and the operation of free trade. The objections at first taken to the scheme, however, on being sifted passed away. The proposal, moreover, was not so novel as it at first sight appeared. In 1858 Mr. Ricardo, the founder, and then the Chairman of the Electric Telegraph Company, brought the subject under the attention of the Government, and in a letter to Mr. Gladstone urged his reasons for thinking it desirable that the telegraphs of this country should be placed in the hands of the State. Again, Mr. Allen, a distinguished civil engineer, and a man of great experience in regard to telegraphic communication, urged the adoption of the same course. In 1861 the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce also took up the question, and memoralized the Government upon it; and since then there had been a very general expression of opinion by various public bodies and other persons in favour of such a measure. Petitions had been presented to that effect from thirty-two Chambers of Commerce, from sixty-four Town Councils and Corporations; from the general public there were twenty-four, and from persons connected with the newspapers, and more especially the provincial Press, there were 297 petitions. The petitioners concurred in thinking that the existing charges for the transmission of telegraphic messages in this country were too high; that many places were unprovided with facilities for telegraphic communication; that in the great majority of places provided with such facilities the telegraph office was inconveniently remote from the centre of business and of population, and open for too small a portion of the day; that in countries in which the telegraphs were under the control of the State lower rates and a more widely spread system prevailed; that in such countries correspondence by telegraph was more general and more popular, as it were, than in England; and that like results to those produced in other countries in those respects would follow in this country the adoption of the like means. In Belgium and in Switzerland telegraphic communication was in the hands of the Post Office; and in most other European countries it was also in the hands of the State. In Belgium there was one telegraphic message sent for every thirty-seven letters; in Switzerland one message to sixty-nine letters; and in England only one message to 103 letters; thus showing that the telegraph was not at all made use of here as it was in other countries. It was stated by those who were examined before the Committee, and who were perfectly well acquainted with the working of the telegraphs, that the persons who chiefly used them in England were stock-brokers, mining agents, and persons engaged in other speculative businesses, but not the general public; whereas in Switzerland all classes of the community availed themselves of telegraphic communication for their private correspondence, in respect to which, indeed, it to a great degree took the place of the post. In Belgium 59 per cent of the telegraphic messages sent related to private, not to commercial affairs. The rates charged there were of course lower than in this country; and it was expected that through the present Bill the rates would be very much diminished. In France the cost of sending a message 600 miles —a greater distance than in this country —was 1*s.* 8*d.*; in England it cost 2*s.*; in Prussia the charge for sending a message 500 miles was 1*s.* 6*d.*; in England it was 2*s.*; in Belgium the cost of sending a message 160 miles was only 5*d.*; while in England it was 1*s.* 6*d.*; in Switzerland a message was sent 100 miles for 5*d.*, and in England for 1*s.* 6*d.* The reductions in the rates had produced a great increase in the number of messages. In 1863 in Belgium a reduction of 33 per cent in the rates produced an immediate increase of 80 per cent in the number of messages; and in 1866 a reduction of 50 per cent in the rates caused an increase of 85 per cent in the number of messages. In Prussia in 1867 a reduction of 33 per cent in the rates was followed by an increase in the first month of 70 per cent in the number of messages. In France, in 1862, a reduction of 35 per cent in the rates was followed by an increase of 64 per cent in the number of messages. But Switzerland afforded the most striking example of all. The inland rate was reduced 50 per cent in the early part of this year, and the number of inland messages increased 90 per cent over those of the corresponding three months of the previous year. It was remarkable that the increase in the number of messages followed immediately the reduction of the rates. In England there had, indeed, been an increase from the growth of population and the extension of business, but not a very large increase. Under those circumstances the Chambers of Commerce adverted, as he had stated, to the want of accommodation in this country, and the high rates charged; and they believed that a reduction of the rates, together with improved facilities, like that in other countries, would be followed in England also by a very great augmentation in the number of messages transmitted. It was proposed to place the telegraphs in the hands of the Post Office, because that Department had great advantages which no telegraph company could possess. It had agents in every town and village in the country, and persons whom it could employ at a very small cost; and, according to the arrangement that was proposed, almost every Post Office would be made a telegraph office as well. That would be the case not only in the large towns, but in country places also. A map had been prepared, marked by 2,056 dots, representing the places at which Money Order Offices were opened, and to which the electric wires were carried. Of these, there were 567 places at which the telegraph accommodation was very imperfect, only 648 where it was perfect, and 850 where there was no telegraph at all. In Scotland there were 196 Money Order Offices, and in Ireland 369, at which towns there was no telegraph. In England there were 1,300 out of 2,000 towns and villages which had now no telegraph within the town. A circumstance which had prevented the full development of the railway system was that the telegraph offices were generally in or near the railway stations, which were frequently three-quarters of a mile or a mile from the town itself. Out of 622 places supplied by one railway company with telegraphic communication about 223 were only worked at the railway stations. The distance of the office from the town naturally led to a very considerable payment being demanded for porterage; and the saving in this respect would greatly diminish the charge for telegrams. The cost of the telegraphic message was now comparatively little, but the cost of porterage was great. The usual charge was 1*s.* a mile, and in a very large number of cases 1*s.* was charged for porterage. But the Post Office was usually in the centre of the population, and the distance to be carried would therefore be very much smaller. As the telegrams would go through the Post Office delivery, it was proposed that they should be delivered free of charge, which would of itself involve a considerable saving. In many large towns where it might be thought considerable facilities would have been given by the telegraph companies they had one head office and no more. In Edinburgh there were three telegraph companies; but their offices were all within 100 yards of each other and in the centre of the town, leaving a large portion of the city unprovided with telegraphic communication. In Manchester and Liverpool there was a head office in each town, but no district offices, and all the telegrams had to be sent out by messengers. It was proposed that there should not only be telegraphic communication with the head offices but with the minor offices. The district offices would be made separate head offices, and when messages came to them they would be delivered at much less cost and with greater speed than at present. A good deal had been said about a 6*d.* rate; but it only nominally existed in some towns. It would be a great convenience, but in reality the 6*d.* rate was quite a delusion. A charge was usually made of 1*s.*, or 1*s.* 6*d.* for porterage, and what was called a 6*d.* rate was in reality more expensive than the proposed 1*s.* rate under the new system. If any one attempted to send a telegraphic message five or six miles from London it often took three or four hours to reach its destination. Some experimental messages had been sent to places like Highbury and Hampstead, which were not delivered for three or four hours. In one case a messenger was employed to take a telegram to the office in London. He then walked to the railway station, took a return ticket by the train, which cost 8*d.*, and got there before the message, for which 1*s.* was paid. It was thus cheaper and quicker to send the message by the railway. Under these circumstances it was not wonderful that mercantile men and Chambers of Commerce were of opinion that there was a great want of additional telegraphic accommodation, and that the work would be much better done. Another convenience under the new system would be the facilities offered by the Post Office for the transmission of messages at night. In many towns it was necessary to give attendance at the Post Office during the whole night, and the clerks, being more or less occupied with other work, could attend to the telegrams at an hour when the telegraphic offices were now shut up. At present in many towns there was practically very little accommodation except in the middle of the day. Great objections were at first made to the Bill by different persons, but they had been entirely removed in the course of the discussions in the House of Commons, and before the Select Committee. A dislike was expressed by some to put the telegraphs in the hands of the State, and it was suggested that the Government might detain some messages and send others on. He thought it was much less likely that such practices should occur in a Government office, when the matter would be open to the animadversion of Members of both Houses, than in the office of a public company. The telegraph companies had had, indeed, such a complete monopoly that complaints had never been listened to at all. It was said that the Government would not be liable for the non-delivery of messages; but the telegraph companies were equally above control; they protected themselves by very stringent conditions; and the consequence was that, although many persons had been injured by mistakes and delays in the transmission of messages, there was no instance of any one ever obtaining redress. One mistake involving the buying or selling of 3,000 instead of 300 shares had caused the absolute ruin of one individual, but he never got 1*s.* from the company. The public would therefore be just as well off in the hands of the State as of a public company. Another objection was that the secret contained in these telegraphic messages would be divulged. He did not believe that the companies had always been free from these imputations. The proof, however, that the Post Office would be likely to keep these secrets was supplied by the Post Office itself. It was known to their Lordships that an enormous number of letters were posted without any address at all, while the persons to whom others were sent could not be found. The number of letters that went through the "Dead Letter" office was stated at 3,000,000 a year; but though these were often letters of great importance, and sometimes contained large sums of money, he had never heard the slightest imputation against the Post Office that the secrets contained in these letters were divulged, and this objection might be regarded as sufficiently answered. It was at first impossible to make satisfactory arrangements with the telegraph companies; but all objections had been overcome. The companies had asked for provisions about arbitration which they had obtained, and it was agreed that they should receive twenty years' purchase of the net telegraphic profits of the company, deducting the working expenses. The next objection which had been offered was that the railway companies had arrangements for the use of the wires along their lines, and that the public safety would be endangered if they were deprived of those advantages. This, however, had been met by allowing them facilities of communication by their own wires, the wires of the Post Office being used independently of them. With regard to the Press, it would, of course, be impossible for the Post Office to procure information, as some of the telegraph companies had been doing; but the Press would choose what intelligence they wished to be transmitted, and such messages would be forwarded at a reduced rate. With this arrangement the Press were quite satisfied, and were strongly in favour of the Bill. The objections originally entertained to the measure had thus been completely removed. Another objection remained, which had referencee to secresy in connection with very important messages; but with reference to these, it had been proved that cipher could be used with great facility, mercantile transactions being now, indeed, carried on in this way. A slight penalty now existed with regard to breach of confidence, and to allay any apprehensions on the subject a clause had been inserted constituting it a misdemeanour, punishable by imprisonment, for any person to make a telegraphic communication public; and this, he thought, would give perfect security. With respect to a monopoly of telegraphic communication, some had objected to it, while others had urged that if, after the Post Office had paid a large sum of money for these undertakings, other persons competed with it, the result might be a considerable loss to the State. It had not been thought right, however, to sanction a monopoly, and thereby, perhaps, prevent a fair trial of new inventions; though he believed that if all the existing undertakings came into the hands of the Post Office there would be no prospect of competition arising, so that a monopoly would practically exist. As to the financial part of the question, their Lordships would probably not wish him to enter into details, but would like to know what the cost was likely to be, and whether the arrangement would be remunerative. Now, calculations had been made, based on the returns of receipts and expenditure furnished by the telegraph companies. The maximum estimate assumed an increase of revenue from an increased number of messages; and as such an increase had been going on for years, and would be likely, with reduced rates and greater accommodation, to go on in a still greater ratio, this presumption appeared a reasonable one. According to this estimate there would be 7,500,000 of messages, increasing 10 per cent yearly, and producing an annual revenue of £680,000; while the expenditure, judging from the companies' experience, would be £378,000, thus leaving a balance of £301,000. The minimum estimate, founded on the present number of messages and the present expenditure, gave a gross revenue of £437,000, the net proceeds being £203,000. It was exceedingly unlikely that no increase would arise, and £280,000 might perhaps be taken as the probable surplus. As to the cost of purchasing the telegraphs, an estimate was presented in the first instance very much lower than that which was now offered, it being based on the purchase of only one or two of the undertakings. Negotiations had been since carried on for the acquisition of the other undertakings; and it had been found necessary to take some of the submarine cables. The undertakings it was now proposed to purchase were the Electric and International, the British and Irish Magnetic, the United Kingdom, the London District (a very small concern), and the Universal Private Companies, as also Reuter's cable and privileges. In addition to these there were some railway companies which had telegraphic communication entirely in their own hands and carried on the business of telegraph companies. A great saving to the public would result from the purchase of these rights; for at present, while for a message between Manchester and London there was a certain rate, a message between Manchester and Dover would cost considerably more, a charge being made by two distinct companies. It would, therefore, be necessary to purchase the telegraphic rights of the South-Eastern, London and Brighton, Chatham and Dover, and North British Railway Companies, and also of the Caledonian Company, north of Perth. The purchase of all these undertakings would probably cost £5,000,000. Now, taking the minimum net revenue of £200,000, this would meet a loan at 3½ per cent of £6,000,000, so that there would be no fear as to providing the interest of the money. If, on the other hand, the net revenue amounted to £300,000, the Government would be able to raise nearly £10,000,000. It was evident, therefore, that there would be a sufficient margin; and since in all probability it would be unnecessary to raise so large a sum, there was no fear of loss to the State, which would, in fact, be borrowing money at 3½ per cent and be receiving 5 per cent. The mode of raising the money would rest with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and a great part of it might probably be obtained from the surplus lying in the Post Office Savings Banks, or it might be raised in other ways which would present no difficulties. He thought he had now sufficiently shown that this measure would lead to greatly increased accommodation, that it would involve no cost to the State, that the work was likely to be very much better done, and that public opinion was in favour of the change. The Bill had passed the other House without a division; and he believed that Lord Stanley of Alderley, the late Postmaster General, was strongly in its favour, he having, indeed, moved in the matter some three years ago. He should have been glad had the noble Lord been present to give his testimony to the value of the measure.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Duke of Montrose.*)

Lord OVERSTONE said, he hoped the measure would work successfully; but he should like an explanation as to the basis on which the Government had calculated the purchase money. Twenty years' purchase on the profits seemed to be excessive.

The Duke of MONTROSE said, it should be recollected that the Electric Telegraph Company paid a dividend of 10 per cent, and they had been making a great deal more, which they were not allowed to divide, but which went to form a reserved fund and to maintain their cable. As far as he could learn they had kept their telegraph in excellent order and much of their surplus profits had gone to keep up the cable, which more than anything else was liable to interruption. There was a great increase every year in the business done and the profits made; but the Government had taken into account merely the present profits, and had not made their calculations with reference to any probable increase in future years. The arbitrator would have full power to examine the books and accounts.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2ª, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILL—(No. 285.)

(*The Earl of Derby.*)

REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

Lord LYTTELTON said, with regard to the Conscience Clause, he ventured to think that the words as they now stood would involve a power of interference by the Governing Body with the regulations of the boarding-houses of the Schools which he could not approve. The noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Marlborough) did not think any such power was given by the clause. But all he (Lord Lyttelton) proposed to do was simply to put into the clause what the noble Duke said was already within its meaning. He did not think his proposal would do any harm, and the Bill would work much more satisfactorily if it were adopted. He therefore moved at the end of Clause 13 to add—

"Provided that no such regulation shall interfere with the discretion of any keeper of an authorized boarding-house in connection with the School in respect of his religious teaching and training of the boys in such house."

The LORD CHANCELLOR opposed the Amendment, which he did not think was required, and which, if made, would not meet the objection of the noble Lord. It was impossible to mix up the religious instruction of the Schools with the regulations of the boarding-houses.

Lord OVERSTONE asked whether the Bill would not empower the Governing Bodies to withdraw the boys in a particular boarding-house from religious instruction?

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that as he understood it there was no such power in the Bill.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he hoped the noble Lord would not press the Amendment.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH joined in the appeal. The Amendment was really not wanted; and the insertion in the Bill of anything that was not wanted would be injurious. This original clause had been the subject of discussion and of compromise in the House of Commons; and though he did not deny that the intention of the noble Lord pointed in the right direction, he feared that the Amendment, if adopted, would be looked upon as an attempt to get rid of the full beneficial effect of the clause introduced into the other House. He hoped the noble Lord would listen to the advice which had been tendered him, and would not press the Amendment.

Lord LYTTELTON said a few words in reply.

Amendment *negatived.*

Lord LYTTELTON said, he would now move the clause investing the Master with certain powers, the consideration of which was deferred by the Committee on Thursday. If their Lordships would look at the evidence which had been collected on this subject they would see that the points embraced by the clause were of the greatest importance in the administration of Schools, which would be more efficient if these powers were distinctly conferred on the Master, and their possession by him would sometimes enable the Governing Bodies to obtain better men. In the case of expulsion, for instance, the Head Master alone was in a position to know all the circumstances of a particular case, and that his hands would be weakened by an appeal to the Governing Body.

After Clause 13, *moved* to insert the following Clause:—

The Head Master should have the uncontrolled Power of regulating the Arrangement of the School in Classes or Divisions, the Hours of School Work, and the Holidays and Half Holidays during the School Time, of appointing and changing the Books and Editions of Books to be used in the School, and the Course and Methods of Study (subject to all Regulations made by the Governing Body as to the Introduction, Suppression, or relative Weight of Studies), of maintaining Discipline and prescribing Bounds, of administering Punishment, and of Expulsion.—(*The Lord Lyttelton.*)

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, that when the noble Lord asked him yesterday what course the Government would pursue in reference to the clause now moved, he answered that the Government would give it their best consideration. They had done so, and his objections to it were unchanged. The first objection to the clause was that it proposed to place specially under the control of the Head

Master certain minor arrangements in respect of which it was scarcely possible to conceive the Governing Body would ever wish to interfere by taking them out of the hands of the Head Master — such matters as the prescribing of bounds, administering punishments, and details of that kind; and, on the other hand, the noble Lord proposed to give to the Head Master exclusive power in some important matters, such as expulsion. But even with regard to expulsion the noble Lord felt the weakness of his case, for the Head Master would have no power to expel a boy from the foundation. [Lord LYTTELTON: He would under this clause.] No; the power rested exclusively with the Governing Bodies. Another point of the greatest importance was that of the selection of the books to be used in the School. He was quite aware that that proposal came quite within the recommendations of the Commission; but no Head Master ought to possess the power of determining the character of the instruction to be given in a School, whether secular or religious. If the discretion were limited to the nature of the secular instruction, there might be more said in favour of it; but the case was different with respect to religious instruction. Many eminent and talented persons took different views on religious subjects; and he could not conceive that anything would be more likely to prove injurious to the interests of a School than that its Head Master should have peculiar views on some of the religious subjects of the day, or that he should introduce into the syllabus of School instruction books that might be looked upon by many with suspicion. There was nothing parents were more particular about than the religious instruction of their children, and if books that were objectionable in their eyes were introduced, they would at once remove their children from the School. The matter might come to this—the Head Master might be a man of great attainments, and in every other respect well fitted for superintending a great institution, and yet, if he introduced these obnoxious books, in the exercise of the discretion vested in him, the Governing Body would have no power to prevent his doing so, except at the cost of parting with a man who was in all other respects a most valuable and excellent Master. The noble Lord proceeded on the assumption that this proposal was recommended by the Commissioners, whose words, indeed, he used. That was perfectly true; but the Commissioners never intended that their recommendations should be embodied literally in an Act of Parliament. On the same principle the noble Lord might have taken the very next recommendation, which was that there should be periodical School Councils, presided over by the Head Master; but that the noble Lord omitted altogether. The intention of the Commission was to give a general guidance either to Parliament or to the Governing Bodies, and it was not fair to say that because they recommended anything it ought to form part of a Bill. Another objection to the clause was, that while it placed certain things directly under the uncontrolled and exclusive management of the Head Master, it left out other things which, from their omission, would be assumed by the Governing Bodies to be not under the control of the Head Master, but under their own. Take the amusements of the School — cricket, boating, swimming, and rifle corps. It was now admitted by everybody that all such things were under the control of the Head Master; but if certain things were by the clause taken out of the control of the Governing Body, and minor matters were not specified, the argument would be that those things which were not legislated for directly and specifically were left to the Governing Body. The result would be that, although the noble Lord wished the Master to have uncontrolled power, the passing of the clause would defeat his object. By placing certain things by statute in the power of the Head Master, and leaving out other things, the noble Lord would raise an antagonism between the Head Master and the Governing Body, as the latter would assume that all powers not vested in the Master belonged to themselves, and the result would be confusion, where there ought to be harmony and peace. It was further highly objectionable to give statutory powers to a Head Master, who occupied the position of a servant, was subject to dismissal by the Governing Body, and had his salary regulated by them. For his own part, he thought that as long as the Governing Body had the power of dismissing the Head Master, there was security for the good management of the School, and that there was no necessity for the proposal now submitted to their Lordships. On these grounds he must ask their Lordships not to agree to the clause.

EARL DE GREY AND RIPON said, that two of the School Commissioners were present in the House the other day when the Bill was under discussion, and both were agreed as to the propriety of some such clause being inserted as was now proposed. He did not think that the noble Lord who introduced the clause had been guilty of any inconsistency in adopting one portion of the recommendations of the Commissioners and omitting the other. Every Head Master was in favour of such a proposal as that now made. He himself thought, for instance, that it was essential to the maintenance of discipline that the Head Master should have the power of expulsion. At Sandhurst the Commandant had not that power fully, and consequently his power over the discipline of the pupils was greatly impaired. If that was the case in a Military College, how much more must it be so at the Public Schools? He granted that so long as the Governing Bodies preserved the power of dismissing the Head Master, should he misconduct himself, they would be able to influence him and check him should he do wrong. But he maintained that the point under debate was one of principle and not of detail; and the success of those great institutions for which their Lordships were called to legislate depended very much on their having fit men at their head, and, when such men were secured, in intrusting them with the entire conduct of the Schools. He trusted their Lordships would not reject the clause.

LORD HOUGHTON said, that if the Governing Body were not intrusted with a certain amount of power and left a certain amount of discretion, they would in reality be no Governing Body at all. The question was whether in establishing those bodies they should not be placed in a position which would enable them to exercise such a general supervision as would secure for them the respect of the Schools.

LORD OVERSTONE observed that it was the Governing Body who would in the first place choose the Head Master, and that if he misconducted himself it would be in their power to remove him. There were common-sense principles applicable to all such cases. A high officer, like a Head Master, should be chosen with all caution, prudence, and judgment; and when a man was appointed to manage important affairs, accompanied by responsibility for their proper management, he must be invested with the necessary authority to insure success. Plenary authority with plenary responsibility vested in one person was, in reality the only way in which truly efficient and satisfactory service could be obtained. The Head Master of a School might be compared with the commander of an army, the Governing Body being his council of war; and their Lordships were aware that no army could achieve glory with a council of war as its commander. If a man were put upon his trial, and he knew that failure in his undertaking would be his misfortune and success his glory, he would exert himself to the utmost. It was only by giving complete authority to the person intrusted with the charge of a School, and making him exclusively responsible for the consequences, that they could expect to see its affairs managed with real efficiency and success.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, he thought the Governing Body might be intrusted with a very large share of authority, and yet by no means be constantly meddling in the details of daily School management. It was said, "Let them choose the best man as Head Master," but that was what the Governing Body always tried to do; but even if they succeeded in securing the best man he would not be impeccable. He might require advice, and might occasionally have to consult the Governing Body. Public Schools had flourished, in spite of the possibility of the Governing Body interfering; and it had never yet been held that it was necessary to make the Head Master absolute. He hoped their Lordships would not make the Governing Body ridiculous by rendering them powerless, by investing the Master with absolute power. It was to be supposed that the Governing Body would at least have the attribute of common sense, and common sense would teach them to abstain from interference in cases when it would be unnecessary or injurious.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he had been struck with the difference between the opinions expressed in regard to the Governing Bodies of these institutions. Some authorities held that they always acted with sense, and never interfered unduly with the Head Masters, while others took an opposite view. He himself believed that the Governing Bodies had, in certain cases, interfered in very minute matters, and thus weakened the authority of the Master. A Governing Body meeting once or twice a year would probably wish to do something to show it had authority, and by its interfering between the Master and the boys the latter might get the notion that the decision of the former was not final. That would be a great evil, considering that the character of the School must always depend so greatly upon the character of the Master. Moreover, if the Head Master committed very grave faults, the *ultima ratio* of dismissal must rest with the Governing Body.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR was anxious, before their Lordships went to a division, that they should consider what was the real question on which they were about to divide. He thought they were all substantially agreed on the proposition that it was very desirable, if the Governing Body exercised due care in getting the best Head Master they could obtain, that they should give him very great—indeed, the utmost possible latitude; that they should make him feel that he had that latitude, and that they were not going to interfere with him in matters of which he must have infinitely more knowledge than they could possess, and on which he must act almost every day in the year. But the question was whether now, for the first time in the history of their legislation, they would give statutory powers, absolutely uncontrolled, to a person who, standing in the position of a Head Master, however excellent he might be, and however large the discretion vested in him, was, after all, only the servant of the Governing Body. He would put the matter in this way to the noble Lord (Lord Overstone) who had had large experience in extensive banking operations. He had no doubt that the noble Lord, if he wished to set up a branch bank in a country town, would get the most trustworthy confidential manager or clerk he could, pay him a large salary, and say to him —"I look to you for the proper conduct of the business in that town. I give you very great latitude." But if an Act of Parliament stepped in and said that the person thus employed should have such statutory powers that his employer should not be able to interfere with him, he asked, would the noble Lord undertake the government of the bank on those terms? But it was said that if anything went wrong the Governing Body of the School would have the power of dismissing the Head Master. Let him test that assertion. Supposing the Head Master had the statutory power which the Amendment would give him, and supposing he introduced into the School a book trenching on religious instruction and containing principles and doctrines of which the Governing Body highly disapproved, and which might operate very injuriously on the fortunes of the School—then the Governing Body would have no power to interfere. But as it was said they would be able to dismiss the Head Master—supposing they did dismiss him, in that case what would happen when the matter came before the public, as it was sure to do? The Governing Body might allege, on their side, that it was true the Head Master was an excellent Head Master, but they had disagreed with him about a certain book which he had introduced into the School, and thereupon had dismissed him. The answer made to that would be—" What! dismiss him for that! Why, Parliament has given him power to do these things." What then becomes of that great safety-valve, the power of dismissal? A Governing Body could not in the face of public opinion, after Parliament had passed a clause saying these things should be in the uncontrolled power of the Master, dismiss the Master for exercising the uncontrolled power which Parliament had given him.

LORD LYVEDEN said, that as the whole responsibility rested with the Head Master he ought to have a power separate from the Governing Body. If the powers were given him by the clause the Governing Body would remove him for exercising that power in a bad manner, as well as for other things.

LORD REDESDALE said, that from his experience as president of one of the largest schools in England—Cheltenham College—he thought it necessary to give uncontrolled power of management to the Head Master. He was removable by the Governing Body, subject to an appeal to the Visitor, who was the Bishop of the diocese. He did not believe that a competent man could be otherwise obtained; but there appeared to be much force in the objection of the Lord Chancellor against making this a matter of statutory regulation. It ought to be imperative, however, upon the Governing body to make regulations under which the Head Master should be elected, giving him freedom in all these matters.

LORD LYTTELTON was certain the Governing Bodies would get very much better Masters if they left them uncontrolled, and he must therefore press his clause to a division.

Lord DENMAN addressed the House shortly, but was quite inaudible.

On Question? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 17; Not-Contents 30: Majority 13.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

CONTENTS.

Abingdon, E.
De Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Granville, E.
Lichfield, E.
Morley, E.

Sydney, V.

De Mauley, L.
Foley, L.
Lyttelton, L. [*Teller.*]
Lyveden, L.
Monson, L.
Northbrook, L.
Overstone, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cairns L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Exeter, M.

Bradford, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Chichester, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Harrowby, E.
Lucan, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.

Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Strathallan, V.

Abinger, L.
Churchill, L.
Churston, L.
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Denman, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Houghton, L.
Mostyn, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Southampton, L.

Further Amendments made: Bill to be read 3ª on *Monday* next; and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 288.)

REGISTRATION (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 281.)

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

SECOND READING.

The Earl of MALMESBURY *moved*, that the Bill be now read 2ª.

The Earl of LEITRIM expressed regret at the course taken by the House of Commons with regard to polling-places, his fear being that scenes of confusion and bloodshed would occur at the approaching election.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, he deeply regretted the failure of the proposition made by the Government, when the Bill was in the other House, for an increased number of polling-places, in consequence of the opposition of the very persons who for the last two years had been urging the necessity of such an increase for the convenience and peace of the country. Polling-places were now in many instances thirty miles apart. Considering, however, that the question was peculiarly one for the consideration of the House of Commons, and that it would have been useless for the Government to persist in their scheme against the determined opposition they met with, they were obliged, especially at so late a period of the Session, to give way and leave things in their present unsatisfactory state. He trusted that the noble Earl's predictions would not be verified, and that the opposition to the scheme would not occasion the confusion and bloodshed which he appeared to dread. The Government had every wish to preserve tranquillity as far as possible during the coming election, and were determined to perform their duty by maintaining the law, as it stood, to the utmost. They did not think it expedient to propose any alteration in the Bill as it had come up from the other House.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he did not think it necessary, as the Government did not intend to propose the restoration of the clauses expunged by the other House, to enter into the reasons why those clauses had been deemed objectionable.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before
Eight o'clock, to Monday next,
half past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 24, 1868.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report*— Royal Gun Factories Committee [No. 459].

Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Marriages Validity (Blakedown) * [250].

Committee — Regulation of Railways [142] — r.p.; Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-comm.*) [139] — r.p.; District Church Tithes Act Amendment * [246]—r.p.; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) * [210]; Regulation of Railways * [142].

Report—Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) * [210]; Regulation of Railways [142].

Third Reading — Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections [243], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Married Women's Property (*re-comm.*) * [89].

The House met at Two of the clock.

COURT OF CHANCERY AND COUNTY COURTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. **HARDCASTLE** said, he wished to ask Mr. Attorney General, Whether his attention has been called to a statement of Vice Chancellor Stuart's, in the case "Picard *v.* Hine," in which the Vice Chancellor refused to transfer the suit to a County Court on the ground that the costs in the County Courts exceeded those in the Court above; and, whether he is aware of the truth of this statement of Vice Chancellor Stuart's?

The **ATTORNEY GENERAL** said, in reply, that he had received a communication from the chief clerk of Vice Chancellor Sir John Stuart on this subject. The result of that communication was this—that the chief clerk believed he did state in reply to a question from his Honour that the expenses to be incurred after the transfer of the case to a County Court would exceed those in the Court of Chancery. He went on to say that the opinion so expressed was formed from general impressions.

METROPOLIS—PARK LANE.—QUESTION.

Mr. **LABOUCHERE** said, he would beg to ask the hon. Member for Bath, Whether it is the intention of the Metropolitan Board of Works to give the necessary notices to the owners and occupiers of houses in Hamilton Place, in order to enable the next Parliament, should it think it expedient, to carry out the recommendations of the Private Bill Committee, to which was referred the Bill to widen and improve Park Lane?

Colonel **HOGG** said, as the hon. Genleman appeared to be under some misapprehension, he would state exactly what had been done in this matter. The first Bill brought into Parliament by the Metropolitan Board of Works for improving Park Lane was in the Session of 1865; its object was to open a new public road or street in continuation of Hamilton Place (Sec. 7). The deposited estimate of expense was £10,000. The Bill went into Committee, but the Preamble was declared not proved. A further Bill was brought into Parliament by the Board in the Session of 1866 to widen and improve Park Lane on the west side. The capital sought to be raised was £120,000. The deposited Bill was withdrawn by order of the Board on account of the state of the Session. A further Bill was brought into Parliament by the Board in the Session of 1867 for the same improvement as mentioned in the Bill of 1866; the proposed capital was £120,000. The Bill was never proceeded with in Committee. A further Bill was brought in by the Board this Session for the same improvement, the capital proposed being £115,000. This Bill went into Committee, who declared the Preamble not to have been proved. The Metropolitan Board were, therefore, in some sort of difficulty. They had several meetings on the subject, and the matter had been referred to the surveyor to go into the matter thoroughly. That gentleman had now been about three weeks engaged on it, and expected to report next week about the various schemes and expenses. What the decision of the Board would be it was impossible for him to say, but he could assure the hon. Gentleman that they would endeavour next year to bring in some Bill or other for opening up Park Lane, and making it more convenient for the public than it was at present.

AGENTS AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE.

QUESTION.

Mr. **LABOUCHERE** said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether a Circular has been sent to Her Majesty's Missions Abroad, notifying that no person in the Diplomatic or Consular Service who has not now an Agent at the Foreign Office will be allowed to take one; and, whether it is intended to make any arrangement to enable those who will be without Agents to draw their salaries; and, if so, whether those who now have Agents will be allowed to profit by any such arrangement?

Lord **STANLEY**, in reply, said, what had been decided and what the diplomatic and consular servants had been informed of was the adoption of a Minute, of which the following is an extract:—

> "That no Clerk or other person connected with the Foreign Office, except such as are at the date of this Minute (June 24, 1866) acting as Agents, shall hereafter, directly or indirectly, undertake to act as such for any of Her Majesty's diplomatic or consular servants."

Diplomatists and Consuls have at the same time been reminded—

> "That there is no obligation on them to employ as an Agent a Clerk in the Foreign Office for any purpose whatsoever, and that they may entrust to any person whom they may choose to employ,

unconnected with the Foreign Office, their Powers of Attorney, under which moneys becoming due to them may be regularly received."

CASE OF JAMES BELL.—QUESTION.

MR ALDERMAN LUSK said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has received any communication on behalf of a lad of the name of James Bell, who was convicted on the evidence of three policemen at the Middlesex Sessions on the 28th day of March last, (but from evidence since obtained he is supposed to be innocent); whether any copy or original Confession of a man named Daly, who was convicted on the 21st instant at the Middlesex Sessions has been received at the Home Office; and, what course the Home Secretary intends to pursue in reference to the lad James Bell?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that that morning only the Papers to which the hon. Gentleman referred reached the Home Office, consisting of a Memorial from the accused in his own favour, to which was attached a statement of a person who was in custody. He had directed that the Papers should be immediately sent to the Assistant Judge who tried the case, in order that he might receive the learned Judge's notes and such comments as he might think fit to make upon the case before he took further steps in the matter.

NAVY—OLD SHIPS AND SHEERNESS DOCKYARD.—QUESTION.

MR. PEMBERTON said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, If the Government have come to any decision as to the mode of disposing of old ships; and, whether there is any truth in the report that the Government intended to close Sheerness Dockyard?

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, in reply, that the mode in which old ships belonging to Her Majesty's Navy would be disposed of in future would depend upon the recommendations of the Committee now sitting upon the subject. There was no intention to close Sheerness Dockyard at present.

NAVY—TURRET AND BROADSIDE-SHIPS.—QUESTION.

MR. SEELY said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, with reference to the extracts which he read on the 2nd and 13th instant, If he will lay upon the Table of the House Copies in full of the Reports and Letters of Captain Macdonald, Captain Vansittart, Admiral Ryder, and one of the Officers of the *Ocean*, Captain Chamberlain, of Admiral Warden, Admiral Yelverton, Captain Foley, Captain Hood, Captain King Hall, and Captain Willes, relating to Turret and Broadside-ships, with the Letters (if any) proceeding from any officer in the Admiralty to which any of these Reports and Letters were replies?

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, in reply, that he had received a letter from the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty to the effect that there would be no objection on his part to lay upon the table of the House the documents to which the hon. Member referred. Some of those documents were written under the supposition that they would not be published, and contained matters of a personal nature; but the hon. Member might feel assured that nothing material to the subject would be omitted.

CASE OF CHARLES PENNEL MEASOR.

QUESTION.

An hon. MEMBER, in the absence of Sir John Gray, said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House Copy of the Correspondence between Charles Pennell Measor, late sub-inspector of Factories and previously Deputy Governor in the Convict Service, and the Home Office, in reference to his claims for compensation for suggestions made by him for the improvement of the Convict system?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that this was a Question which should be made perfectly clear to the House. The Question of the hon. Member was whether he would lay upon the table of the House a statement which a man made in his own favour in order to obtain compensation from the public? and, in reply, he (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) begged to state that he did not think it expedient that such a course should be adopted. This was a case where a gentleman who thought that he had done great service to the public had entered into a long correspondence with a particular Department of the Government for the purpose of obtaining a favourable consideration of his claims, which had been already rejected. The gentleman had other modes of bringing the correspondence before the public than that of having it laid upon the table of the House. Under these circumstances he could not consent to the request of the hon. Member.

OUTBREAK OF CATTLE PLAGUE.

QUESTION.

MR. LIDDELL said, he wished to ask the noble Lord the Vice President of the Privy Council a Question of which he had given him private Notice—namely, Whether his attention has been called to the report which has appeared in one of the morning journals that an outbreak of Cattle Plague had occurred on the Continent of Europe; and, whether any official information on the subject of that report has reached him; and, if not, whether he will take immediate steps to ascertain whether or not that report is accurate?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, in reply, that about a week ago the Government received official intelligence that an outbreak of cattle plague had occurred in Egypt, and that morning he had seen a telegraphic communication stating that there had also been outbreaks of that disease in St. Petersburg and in other districts of Russia. He was not aware that any official intelligence had been received with respect to the latter occurrence, but he would take care to inform himself whether such was the case or not by nine o'clock that evening.

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

[BILL 243]. THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Disraeli.*)

MR. FAWCETT said, he rose to move as an Amendment that the Bill be re-committed, with the object of bringing up a clause relating to election expenses. His object was not to reverse a decision already arrived at; but he was induced to take this course, because, in consequence of the tactics adopted by the Government, he had been prevented from adding to the clause on which the House divided yesterday a proviso which originally belonged to it, protecting constituencies against unnecessary and factious contests, and consequently a false issue had been raised, and many hon. Members voted against the clause who would have supported it if it had been accompanied with the proviso in question. Therefore he contended that he was justified in taking this, perhaps, unusual course, in order to obtain the decision of the House on a straightforward and intelligible issue. He proposed, if his Motion to re-commit the Bill were carried, to bring up the original clause, throwing the expenses of elections in boroughs and counties on the ratepayers, and to add to it the clause carried by his noble Friend the Member for West Riding (Viscount Milton), which was approved of by the highest authority in that House upon rating questions—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) and which enacted that, as regarded county elections, the expense should fall on the division of the county in which the election took place. Then he should also add the proviso proposed yesterday by the hon. and learned Member for York (Mr. Leeman) requiring every candidate for whom a poll was demanded to deposit with the returning officer, in the case of a borough, £100, and in the case of a county, £200, which deposit would be forfeited in case the candidate did not poll one-fifth of the whole number of electors voting at the election. This proviso was an effectual safeguard against the nomination of sham candidates. His great desire was that before the subject was finally decided the House should have the opportunity of expressing its opinion in a clause properly framed and properly protected.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now read the third time," in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of a Clause providing for returning officers' expenses out of rates,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*)—instead thereof.

MR. DIXON said, if there should be an objection to the proposed clause that it would not work well in the counties, they might in Committee make it applicable only to boroughs. He maintained that the expenses incurred at election contests by the returning officer would be reduced by one-half, or possibly by two-thirds, if those expenses fell upon the ratepayers instead of the candidates, inasmuch as the latter were regarded by the builders as fair game, and plundered in a way to which the guardians of the ratepayers' money would never think of submitting. Last year, in the borough that he represented there was a contested election, and the expenses of the returning officer were £876. About 10,000 persons voted; but at the next election the number of voters would probably be three times as many, and the expenses of the returning officer would probably be increased in proportion. The Mayor of Birmingham, a man of great experience and capacity, and he might add, for the benefit of hon. Gentlemen opposite, a sound Conservative, had informed him last night that the ratepayers of that borough were quite willing that the cost should fall on them, and he added that the authorities of the town would be able to erect hustings and booths at a much less cost than the candidate could; the same, he believed, might be said of all the boroughs throughout the kingdom. Personally he should hail any increase in the election charges with satisfaction, because it would lessen the chances of any opposition to his return on the part of gentlemen who were not able to expend as much as he could afford to; but he trusted that the House would not consent to any course which would make wealth the passport to that assembly. The squires of this country must not expect that they were to continue to be the only class who could get into the House; for he would warn them that the traders and manufacturers were rapidly passing them in wealth, and were prepared to spend more money to get into the House than the landed aristocracy could, and therefore it was for the interest of the landed gentry to oppose this clause. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government not to diminish the credit which he had obtained in reference to this measure from all parties throughout this country by resisting a clause which was received out-of-doors with so much favour.

MR. DISRAELI said, he could assure the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Dixon) that one of the principal objects of the Bill, which he (Mr. Disraeli) had had the honour to introduce, was to prevent any undue advantage being given to wealth in the election of Members of Parliament; and he hoped that that purpose was apparent in most of its clauses. The hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) seemed to complain that he had not been fairly treated by the Government or the House in reference to his clause. But he (Mr. Disraeli) wished to remind the hon. Member and the House that they had never had from the hon. Member a complete proposition. On more than one occasion they had passed a clause, transferring the expenses of elections from the candidate to the locality for which the election took place; but whenever such a clause had been moved the hon. Member had declared that it must be accompanied by an arrangement that would save the constituencies from having to bear the charge of improper and vexatious contests. The hon. Gentleman had repeated that morning his statement that that was an indispensable portion of his proposition. But the hon. Gentleman had never brought that second half of his proposition before the House; and what did he tell them that morning? He said that if he had the opportunity given him at this period he would propose the original clause, transferring the expenses of elections to the constituencies, and, at the same time, would endeavour to accomplish the other part of his plan to protect the constituencies from vexatious contests, by proposing the clause which was brought, without Notice, under the consideration of the House yesterday by the hon. Member for York (Mr. Leeman), and which the House, so far as he (Mr. Disraeli) could form any opinion of their treatment of it, almost unanimously rejected. They rejected it because they preferred the proposition of the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. W. B. Beaumont), which they then proceeded to consider; but in the end they were obliged to reject that also. Therefore they had every reason to believe that no practical proposition could be advanced which would satisfactorily accomplish the hon. Gentleman's object, for the hon. Member had told them that some addendum was not only indispensably necessary but was an indispensable portion of his proposition. He (Mr. Disraeli) wished to say one word in reference to the course taken by Her Majesty's Government in regard to the original clause proposed by the hon. Member for Brighton. When that clause was passed, the Government thought it their duty to take the opinion of the Committee a second time upon it, because they felt that the final adoption of it in its imperfect state would probably involve them and the country in difficulties which could be scarcely exaggerated. It had been said that he had expressed great indignation on Monday last at the idea being suggested that Her Majesty's Government contemplated asking the House to re-consider this question. Now that was a complete misapprehension.

He would not acknowledge that the sentiment he then expressed was one of indignation, and he must say that it was not an occasion when any indignation was necessary. Why should he feel indignant at the imputation that Her Majesty's Government thought it their duty to ask the House to re-consider the vote to which they had come? Nothing, certainly, was more disagreeable to Her Majesty's Government than to be obliged to ask the House to reconsider or rescind any vote; but if the Government felt it their duty to do so, the imputation of such an intention was not one that could cause any feeling of indignation in their minds. He had certainly expressed surprise at the inquiry made by the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), because as the hon. Gentleman himself then admitted, his inquiry was founded upon a mere rumour, and he did not think that the hon. Member for Bradford was justified in putting such a question to him from a mere rumour. At that moment he said candidly, he had not the slightest intention of asking the House to rescind the vote. The Government were at the time endeavouring to complete the proposition which the hon. Member for Brighton had failed in completing. The House having committed itself to the clause, and—notwithstanding the warning they had received from the Government in calling upon them to re-consider it—having adopted it, and the hon. Member for Brighton having, as he (Mr. Disraeli) had said, failed to complete his proposition, Her Majesty's Government felt it their duty, if they could, to connect the two branches of the hon. Member's proposition —the principle that the election expenses should be transferred to the constituencies, and some proviso which would practically protect the constituencies from vexatious and improper contests. He confessed that he had himself indulged in a hope that such an arrangement was not impossible. That it was a very difficult one must be acknowledged by every hon. Member, considering the time which had been taken to solve the difficulty and the complete failure of the attempts ultimately. No proposition brought forward on the subject had attracted the sympathy or obtained the support of anything like a majority of that House; and even to-day they were asked to fall back upon a proposition which had never been put upon the Paper, which was hurriedly drawn up — *stans pede in uno* — and which had been rejected by the House, because they preferred at the time another proposition which, after some deliberation, was in its turn rejected also. The Government certainly hoped even up to Tuesday evening that some proposition would be made by which the difficulty would be surmounted. But late on Tuesday night he was informed that it had been quite given up as hopeless that any proposition could be brought forward to which the House would assent. Under those circumstances the Government felt it their duty—he confessed, with great reluctance on his own part, as his Colleagues were aware—on Tuesday night to give the House another opportunity of reconsidering the clause, and the option of adopting some other proposition, rather than to send up to the other House at that advanced period of the year a piece of legislation upon this important subject, framed in a manner so crude and unsatisfactory, and which in itself might endanger the favourable conclusion of their labours. Well, every possible precaution was then taken to acquaint hon. Members generally with this intention on the part of the Government. The moment the Government arrived at the conclusion that such a course was absolutely necessary Notice was given to Gentlemen who possessed the confidence of hon. Members opposite, who thereupon became informed of the fact even before Gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House. Though the Government placed the Notice on the Paper for Wednesday, if anything like an intimation had then been given from those hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite who influenced opinions upon such questions that further time was necessary the Government would not have insisted on coming to any definitive conclusion upon it on that day. The course of Public Business however relieved both sides of the House from any difficulty on that point, and the question at issue was not brought on until the following day. The House had, however, from Wednesday been employed more or less in discussing the question. Nearly the whole of the Morning Sitting yesterday had been employed in discussing it, but as it was not actually reached until late upon the Thursday the House had not the full opportunity of discussing it which the Government was so desirous of affording. Incidentally, however, they had been for some time previously discussing more or less the whole principle involved, and it must be admitted that notwithstanding all the time spen in considering the matter no satisfactory solution of the difficulty had been offered to the House. He made those remarks in order that the hon. Member for Brighton should not for a moment suppose that he had been treated by the Government with any want of fairness or courtesy. Her Majesty's Government were in a great difficulty at that advanced period of the Session, and they felt that even a delay of twenty-four hours was not a matter that ought to be lightly assented to. The House, he however submitted, had had sufficient notice, under the circumstances, for the consideration of the question. They had considered it, and they had arrived at a decision which certainly facilitated the progress of the Bill. The time was valuable, and he thought the Bill was valuable. He entreated the House, therefore, not to embarrass the course of legislation on this subject by re-opening the question, particularly when the hon. Member for Brighton himself had no pretence for saying that he was coming forward with a satisfactory proposition. The hon. Gentleman had come forward yesterday morning with a proposition upon which the House decided, and could now only fall back upon the proposal of the hon. Member for York (Mr. Leeman), which the House had rejected. To press that proposition now would probably embark the House in a long and useless controversy, would waste the whole morning, and prevent them advancing to that point to which they all wished to arrive, and might endanger or embarrass the passage of a Bill which, through the good temper and forbearance of both sides of the House, had been brought to its last stage. He could assure the hon. Member with perfect sincerity that he laboured under a great mistake if he supposed that there was any disposition on the part of the Government to take an undue advantage of him, and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would not persevere in pressing his Amendment on the House after the discussion and the result of yesterday.

MR. LEEMAN said, it was evident that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had benefited very largely by the education which he received yesterday from the Solicitor General. On the broad question of the principle of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett's) proposal the right hon. Gentleman had not said a single syllable, and yesterday the Solicitor General sheltered himself under a mere naked technicality. There had been no attempt on either his part or on that of the right hon. Gentleman to meet the arguments of the hon. Member for Brighton. The House had twice decided the broad question of the principle of the hon. Member for Brighton's clause, and the only grounds put forward for asking the House to reverse its decision were the technical difficulties urged *ad nauseam* by the Solicitor General. He asked the House not to be led away by those pretended difficulties—he used the word advisedly—of the hon. and learned Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman had just told them that yesterday the hon. Member for York made a proposition without Notice. Now, he did not think that statement was characterized by the right hon. Gentleman's usual candour. Necessarily he had brought forward his proposition without Notice because it was an Amendment on an amended Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman had further stated that his proposition was rejected by the House almost unanimously. He took issue with the right hon. Gentleman. Several hon. Members on the right hon. Gentleman's own side of the House had since told him they would have voted for his proposition if he had gone to a division. In withdrawing it he yielded to appeals made to him from the front Bench. The House would remember that when yesterday his noble Friend the Member for the West Riding (Viscount Milton) moved his Amendment, which was subsequently adopted without a division, the Solicitor General thought fit to use language which was anything but respectful to the noble Viscount, and anything but what was due from a Law Officer of the Crown to a Member of that House. The hon. and learned Gentleman told the House that the noble Viscount's clause would not work, but he did not condescend to say why. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley), with that acuteness which belonged to him, and with the aid of his great experience at Quarter Sessions, told the House that the clause was perfectly workable; and the fact that the Government accepted it subsequently was evidence that the right hon. Gentleman was right, and the hon. and learned Gentleman wrong. There was no difficulty in reducing to practice the principle for which the hon. Member for Brighton contended; and he entreated the House not to be deluded by the statement of the Solicitor General that there was a technical difficulty. He trusted the House would bring itself back to the position in which it stood on Saturday, and if they saw that the proposition of Mr Fawcett was a just and sound one, that they would adopt it.

Mr. FLOYER said, that, as he understood it, the question was this—How could a county rate be levied on the different divisions of a county which had been divided for election purposes? He should not for a moment dispute the authority of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley). True, there would be no great difficulty in levying a rate in one of several districts of a county; but you must not only levy the rate and receive your money, but you must know how to spend it for the parties who had paid it. Now, Somersetshire had been divided into three divisions for election purposes; and, taking it as an illustration, he asked what would happen if there was an election in one division and not in the two others, supposing the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) to be added to the Bill? It was well known that county rate was levied by fixing on some aliquot portion of 1*d.* or some other sum. Assuming that the lowest rate —¼*d.* in the pound—was levied on one division for election purposes, and that £1,000 was raised thereby, while the expenses of the election amounted to only £700 or £800, in what way was the balance to be expended? If it was paid over to the county rate, then one part of the county would be paying for the whole county, and would be thereby so far relieving the two other portions of the county of some of what they ought to pay. On the other hand, it might be said that you could credit the balance after payment of the election expenses to the portion of the county in which the money had been raised; but in what way could that balance be applied? —because for all other than election purposes the county was a whole, and the entire of the expenses of the county must be paid by rates levied at so much in the pound. It might be proposed that the money should be locked up and kept for some future election; but elections were not of such frequent occurrence in counties that any such proceeding would be satisfactory to the ratepayers. The hon. and learned Member for York (Mr. Leeman) said this was a question of principle. He (Mr. Floyer) contended that it was a question of practical arrangement. Again, it had been said that the principle of the clause was one of economy. If so, it was the economy of looking to your neighbour to pay instead of paying yourself. Until the incidence of local taxation could be settled in a more satisfactory manner the ratepayers of the counties and boroughs, who were already very heavily taxed, would look very jealously on any such proposition as that now under consideration.

Mr. CANDLISH said, it was not the practice for county authorities to levy a uniform rate of so much in the pound on the different parishes. The practice was to call for so much from each of them in a lump sum. Each union in a county was called upon to contribute its quota, according to its rateable value. At the present time certain rates were levied by union districts, and nothing would be more easy than to levy the sum necessary for defraying election expenses by a rate upon those unions which were included in the district for which the election was held. He thought this proposal would entirely get rid of the technical difficulty raised by the Solicitor General. Neither was there any necessity for levying an amount in excess of what would be actually required. The exact sum could be as easily levied.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he must represent that the narrative which the First Lord of the Treasury had given of the circumstances connected with this proviso was, no doubt unintentionally, not quite accurate. The object of the clause, as originally introduced by the hon. Member for Brighton, was to throw the expenses attendant on the machinery of elections upon the ratepayers for whose benefit it was assumed that Members of Parliament existed, and so help to get rid of that element of vulgar display which had always been so corrupting an element in elections, and which threatened to be hereafter still more rampant. At the same time it contained a provision to protect the constituencies from the contingent risk of their being infested by the pest of sham candidates advertising themselves at the hustings. The clause was well considered and fully sifted, and finally read a second time in its complete form by a not inconsiderable majority, remembering the number of Members up in town. At this stage questions were raised as to the details of the saving provision, some of them in a friendly spirit, by Members who approved of the principle, but who were doubtful as to the particular machinery. His hon. Friend the Member for Brighton, although in possession of the field, in the most good-humoured spirit waived his advantage, and consented to leave the form of the proviso open to further discussion by withdrawing the second paragraph of the clause which embodied his own scheme. That concession reduced the clause to the naked condition of an enactment that the expenses of the hustings, polling booths, and so forth were to be thrown upon the rates. But he (Mr. Beresford Hope) appealed to the recollection of the House if an honourable understanding had not been arrived at that if the clause, which had been read a second time in complete proportions, should pass in its naked form, it was hereafter to be clothed upon, if possible, the Report. In short, if it were allowed to pass, it was to do so *de bene esse*, and without prejudice, with the understanding that some limiting provision was to be appended when it came up upon the Report. Accordingly, on the second division, it was again affirmed, and by a majority only diminished by a single vote. The honourable understanding regulated the votes, and the principle of the clause was affirmed under the idea—shared by friends and by opponents—that a proviso would be added to it before it came on for the final trial of the Report, which might act as a safeguard against the constituencies being put to any unnecessary expense by vexatious or illusory candidatures. How did Her Majesty's Government use the opportunity? Standing, as he was doing, in the somewhat invidious position of separating himself on this question from the party with which he usually acted, he would refrain from reflections on them; but he must say that he thought the Government would have taken not only the more straightforward but the more politic course if it had—also without prejudice—while not flinching from its opposition to the clause at the proper time, yet co-operated in bringing it into the most perfect, and, from its own point of view, least objectionable form, by aiding in framing as workable a proviso as possible. The Government might, with perfect honour, have done so, and yet reserved its final vote against the clause in its entirety, just as no Member is precluded by his aid, contributed in Committee, from voting against the third reading of any Bill. It was an insult to their common sense to pretend that the Government could not, if it had pleased, have found something which would hold water. But, instead of taking the generous course, what did it do? It adopted the strategic policy of beating the supporters of the clause in detail by setting up the Solicitor General to oppose everybody's plan and propose none of his own. Every suggestion from every quarter which had been made upon the preceding day met with the derision of the Treasury Bench. That of the noble Lord the Member for the West Riding fared no better until there uprose the Nestor of the Conservative party, his right hon. Friend the Member for Oxfordshire, to show, with his characteristic broad sense and long experience, that it was very reasonable and perfectly easy to be worked, and the Government had to swallow it. Then came the division, and it was not surprising that the Government by its tactics should have snatched a majority. He was not ashamed to confess that it was a question with himself—as he felt sure it was with the other Members on that side who supported the hon. Member for Brighton—whether he would vote for the clause in its naked form, stripped as it was of the safeguards afforded by the proviso. But he reflected that it was not the fault of the hon. Member for Brighton, nor of himself, that the House was placed in that false position, but of the Government. The principle which they desired to affirm was this, and it was the office of the Government to see that, if carried, it should be put into working order, while if the office were forced upon the Treasury Bench, there was another place, and further opportunities, in which to do its duty. Accordingly, he voted without misgiving with his hon. Friend the Member for Brighton, as he now intended to do again. He would now, before he concluded, briefly state the general principle on which he had all through the debates upon this Bill supported not only the present proposition, but all others having for their object to simplify and to cheapen the process of elections. He found himself face to face with the enormous addition to the constituencies created by the Reform Act. This increase was in the main made up out of the least educated and most impressionable classes of the community. These were the persons who were not only the most accessible to direct monetary influence, but to the juggling cajolery of noise, and pomp, and bluster, and stage play, of which demagogues, and the wholesale buyers of constituencies, would well know how to make full use, but of which the intellectual and conscientious candidate would be ashamed to avail himself. This system of histrionic electioneering had attained its climax in America, and some amusingly flagrant instances of its abuse during the pending contest for the Presidency had got in the English papers. With the increase of voting numbers in the country the increase of the same bad system might be apprehended, unless a check were put to it by a series of enactments providing, as far as laws can do, for a reasonable degree of electoral purity, such as the prohibition of committee-rooms being held in public-houses, and for the encouragement of cheapness and simplicity in the machinery of contests. If the cost of hustings and of polling-places were left, as heretofore, to the candidates, there would be most salient danger of jobbery on one side and of corruption on the other, which might best be met by the simple process of making the constituencies themselves feel an interest in the economy of their production. In fact, dispassionately viewed, cheapness of elections would in the time to come be as truly a Conservative safeguard as it would be a really Liberal policy. As a political question, cheap and decent elections would be the best guarantee against the House being flooded by a combination of demagogues and of plutocrats, while from the social side the more simple and the more business-like elections were made, the better would it be for general morality.

Mr. HENLEY said, that the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope) had with great ability and with some considerable success placed the question upon a false issue. The provision respecting the counties was of trifling importance, and applied only to those counties which were divided into districts for election purposes. The main question before the House was, whether or not the Bill was to be re-committed. The hon. Member for Cambridge had not quite accurately stated what had occurred. In a very thin Committee, not comprising one quarter of the Members of the House, the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton was introduced with a proviso or rider to make provision for deposits at the time of the nomination, or, as the clause originally stood, before the nomination. It was speedily seen that that proviso was not a good one, and the hon. Member himself undertook to bring up another proviso upon the Report. It was perfectly true that the clause was agreed to on two divisions, but it was carried by narrow majorities, and it was the constitutional practice for the House on the Report to review what had been done in Committee. On Tuesday, Notice was given on the part of the Government of their intention to strike out the clause; but, considering that on Wednesday there were several divisions in the course of the discussion on the Bill, and on Thursday two more divisions before this particular clause was reached, the Notice relative to it could not be considered very short; for any one observing what was on the Paper of Business for Wednesday must have been very sanguine if he thought that the clause had the least chance of being considered on that day. What happened on Thursday? On that day the House, upon the proposition of the proviso of the hon. Member for Brighton—which proviso the hon. Member deemed the necessary adjunct of his clause — was occupied for a long time in discussing what sort of proviso should be framed, and there were hardly two Members agreed on what ought to be done, how it should be done, or, when done, who should be made to pay for it; and the natural result of the prevailing confusion was that no proviso was agreed to. The Amendment of the noble Viscount (Viscount Milton) merely declaring how the cost should fall on counties which were divided, had nothing to do with the general principle of the hon. Member for Brighton's clause. It was now proposed to re-commit the Bill, but if that course were adopted the whole of the previous proceedings might be repeated, the clause being again inserted in Committee, and again struck out on the Report. That would not be a very convenient process to go through at the end of July. The clause having been struck out in a House of 200, and by a larger majority than that by which it had been carried in Committee, the wisest course would be to adhere to the last decision. Nothing had been done but what was quite regular and in conformity with the Orders of the House, adopted to prevent anything being carried into effect of which the House might not be generally aware. He was not fond of the Bill, and he should not care if it were lost altogether; but he could not understand why the parties who were anxious for its passing should now be contending for a matter which had no connection with corrupt practices at all. For himself he did not see why those expenses should be thrown on the poor ratepayers—a course of proceeding that he did not think he should describe wrongly if he said it was dirty.

Mr. MAGUIRE said, if he understood the First Minister of the Crown aright he rather regretted that the proposition of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) was not carried with a proper proviso, and, as the Liberal party were anxious that it should not be lost, he believed that three or four Gentlemen, if they were earnest in the matter, could in three or four minutes prepare a perfect clause. He would remind the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) that on one division the proposal was carried in Committee by a majority of 84 to 74. He did not think that a thin House.

Mr. READ said, he was anxious to reduce the costs of Parliamentary Elections, but he objected to do it at the expense of the ratepayers. If it were possible to levy a fair rate for the boroughs it would be very difficult to make it with any amount of justice on the counties. One-half of the freeholders of his division of the county lived in Parliamentary boroughs in the city of Norwich or out of the county, and besides that one-half of the ratepayers were not voters, and the result would be that in his county the great bulk of the expense would fall on the non-electors and farmers of the county.

Mr. J. STUART MILL: The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down seems to think that unexpensiveness and purity of election is a matter which affects the electors only, and that the non-electors have no interest in the matter—a view in which I confess I do not share. I do not propose to revive the question of how far the Government has treated us fairly in regard to this matter. We must accept the statement of the First Minister of the Crown that at the time when he replied to the question of the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) the Government had no intention of opposing this clause. But when the right hon. Gentleman proceeds to give a history—the correctness of which is countersigned by the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) — of what has passed, and says that the House have rejected as ineffectual all propositions to reconcile the scheme of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) with the desirableness of giving security against vexatious contests, I cannot assent to the correctness of his statement. There was not one of the proposals made which would not, in the opinion of the supporters of the clause, have proved perfectly effectual. The objections did not turn on the efficacy of the proposals, but on which of them was most likely to pass the House. They were overthrown by the action of the Government, but the right hon. Gentleman has not shown that there would be any difficulty in working them. The course pursued fully illustrates the old proverb "None so deaf as those who won't hear." Does anyone think that if the right hon. Gentleman applied his mind to the subject every difficulty would not quickly vanish? We have an apt illustration of the mountain-like magnitude that molehill objections may assume, in the argument of one hon. Gentleman—that if a little more money than enough is taken from the county rate for the purpose of paying election expenses it will be impossible to know what to do with the balance. We have heard of lions in the path, but difficulties such as these are snails or earwigs in the path, and not lions. Were the Government aware of the feeling of satisfaction that went through the country along with the news that the clause of the hon. Member for Brighton was carried, they would, I think, instead of throwing technical difficulties in the way of its adoption, rather bring it in in the form of a separate Bill than lose the chance of its passing. I hope, therefore, that the Motion to re-commit the Bill will be carried.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he was quite ready for a division, and if the House were of that opinion his object would be answered. He would remind the House that there was not even a Notice of a clause on the Paper to be introduced into the Bill if the Bill was re-committed. With the various Amendments that had been proposed and the discussion that had taken place upon them, what chance was there of their agreeing to a clause?

Mr. CORRANCE said: As one of the county Members on this side of the House, who upon a former occasion expressed opinions not in accordance with the views of those among whom we sit, perhaps I may ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments, which may suffice to explain myself upon certain points. Of this whole Bill let me first say this, that it seems to me to possess a value beyond that of the mere penalties inflicted for an offence—beyond that even of a measure having a deterrent effect. Sir, it expresses a moral sentiment which upon the country will not be lost, and which will strengthen the hands of Parliament to govern this country. Modern Governments must rest upon respect. Now, Sir, my approval of this clause, as a general principle, is also based upon this—it will add to the confidence of the country in those who are sent here, in certain respects. My reasons for this I have already set forth, and with these I will not now trouble the House at further length. But, Sir, what is said? That ratepayers will object. Now, Sir, one word as to this. By those who say so, it seems to be assumed that the ratepayer is a thing—a troglodyte, if you will—of a special class, *sui generis*, and uniform in his habits and thoughts. Is this so? In truth, I think not. Sir, the ratepayer is a creature of very various habits, ways, and thoughts, if I may say so without offence, after the many remarkable descriptions of him we have heard, not wholly dissimilar from even Members of this House. You cannot correctly predicate of him that he is simply and unreservedly opposed to rates. And yet this is what is said in his behalf. Now, Sir, let me qualify this, and admit that he is opposed to payment of rates unless he can see some major advantage accruing to himself. Well, it may even be so in this case; especially among the more acute. Sir, I object to an increase of rates, on the plain ground that they are unjust, and perhaps it is for this very reason that I do not object to this. How and where and by whom is the battle to be fought? By the representation of ratepayers sent up to this House. If you give the ratepayer a direct interest in the matter, will his battle be worse fought? It is time that this was understood: protected interests make a poor fight. Sir, those who think that this question of the rates can be won by mere words or out-door agitation make a great mistake, and they miscalculate their means towards the end they would promote. The Market Bill and the malt tax, far minor points, might have made them wiser than this. Omelettes like this are not made without breaking eggs; and we do but clip the shell in this case. It is time that ratepayers should understand this. But, Sir, undoubtedly there are ratepayers of an unintelligent class, not conversant with these public affairs or their own interest in such a case; and to them, for a brief moment, you may make your appeal with success. But remember, Sir, this—that behind, or rather before, such men, we have now organized bodies of intelligent men of the middle class to whom we can appeal, and who will see their interest in this measure, and public opinion will follow their opinion in such a case; and that opinion will endorse the expediency of this. That, Sir, is the principle which I on Saturday expressed by my vote. But, Sir, when we thus sanction a general principle we have another duty to perform, and it is in this instance a very important duty—to protect the ratepayer from the misuse of the public purse. We must have a proviso sufficiently large to do this. It did not seem to me that any proposition yesterday sufficiently met the case, and upon that ground I gave my vote. We must have a money deposit of a substantial class. Now, Sir, what has been said against this by the right hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie)? That it is unconstitutional to fine an Englishman who wants to make a speech. Sir, I wish it was unconstitutional to talk nonsense, and that we could clap a fine upon it—yes, even in this House. I do not allude to the right hon. Member when I say this; but I do say that I would even double such a fine if I could. Now, Sir, in the proviso now proposed I do think we have such a guarantee of a substantial class; and that, coupled with it, the clause deserves our support. What other objection to this—that it will not work? The Solicitor General moved its rejection; but he assigned no reason for this, or, if he did, one of this class — I think I have heard such from counsel when a particularly stupid jury was addressed—"Gentlemen, you are so intelligent I needn't enlighten you; so well informed that I won't venture to instruct you; and of course you have made up your mind upon the point." But suppose, Sir, he helps us a little as to this, and deals with the difficulty—not so very great — of an enactment for a separate rate. Sir, I at least believe that he will confer a great boon on that ratepaying class; and they will gladly erect in their market-places, not perhaps a statue, but that hustings upon which he will be triumphantly returned to the House without charge to him or expense.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 102; Noes 91: Majority 11.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

REGULATION OF RAILWAYS BILL.

[BILL 142.]

[*Lords.*] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 13 (Liability of Company during Sea Transit).

MR. DIXON moved to omit the clause. Its object was to relieve the railway companies from the sea risk which they at present incurred by booking and conveying parcels over a route a portion of which was by sea. He contended that it was undesirable to relieve these companies from a responsibility for which they were to a great extent compensated by the magnitude of the transactions which they undertook.

MR. STEPHEN CAVE thought it unjust that the railway companies should be subjected to a risk to which ordinary shipowners were not liable. Steamship companies, which are sometimes competitors with railways, were protected by their bills of lading, and the wording of this clause was really taken from one of those bills of lading. The clause was simply to leave an absolute freedom of contract between all parties. Everyone must admit the great advantage to the public of through booking. The railway companies said they could not continue this, if they were to be subject to greater liability than shipowners, during the transit in vessels over which they had frequently no control. For the public convenience, and more particularly in the case of the conveyance of cattle from Ireland to this country, it was desirable that this clause should be passed, especially as it would by no means exempt the railway companies from any responsibility they might incur through negligence.

MR. CANDLISH said, he thought it unjust that the railway companies should incur this risk without receiving any compensation in the way of increased rates. For the public convenience, however, it was, he thought, unadvisable that this clause should be adopted, inasmuch as the real remedy, in his opinion, lay in an increased charge upon the parcels.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he believed that this was just one of those cases where the railway company could insure and no one else could. As the clause stood it would practically bar insurance.

MR. GILPIN said, that the system of insurance hitherto in vogue had not been profitable to the railway companies, and that it was easy for merchants and others to have a running policy if they chose.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 14 to 16, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 17 (Communication between Passengers and the Company's Servants).

MR. HENLEY said, he objected to limiting the provisions enforcing means of communication between passengers and guards to trains running longer distances than twenty miles.

MR. STEPHEN CAVE said, that though a great number of inventions for securing a communication between the passengers and the guard had been submitted to the Board of Trade, he did not believe that any plan yet tried had been found altogether satisfactory. Neither the system at work on the Continent nor that which had been tried at home was quite perfect. That very day a letter had been received from the Commissioner of Railways in Ohio, giving a description of a communication by the simple method of a cord which seemed to work well even round the sharp curves of American railways. Under these circumstances he thought it would not be well to force the companies to a large expenditure without giving some time for further trial; but as to the exact date that ought to be inserted in the clause, he was in the hands of the Committee.

MR. AYRTON said, that on the Continent, when the communication was made by a passenger, the guard went to the carriage from which it had proceeded. The construction of the permanent way on the lines in this country did not permit of that being done on our railways; and as any plan yet tried in England consisted of a single signal, the guard could not know what was meant unless he stopped the train. To do that would in many cases be attended with the greatest danger to the lives of the whole of the passengers.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, that the principle of having a communication between passengers and guard had already been approved by that House. A means of such communication had been supplied in the express trains of the South-Eastern Railway for a very considerable time, and he believed that no passenger had been found mischievous enough to make use of it for any idle purpose.

The word "April" substituted for "January."

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. STEPHEN CAVE, the following new clauses were agreed to and added to the Bill:—

After Clause 19—"V. Light Railways.—(Order for construction and working of Railway as a light Railway); (Conditions and regulations for light Railway); (Publication of regulations)."

Before Clause 23—"(Printed copies of shareholders address book); (Extension of scope of 'Railway Companies Powers Act, 1864,' 27 and 28 Vic. c. 20).'"

After Clause 28—"(Extension of time)."

MR. BAZLEY moved, after Clause 12 to insert the following clauses :—

"II. Management. — Company may appoint or authorize appointment of executive committee; Power to separate the capital and revenue management; Capital expenditure to be voted at general meetings; Company in general meeting may remove directors; Preference holders on certain questions to have a right to vote; Questions may be decided by voting papers; Report of question and voting papers to be sent to shareholders; Secretary to receive proxies and voting papers."

MR. STEPHEN CAVE, while admitting the advantage of the objects aimed at by the hon. Member, objected to these clauses, some of which would effect a revolution in railway administration. Many of them no doubt were useful, and he had given, under the clause extending the Railway Companies Powers Act, increased facility for adopting them. Of others he might say with all respect that they were suggested during the railway panic, and would over-ride Acts of Parliament under which the railways had been constructed. They went, in his opinion, much too far to admit of their being accepted.

MR. AYRTON said, that it should be recollected that directors had the power to carry out the provisions of those clauses without any Act of Parliament.

Clauses *negatived seriatim.*

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN moved in Part III., after Clause 17, to insert the following clause :—

(Smoking compartments for all classes.)

"And all Railway Companies shall, from and after the passing of this Act, in every passenger train, provide smoking compartments for each class of passengers."

MR. LEEMAN said, that some trains had so few carriages that two sets could not be provided.

MR. W. B. BEAUMONT said, he was chairman of a company whose trains sometimes consisted only of one compartment.

Mr. H. B. Sheridan

MR. J. STUART MILL suggested that the provision should be made to apply only to trains of a certain length. The abuse of smoking had become so great, and the violation of the companies' by-laws so frequent, that the smoking in trains had become a positive nuisance. Scarcely a railway carriage could be entered in which smoking was not going on, or which was not tainted with stale tobacco.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, he was in favour of smoking compartments. Journeying on the Charing Cross and Cannon Street line the other day he found a youth in one of the carriages with a great deal more hair on his face than brains in his head smoking vigorously; a lady was in the carriage, and presuming she objected to the smoking, he asked her to go into another compartment with him. He conducted the lady to another compartment and returned to the contest with the young man. But smokers always had their own way.

MR. LAING said, he thought the matter had better be left to supply and demand; several railway companies had already provided smoking carriages, because they found it was to their interest to do so.

MR. STEPHEN CAVE sympathized with the supporters of the clause. As a non-smoker he had often suffered severely from the violation of the by-laws against smoking; but, while admitting that railway companies had been rather slow to respond to the wants of travellers in this respect, he thought it better to leave the question to be settled by public opinion.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, public opinion in this instance was swayed by a majority of smokers. It was a case of oppression by a majority of a minority.

COLONEL W. STUART said, he would support the clause. Anyone, no matter under what circumstances, asking a smoker to desist was generally abused like a pickpocket.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he would propose to withdraw the clause and bring up an amended one at the next stage of the Bill to meet the objection raised.

Clause *withdrawn.*

MR. KENDALL moved a new clause—Carriages to be provided exclusively for women.

Clause *negatived.*

MR. LEEMAN said, he had a series of clauses to propose, but as it was now so near the hour at which the Sitting must be suspended, he would bring them up on the Report.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN proposed the following clause :—

(Railway Companies to be liable to penalties in case they shall provide Trains for Prize fights.)

" Any Railway Company that shall knowingly hire or otherwise provide any Special Train for the purpose of conveying parties to or to be present at any Prize fight, or who shall stop any Ordinary Train to convenience or accommodate any parties attending a Prize fight, at any place not an ordinary station on their line, shall be liable to a penalty, to be recovered in a summary way before two Justices of the county in which such Prize fight shall be held or shall be attempted to be held, of such sum, not exceeding £500 and not less than £200, as such Justices shall determine, one-half of such penalty to be paid to the party at whose suit the summons shall be issued, and the other half to be paid to the Treasurer of the county in which such Prize fight shall be held or shall be attempted to be held, in aid of the county rate ; and service of the summons under which the penalty is sought to be enforced on the Secretary of the Company, at his office ten days before the day of hearing, shall be suficient to give the Justices before whom the case shall come jurisdiction to hear and determine the case."

MR. CLAY said, he thought there was a considerable amount of false philanthropy in this matter. If time permitted, he had a great deal to say against this clause. A prize fight might be a very disgusting exhibition, and those who thought it was were not obliged to go to it. He did not go to prize fights ; but he was of opinion that when we got rid of prize fighting the knife would appear.

Clause *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress ; to sit again *this day.*

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT said, he rose to move that the House at its rising should adjourn till Monday. It was a hard thing that hon. Members who had spent their days and nights in the House for the last week should have to come down again on Saturday.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY rose to Order. He believed that the Motion for Adjournment must be put before a Motion for fixing the adjournment to a particular day.

MR. SPEAKER was understood to say that the hon. Member for Manchester was in Order, though the course mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hardy) was the one usually pursued.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT said, that there was occasions when a Saturday Sitting was perfectly legitimate ; but they were not in that position now, and he therefore objected to their having to assemble to-morrow.

MR. MILNER GIBSON seconded the Motion.

MR. DISRAELI : I regret that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Jacob Bright) should have found it necessary to commence the Business of this evening by such a Motion. There is no necessity for anticipating when the adjournment will occur. That depends on the progress which will be made this evening. The House may make a compensatory progress—one which will compensate for what occurred last night. But for what happened then — owing to too strict interpretation of the rules of the House—there would probably have been no necessity for anticipating a meeting to-morrow. Such a necessity may even now be prevented if the House is in the cue for making progress to night ; but if not, then so far as the Government can influence the decision of the House, we shall certainly do everything to expedite the progress of the Bill that is now to be considered. I hope the hon. Gentleman will not ask the House to come yet to a decision with regard to the adjournment, because later in the evening we shall be able to form a better conclusion as to the course we ought to take. The hon. Gentleman has not been long in the House ; but so far as I have observed, he has never taken any step that did not entitle him to the respect and consideration of the House. But I observe that the Motion has been seconded by a right hon. Gentleman who has great experience of the House, and I am surprised that a Gentleman, once a Minister of the Crown, knowing, as he must, how important is the discreet management of the time of the House with a view to the proper conduct of Public Business, should have advised the hon. Gentleman to take a course which I certainly do not think will recommend itself to the general opinion of the House.

MR. MILNER GIBSON : If the right hon. Gentleman had not referred to me, I should not have thought it necessary to remark that it is in consequence of hon. Gentlemen opposite who are interested in the Bill, not thinking it worth while to come down here last evening to make a

House that we are called upon to take the exceptional course we have taken in view of a probable Sitting on Saturday. Now, Sir, I contend that it is not the business of the Opposition to make the House. I contend that it is not fair to call upon Members of this House to address the House, and to propose Motions and important Amendments upon a Bill before the House, in the absence of a great proportion of hon. Members who could have been here, and who were absent. It is not fair to call upon them to address their arguments to some six or eight or ten Members. It may be very well for Gentlemen to dine, and enjoy themselves, and come down here at ten or eleven o'clock to interrupt Business. There was nobody here. There are a sufficient number of officials of the Government to make a House. ["No!"] Well, very nearly. And then where were the farmers' friends last night? There were no supporters of this extraordinary Bill here. We, who are opposed to the Bill, were not bound to come down in violent haste. However that is not now the question before the House. Now I will take leave to say that when a change was made in the Standing Orders of this House, by which hon. Members were deprived of the opportunity which they had enjoyed for years of bringing forward Motions upon the Adjournment on Friday, it was agreed that another opportunity should be substituted for it. I remember that when Lord Palmerston proposed the change, he said he would always put Supply on a Friday, and hon. Members should have the same opportunity of bringing forward their Motions and making statements upon a Motion to go into Supply as they formerly had upon a Motion for the Adjournment of the House from Friday until Monday. A Resolution was passed that during the time Supply was open and Committee of Supply could be moved, it should be moved always on a Friday; and that the House without a special Motion should, as a matter of course, stand adjourned from Friday until Monday; and I remember that Lord Palmerston said in that way hon. Members would have the opportunity of making Motions which they would otherwise have had, if the change had not been made; and that the Government, in case the propositions on Committee of Supply did not occupy the whole evening, should have the opportunity of moving some Vote in Supply. But now Supply is closed, and therefore I contend that the pledge cannot be kept with the House unless the Motion that the House at its rising be adjourned till Monday is made at the commencement of Business. In the hon. Clerk's (Sir Erskine May's) Work on Parliamentary Practice, it is stated that, inasmuch as it is not an ordinary thing to sit on Saturday, it is necessary that there should be a special Motion that the House at its rising on Friday should adjourn till Saturday, if it be so intended. The old Motion to adjourn till Monday was intended to avoid the possibility of an unnecessary meeting on Saturday, and when the House intends to sit on Saturday it is the invariable practice that there should be a special Motion for that purpose. Now, Sir, I object to sit on Saturday, and I therefore support the Motion of the hon. Member for Manchester. Private Members with Motions expect to bring them on on the Motion for Adjournment. I contend that there is a pledge to this House that they should have a right to bring forward these Motions. Lord Palmerston stated that this House was the mouthpiece of the nation, and that he would not deprive the Members of this House of this right of expressing their opinions. Last Friday the hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) made this Motion, and there was no objection then—and the Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright) has made this Motion on the grounds, first, that he objects to sit on Saturday, and, next, that he is unwilling that Members should lose the opportunity of a right which had been given them by a distinct pledge. I should be glad to know from some Member of the Government whether what I have stated is not correct. I know of no one since I have had a seat in this House who has shown a more earnest desire to preserve the privileges of independent Members of this House than the right hon. Gentleman now at the head of the Government. He has always raised his voice to preserve them, and he ought to do so now. I repeat it is not fair to ask the House to sit on Saturday because there was no House last night. That was the fault of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Only two Members of the Protectionist party were present last night, (the hon. Member for East Norfolk and the hon. Member for South Essex). Why were the rest not here? If the supporters of the Government had made a House they could have saved hon. Members the inconvenience of sitting on the Saturday. I have been informed by several hon. Members, Friends of this Bill, that they are very much averse to sitting to-morrow. To myself it would be most inconvenient. I am, of course, ready to sacrifice my own personal convenience; but I am not willing to see the privileges of independent Members violated, nor am I disposed to support the unusual course of meeting on Saturday when no sufficient ground exists for such a proceeding. I shall certainly support the course taken by my hon. Friend.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: The honesty and candour of the right hon. Gentleman are so well known in this House, and also the manner in which he has conducted the opposition to a Bill before the House, that of course everyone will appreciate the language he has now used. If the right hon. Gentleman, with the candour and honesty which are so conspicuous in him, will rise in his place and say it is for the sake of independent Members he has made the speech he has just addressed to us, and if he will tell us it has nothing to do with that factious opposition to the Bill—

MR. MILNER GIBSON: I deny that any Minister of the Crown has the right to say that any Member is offering a "factious opposition." I ask that the words be taken down. [*Cries of* "Order" and "Chair," provoked by the right hon. Gentleman rising several times after he had resumed his seat.]

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the House, at the commencement of its sitting, to conduct itself with more moderation. The Motion which has been made is not an unusual one; on the contrary, it is a perfectly regular and justifiable Motion. The Standing Order is as follows:—

> "That while the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means are open, the House, when it meets on Friday, shall, at its rising, stand adjourned until the following Monday, without any question being put, unless the House shall otherwise resolve."

This implies that the regular rule of the House during the continuance of Supply is that there should be an adjournment from Friday to Monday; but when Supply is over independent Members are provided with an opportunity to make Motions at the meeting of the House on Friday, on the Motion for Adjournment. Accordingly, last Friday the hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) moved that the House, at its rising, adjourn to Monday, and questions were raised upon the Motion. If, for the general convenience of the House, hon. Members choose to give way, they may do so; but I must certainly remind the House that the very strong expression of opinion that the course pursued by the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright) was an irregular course is not justified. He is acting quite in accordance with the Orders regulating the Business of the House.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: I am not aware, Sir, that I took any exception to the Motion.

MR. MILNER GIBSON rose to the point of Order, and amid loud cries of "Chair."

MR. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances of the case I certainly think that the expression of the right hon. Gentleman was too strong a one.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: I at once bow, Sir, to the decision you have given on that point, and I am quite willing to say I am very sorry I used any expression supposed to be irregular. I took no exception to the Motion for Adjournment from this day to Monday; but I beg to say it is not required, because this House would stand adjourned to Monday by the Order which you, Sir, have read, if no Motion was made.

MR. MILNER GIBSON: No; only during Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Supply being at an end, that no longer avails, and the Motion for Adjournment is required.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: I was remarking that if the right hon. Gentleman opposite would say he supported the Motion for the sake of independent Members——[MR. MILNER GIBSON: I did say so.]—The right hon. Gentleman did not say he did it for the sake of independent Members, but he said they had Motions upon the Paper which they would be able to bring forward on the Motion for the Adjournment. But a noble Friend of mine opposite (Lord Elcho), whose name stands first on the Paper, is not here to bring on his Motion—I presume on the supposition that there would be no such Motion for Adjournment. It is notorious that at the end of a Session, when the right hon. Gentleman has been a Member of the Government, as well as while the present Government has been in Office, sittings have been held on a Saturday when Public Business required them; and it is notorious that there is now Public Business which may necessitate a Saturday Sitting. If this night be given up to comparatively unimportant subjects, then it may be necessary to sit to-morrow; but if the House proceeds with pressing Business the occasion may not arise. It was for that reason I said the right hon. Gentleman was not acting in the interests of independent Members.

MAJOR PARKER: When an ex-Minister resorts to the contemptible course—— ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: I have already pointed out to the House that the course taken is not out of Order.

MAJOR PARKER: I beg to apologize. When an ex-Minister resorts to the dubious and unjustifiable course of trying to damage a humble Member for the agricultural interest who endeavours, as far as lies in his power, faithfully and honestly to discharge his duty, by pointing out two hon. Members below the Gangway, and saying that they were the only Members for the agricultural interest that were present, I venture to say he is guilty of a most unjustifiable remark.

MR. BLAKE said, he was one of those who had a Notice on the Paper to be discussed on the Motion for Adjournment, and for whom the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gibson) had so much consideration. But as he considered that the Cattle Market Bill was of much greater importance than his Motion, he had great pleasure in withdrawing it for the sake of securing progress to a measure in which the interests of his own country, as well as England, were concerned.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he had a Motion on the Paper which he had not put down for the purpose of obstructing the Cattle Market Bill. He had had it down several times and had withdrawn it for the sake of Public Business; and he had put it down for this evening in anticipation of the Motion for Adjournment, and in the expectation that private Members would be able to avail themselves of their privileges. As regarded the Motion of which Notice had been given by a noble Lord who was not present (Lord Elcho), he had received a letter from the noble Lord, who said he had been obliged to go to Scotland, and, if he had not, he feared that had he brought on his Motion, he would have been counted out. Seeing the present excited state of the bucolic mind of the House, he should certainly withdraw the Motion of which he had given Notice.

Mr. Gathorne Hardy

BRISTOL ELECTION.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. NEATE said, he could not forego the present opportunity of calling the attention of the Government and the House to the Report from the Select Committee on the Bristol Election Petition, because he had given way on two previous occasions; and if he consented to do so now, another opportunity might not be afforded him. He considered the purity of the British elector far more important than that of British cattle. He could not help thinking that Her Majesty's Government were very little inclined to adopt serious measures for the repression of bribery and corruption, notwithstanding the pretentious pressing forward of the Bill which had been passed, otherwise they would have advised the Crown to issue a Commission. He quite admitted the purity of the Committee that tried the Petition, but he admired their simplicity more than their purity. The Committee had reported that it did not appear to them that, considering the large constituency Bristol possessed, bribery extensively prevailed. Any one who read the evidence, and was made acquainted with the position of some of the persons who took part in that bribery, would probably come to a very different conclusion. He thought if they had had regard, not only to the cases that were actually proved, but to those witnesses who had stayed away under suspicious circumstances, their Report would have been of a more decided character. It appeared to him to be the desire of all parties that just sufficient bribery should be proved to unseat the Member, and that all the rest should be hushed up. He wished to know whether the Attorney General had read the evidence, and, if so, whether it was his intention to prosecute the bribers, two at least of whom had also been guilty of subornation of perjury? He wished also to know, supposing the offenders were out of the way, what excuse the Government could have for not offering a reward for their apprehension? He regretted that Bristol had not been disfranchised, like Yarmouth and Totnes, at least for seven years.

MR. HOWES: Sir, as Chairman of the Bristol Election Committee, I must express my opinion that a Committee has rarely met that was more anxious to come to a fair and impartial conclusion. We were bound by Act of Parliament to say whether we had any reason to believe that there had been any extensive bribery at the Election, and those words, in my opinion, clearly exclude the idea of our giving expression to a mere suspicion. The hon. and learned Gentleman, after bearing full witness to the purity of the Committee, remarked that he admired their simplicity more than their purity. Our simplicity may have led us to form a suspicion, but our feelings of justice induced us to weigh the evidence brought before us, and we had no valid reason to suppose that there was any extensive system of bribery, though bribery to a small extent was proved. We gave our verdict, and I believe it has been generally accepted as fair; at all events, it was a conscientious one. I believe my hon. and learned Friend was rarely present, if at all, during the sittings of that Committee, and I will ask him whether it is possible for anybody to put himself in the position of a Member of the Committee when he has not heard the whole of the evidence adduced, or observed the demeanour of the witnesses? The witnesses brought before us were certainly not those who on any principle of natural selection would have been chosen to elicit the truth of the matter. There was certainly sufficient evidence of bribery to unseat the Member, but a great deal of the evidence adduced was utterly disbelieved by the Committee.

MR. H. BERKELEY said, he must utterly deny that the evidence taken before the Committee, which he believed was as fair a one as ever sat, justified the supposition that corrupt practices had been carried on in Bristol to such an extent as would require the issue of a Royal Commission. No doubt bribery was carried on to a certain extent, and personation also; but suppose there were 500 such cases in a constituency of 13,000 persons, that could be no reason for proceeding against the city, or attempting to disfranchise it. He did not know whether Her Majesty's Law Officers would think it worth their while to crush the poor wretches implicated in these practices, many of whom had been driven to them by want, and some of whom had perjured themselves for 6*s*.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he regretted that he had not had leisure to read the evidence taken before the Committee from beginning to end, but so far as he had read it he entirely differed from the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Mr. Neate), who thought that the investigation had been conducted upon the plan of bringing forward as many cases of bribery as were necessary to unseat the sitting Member and of then going no further. As far as he (the Attorney General) could make out, every case of bribery was brought forward and pressed, in many instances upon most disreputable evidence. The Committee came to the conclusion that the evidence was not sufficient to authorize them in recommending that the proceedings usual in grave circumstances of bribery and corruption should be instituted. He had found that extensive bribery was not charged, nor was personal bribery charged against the candidate at all. The description of bribery rife at the last Election for Bristol seemed to have been carried on amongst the lower classes of the constituency, and not to have been instigated by the personal agents of the Member or the Member himself. He should like to know whether the hon. and learned Gentleman thought that it was the duty of the Attorney General in every case in which it was reported that there had been bribery at an Election, to take upon himself the office of public prosecutor, and institute proceedings against those charged with the offence. From that view he, at all events, begged to express his dissent, for it was utterly impossible, with the various duties which he had to discharge, that any one occupying the position of Attorney General could make himself thoroughly acquainted with all the evidence which was given before Committees in these cases. He quite admitted, at the same time, that in those instances in which it was proved that extensive bribery had prevailed it was necessary that those implicated in it should not go unpunished. Bribes it would appear were in the case of Bristol offered and received; but the result of blindly rushing into a prosecution when the persons who would come forward as witnesses were parties to those transactions, would be, as was well-known, that the Bill would be thrown out, or at all events that the proceedings would end in failure. Whenever a case came before him in which, in his judgment, it was the duty of the Attorney General, as the legal representative of the Government, to interfere, he should be prepared to do so. It was his intention to look through the rest of the evidence. But having regard to the Report of the Committee in the present instance, and to the fact that a new body of electors were coming into existence in Bristol, he looked upon it as unjust that such a penalty as the hon. and learned Gentleman proposed should be inflicted.

CRETAN INSURRECTION.—QUESTION.

Mr. MONK said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, further Correspondence respecting the Disturbances in Crete, in continuation of Correspondence presented to Parliament, May 21, 1868. He thought he was justified in putting the question to the noble Lord, seeing that the documents to which he referred had been published in the *St. Petersburg Gazette,* and were therefore now public documents. He had himself received authentic information from Crete up to the 5th of July to the effect that the insurrection was still in full force, and that the Turkish general and the Turkish army were in a desponding state, and believed it to be impossible for them to reconquer the country. He regretted that the noble Lord had expressed his intention not to interfere, except by friendly advice to the Porte; but he acknowledged that in taking that course the noble Lord was carrying out the policy of non-intervention in foreign affairs which had been sanctioned by the House, and had now obtained for some years. In asking the noble Lord whether he would lay on the Table any further Correspondence which he might have received, he must say that he thought nothing but the independence of Crete and its separation from Turkey would satisfy the brave men whose heroic struggle deserved more sympathy than they had obtained from the present Parliament.

Lord STANLEY: The only Answer that I can give the hon. Member is that since the month of May last—at which time I laid on the table Papers on the subject of Crete — no information has reached me which is of the slightest general interest or importance. The fact is that the state of things in the island has continued pretty much as it was. The attention of European diplomacy has been diverted to other subjects. I have looked through all the despatches which I have received since the period I have named, and I do not think there is any one of them of such general interest or importance as to make it worth while to lay it on the table of the House. It is not at all a question of keeping back any facts or any statements of opinion on grounds of policy. It simply comes to this—that there are no Papers on the subject of Crete which I think either the House or the hon. Member would at all care to see. The Reports are of the most commonplace kind. The state of things in the island, I repeat, has continued very much what it was; and no considerable operations have occurred in any quarter.

THE METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET.
QUESTION.

Mr. AYRTON said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Whether he has made any arrangement with the Corporation of the City of London for carrying out this scheme of agricultural protection, or whatever it might be called? The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated a few days ago, in answer to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton (Mr. Milner Gibson), that no definite arrangement had been come to with the Corporation on the subject. Since then, however, a Notice had been put on the Paper, developing a scheme under which it appeared that the metropolis would be taxed generally by a rate to be levied on all cattle brought to Smithfield Market. That Notice had disappeared from the Paper, and he should, therefore, like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any understanding had been come to with the Corporation of London for carrying out the provisions of the Bill; and, what in fact was the exact state of the negotiations between the Government and the Corporation on the matter?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, there was no agreement or understanding with the City Corporation. An Amendment of which Notice had been given by his noble Friend the Vice President of the Council had been withdrawn from the Paper, because they understood from the highest authority that it was against the Standing Orders. That Amendment therefore would not be proceeded with.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he wished to know whether it was not the fact that the Court of Common Council, or the Markets Committee of that body, had been called together to give an answer to the proposal which was to have been submitted by the Government, although that proposal was in violation of the Standing Orders of that House, and whether, through not taking care to inform themselves beforehand that their proposal was irregular, the Government had not adopted a course calculated to place the Corporation in a false position?

MR. LIDDELL said, that before the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council rose, he wished to repeat his Question of the morning respecting the reported outbreak of the cattle plague in Russia.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, that since the Question of his hon. Friend the Member for Northumberland (Mr. Liddell) was put to him at the Morning Sitting, he had ascertained that information on the subject had been received at the Office, and he found the report alluded to by his hon. Friend was perfectly true. There had been an outbreak of Siberian plague in Livonia and other provinces, and also of rinderpest near St. Petersburg. Cattle plague had also broken out in Lower Egypt, at Gheza and Gezera, near Cairo, and other districts. In answer to the Question of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen), he had to state that that clause was framed on the proposition of one of the officers of the Corporation of the City of London; that that officer was mainly instrumental in drawing the clause; that he had laid it on the table after that gentleman had drawn it, and that he was not responsible for its informality.

FOREIGN CATTLE TRADE.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. HEADLAM said, he rose to call the attention of the Government and the House to a practical grievance seriously affecting the interests of his constituents at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Some years ago his constituents had an important and valuable trade in foreign cattle, partly derived from Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein, about the best grazing country in the whole world. That trade had contributed materially to increase the comforts and luxuries of the people of the district, but owing to the operation of the Orders in Council enforced by the Government it had been practically destroyed. Grave injury had been done to his constituents through their not being allowed to import any cattle from the districts to which he had referred except under restrictions that were fatal to the carrying on of the trade. He had sought to bring about a reasonable compromise, under which the law now existing in France might be applied to this country. The Government of France was a paternal Government. It undoubtedly sought the welfare of the people, that people being agricultural, and it put a stop to the importation of cattle where there was danger, but where there was no danger the importation was entirely free. It was most harsh to his constituents that they should be precluded from having cattle introduced into their district against which no objection could be made. These stories of the breaking out of the cattle plague abroad were certainly very opportune; but if the cattle plague had broken out in Egypt, or at St. Petersburg, or in Livonia, then let the Privy Council stop the importation from those places, but not from places where the disease did not exist. The practical effect of the present Orders in Council was to destroy the foreign cattle trade in his district. The evils inflicted under those Orders were unnecessary and uncalled-for, and he called upon the Government to give some assurance that they would not perpetuate the present system.

MR. NORWOOD said, he thought that his constituents at Hull also had a right to complain of their not being allowed the same privilege as was possessed by the ports of Liverpool and Southampton. The port of Liverpool had the advantage of being represented by two Gentlemen who sat on the Ministerial side of the House. Some time ago the Government was urged to allow the port of Liverpool to import cattle from Spain, Portugal, and France, and that privilege was conceded by the Government. The port of Southampton, which had also the advantage of having a Member who sat on the Ministerial side, obtained a similar privilege. Now, why had not that privilege been extended to Hull and other Northern ports? The reason seemed to be that as the hon. Members for these towns sat upon the Liberal side of the House their remonstrances had less weight with the Government. There was no good reason for stopping cattle coming from Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. The noble Lord the Vice President of the Council told him the other day that there was no port in Denmark proper from which cattle could be exported, but the fact was that there were five such ports. The cattle trade of Hull had been ruined. In 1865 no less than £27,000 was paid for the conveyance of cattle to Hull, and they sent in one year 28,000 head of cattle into the interior, but the restrictions which were imposed entirely cut off this supply, and the profits of merchants and importers from this source had vanished. The proper policy would be to stop cattle coming from infected districts, to place regulations upon cattle coming from suspected districts, and to leave the rest of the trade perfectly free. He challenged the noble Lord to deny this statement, that in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway there had not been a single case of cattle plague.

Mr. J. B. SMITH said, he believed that before long they would have to get up the same battle against the beef and mutton laws as they formerly waged against the Corn Laws. The hon. Member for Norfolk (Mr. Read) furnished him with a paper yesterday which stated that there were 22,000,000 sheep in this country, and that 5,500 had died from the disease. There could be no pretence for keeping out sheep upon this ground.

Mr. READ: The sheep brought the cattle plague.

Mr. J. B. SMITH: There could be no doubt that the object was to place obstructions in the way of the importation of foreign beasts.

Mr. M'LAREN said, that his constituents suffered from the prohibition of which the hon. Member for Newcastle complained. Leith—the port of Edinburgh—as hon. Members knew, was the great entrepôt of the foreign cattle trade of Scotland. A very large number of animals had been brought there, not merely for consumption in Edinburgh, but for consumption in Glasgow, with its 500,000 inhabitants, and in all the towns around Glasgow. A large trade had existed in that way, but the Orders of the Privy Council had paralyzed that trade. In these circumstances, he hoped Her Majesty's Government would be prepared with some measure to relax the stringency of the laws which now existed, and to take away all impediments which were not absolutely necessary for the safety of the cattle of the United Kingdom. It was quite true that those whom he represented obtained a large supply of meat from the northern portions of Scotland; but if they were to be confined to that—if there was to be no competition with foreign cattle—were they not in the very same position as if they were told that they must depend for bread upon their home-grown corn? If obstructions were put in the way of foreign cattle, the price of meat in this country would inevitably be raised to a very considerable extent. He hoped, therefore, that more stringent measures would not be adopted; that the Orders of the Privy Council would be gradually relaxed; and that, unless very strong symptoms of disease were proved to exist, we should hear no more even of the law which now existed. He had no doubt that the cattle plague existed in certain divisions of the Russian Empire; he supposed it had existed there for at least half a century, and it would perhaps continue there to the end of time; but surely that was no reason why restrictions should be placed on the importation of cattle from other regions where cattle plague did not exist.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he hoped some reply would be given on the part of the Government to the statements and arguments that had been put forward from that (the Opposition) side of the House. He was one of those who thought it a good system under which restraints on the importation of foreign cattle were remitted to the Privy Council, for if they went beyond or fell short of their duty they could be called to account by Parliament. This, however, proceeded on the assumption that when hon. Members made statements in a becoming manner in behalf of their constituents the Members of the Government whose conduct was challenged would feel it their duty to rise for the purpose of giving an explanation. Now, this appeared to be a case in which a good system was not well administered, or in which one portion of that administration was grossly inconsistent with another portion. The ports of this country, from the West Coast of Scotland southwards, and round the Southern Coast up to the mouth of the Thames, were allowed the privilege of importing cattle from Spain, Portugal, and France. France, as he understood, was a country where importation was open, subject to vigilant observation from all the rest of the world—these things, he was afraid, being managed there infinitely better than here, and an example being set us, which we had not the wit to follow, of securing the health of the cattle without impeding trade or raising the price of food. Now, why was the importation of cattle from France permitted when France did not exclude foreign cattle in the way desired in this country? The main question, however, which he wished to put was, why the privilege of importing cattle from

Spain, Portugal, and France was not granted to Hull, Newcastle, and Leith, as well as to Liverpool and Southampton? He would not suppose with his hon. Friend the Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood) that the reason was that one of the Members for Southampton, and both the Members for Liverpool, sat on the Ministerial side of the House; while Hull, Newcastle, Leith, Aberdeen, and Dundee were all so unenlightened as to return Members who sat on the Opposition side. [" Oh, oh ! "] He was protesting against that view; but he should like to hear some other reason assigned. He also wished to know, why the importation of cattle was not allowed from Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, as well as from Spain, Portugal, and France? The former countries being free from disease equally with the latter, the representatives of these ports had a right to know upon what ground these different regulations were based; and if no satisfactory reason could be assigned it might become the duty of some hon. Member, on the part of their constituents, to prevent the restriction and extinction of trade, and the lessening the supply of wholesome food for the people, by moving, even at this period of the Session, an Address to the Crown. The opinion of Parliament would thus be taken as to whether there should be a free supply of food in this country, or whether, as the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) had intimated, we were to abandon the "new lamp" used since 1842, and revert to the "old lamp," which, he (Mr. Gladstone) would say, served the purpose extremely well—the "old lamp" being the law which prohibited the importation of foreign cattle, and the new one the measure introduced by Sir Robert Peel, for supporting which an hon. Member opposite (Mr. Neville-Grenville) took credit the other night. The "new lamp" having been thus denounced by the noble Lord, it was necessary that he should be asked with some jealousy for an explanation of these inequalities in the administration of the law by the Privy Council with regard to the countries and ports similarly situated.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, that having already spoken on the Motion for Adjournment, he must solicit the indulgence of the House in answering the questions and representations which had been addressed to him. The hon. Members who had urged complaints had failed to trace the effect to the proper cause. They had complained of the Act of last Session which enabled the Privy Council to define parts of ports, but they should have remembered that the importation of foreign cattle had not decreased, but had rather increased, since the passing of that measure. Even if the importation had decreased, it had not been in consequence of the regulations of the Privy Council, for in that case the decrease would not have affected sheep, whereas in point of fact, the importation of sheep, which came over in separate vessels, and did not come within the Orders of the Privy Council, had decreased to the same extent as that of cattle. The real cause of the decrease, as was proved before the Select Committee, was that when the prices for cattle and sheep were high on the Continent the animals were attracted to Paris and Brussels, it not being worth while to import them into this country at higher freights for longer journeys, unless prices were very high here, for the margin of profit was insufficient to enable the importers to make a livelihood. The reason why the privileges extended to the South Coast and to the West Coast up to Glasgow had not been granted to Newcastle, Leith, Hull, and other ports was this,—Spanish cattle had never been imported in any numbers on the East Coast; a few had been imported one year and the next year none, and the trade was entirely abnormal. It was evident that some persons had attempted to foster a trade in Spanish and French cattle on that coast, but had not succeeded, and the attempt had been given up before the cattle plague visited this country. It was, therefore, useless for the Privy Council to recognize a trade which could not thrive or be beneficial to the importers under any circumstances. With regard to Denmark—the Spanish trade was a totally different one from the Danish trade. The Spanish trade was carried on in certain ships which were set apart for that trade alone. These ships went from Liverpool to Spain for the purpose of bringing over casks of wine, and when there was space cattle were brought over also. Danish ships, on the other hand, went indiscriminately to Rotterdam and to the Baltic ports; they might, therefore, be contaminated, and the cattle brought over in them would become infected while on the voyage. Nearly all the cattle and sheep from all parts of the continent of Europe were, moreover, shipped at Geestemünde, and came thence to London. Cattle from Hungary, Livonia, and other provinces, as well as from Prussia and Schleswig-Holstein, were shipped together there, and arrived in London on the same day; so that if the cattle from any one province were infected, all the cattle shipped there would become infected also. This was his answer to the questions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone).

Mr. CANDLISH said, that the noble Lord had not touched the case of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire; and, besides, the noble Lord was in error with respect to the commercial facts. The right hon. Gentleman had asked why Spanish cattle, which were permitted to come to the South and West Coast, were not permitted to come to the East Coast; and all the noble Lord had to say in reply was that there was a special trade between Liverpool and Spain which did not extend to the North-east Coast, and, therefore, the cattle would not come there. If there was no importation of cattle at present from Spain or Portugal into the North-eastern ports, why impose any restrictions? That was a very good reason why the noble Lord should stand aside and not interfere. The trade, if a natural trade, would soon develope itself. But he was prepared to state, in opposition to the noble Lord, that there existed a large trade between Spain and the ports of Hull, Aberdeen, Sunderland, and Newcastle. There were large imports of ore, which was a very heavy cargo, and to fill up the unoccupied space necessarily left in vessels loaded with such cargo, cattle could be easily and most advantageously imported from Spain to these North-eastern ports.

Mr. CLAY said, that the noble Lord had stated that the only reason for not granting to the North-eastern ports the privilege granted to Liverpool was that there was no trade in Spanish cattle with those ports. Now, without entering into the question of the extent of the cattle trade between Spain and the Eastern ports, he wished to know what proof there was that, under present circumstances, the trade might not prove a paying one, when other ports prosecuted it so beneficially. He would claim, on the very grounds advanced by the noble Lord, that the North-eastern ports should be declared open for the entry of those cattle.

Mr. MOFFATT said, he must ask the House to pause before proceeding further with this measure. The noble Lord might declare that he would not allow certain articles to be imported into certain places because those places had no trade of the kind before. But it was the duty of the Government to encourage importations in every way. In 1866, 234,000 head of cattle and 800,000 sheep had been imported, while in 1867 the numbers had fallen to 177,000 head of cattle and 540,000 sheep; and yet the Privy Council plumed itself on showing such paternal care in providing for the wants of the people.

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next."—(*Mr. Jacob Bright.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 38; Noes 105: Majority 67.

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET (*re-committed*) BILL—[Bill 139.]

(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Hunt.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress July* 20.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee).

Clause 3 (Constitution of Market Authority).

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he would appeal to his hon. Friend (Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson) to withdraw his Amendment. It would be certain to give rise to much opposition and take up much time; and therefore, in the interest of those who wished that the Bill should pass, it would be more prudent to withdraw the Amendment.

Mr. SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that his sole object had been to advance the measure, but he was prepared, in deference to the wish now expressed, to withdraw the Amendment.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he begged on behalf of the ratepayers of London to express his gratification that this Amendment had been withdrawn.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON: I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as the Corporation of the City of London have declined to give any assurance that they will become the market authority, and have refused the terms the Government have proposed to them in order to induce them to become the market authority, why should their name not be omitted as well as that of the Board of Works? I am quite at a loss to know what the Government are are about. In the first instance the Government themselves proposed the Metropolitan Board of Works. The Committee struck out the Metropolitan Board of Works The Government requested the Board should be introduced, and now when it has been proposed to restore the provision, we are told the Government abandon altogether that part of their plan, and that the Metropolitan Board of Works are not to be their authority at all. This continual change of plan does shake my confidence in the Government. Within the last three days we have had from the Government three different plans. First of all we were told by the Vice President of the Council he felt confident that the City would undertake it. Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer told us that he had a plan that would be sure to succeed with the City, that they were going to take it into consideration. At the Common Council yesterday, a very formal proceeding took place. A clause was put upon the Paper that the Islington market tolls were to be increased, and that £300,000 was to be advanced to the Corporation of the City of London. Yes: but the City of London rejected that offer. Now, I say, you have no market authority. As for the Commissioners, it is a perfect absurdity. We used to have three characters in this Bill. First, there was the Corporation of the City of London; if they would not take it, then the Metropolitan Board of Works would take it; and if none of these would take it, then there were to be five Royal Cattle Market Commissioners to be appointed by the Government. Well, then, where are we? Many agricultural friends of mine are of opinion that the Government have conducted this question in a very unsatisfactory manner, and I shall move a distinct Resolution that the course they have taken in regard to the Bill under discussion has been of a vacillating and unsatisfactory character. The House has a right to know clearly and distinctly who are to be the parties that are to manage the foreign cattle trade of this country: I beg therefore to ask the First Minister of the Crown—or if the First Minister will not condescend to answer, then the Chancellor of the Exchequer—as the Corporation have refused the office, and the Metropolitan Board of Works has been withdrawn from the Bill, who is to be the market authority in this Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The right hon. Gentleman has asked me a question a great many times over, which I should have been perfectly ready to answer, if it had only been put to me once. The right hon. Gentleman wished to know what the Government were about? I will tell him very briefly. The Government are doing their best to pass this Bill. He says we have been vacillating in this matter. It is perfectly true that we are unable to pass this Bill in the shape that we should have liked, but that is owing to the machinations—["Oh, oh!"]—As exception seems to be taken to that word, I shall say that we have been compelled to alter our plan, owing to the operations—no one can take exception to the word "operations"—of those Gentlemen who are opposed to the Bill. The operations, I repeat, of those who have opposed us have thrown great difficulties in the way of the Government, and therefore they have been obliged to take the course which they consider most expedient in order to pass this measure. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken of the withdrawal of the Metropolitan Board of Works from the Bill. Our reason for doing so was this: it was felt that a great deal of time would have been lost in discussion, had we supported the proposition to keep that body in the Bill. The Metropolitan Board of Works was struck out of the Bill by the Select Committee, and, as time was precious, we did not think it desirable to persist in re-inserting it. Had we retained the Board of Works in the measure they would have been the market authorities. As the Bill stands, however, the Corporation of London may become so if they choose.—[Mr. MILNER GIBSON: They have refused.]—I do not believe that that is the case. They have only refused a proposed compulsory arrangement. An officer of the Corporation made a proposition to the Government, which was entertained; and the Government proposed that, if the proposition was inserted in the Bill, it should be compulsory on the Corporation to become the market authority. We propose to put in the Bill that the Corporation shall be the market authority upon certain terms; and in the event of their refusing, the Commissioners will then become the market authority. We have discussed the question of what funds there will be for the erection of the market, and we decided that the funds which the Commissioners would have to look to for this purpose would be the market tolls. The question has been asked, will persons lend money on the security of those tolls? We have reason to believe that they will. Of course, if capitalists refuse to lend their money the Bill will be inoperative with a Commission; but we understand that persons will lend money upon the security I have mentioned. Believing that to be the case, we shall press forward this Bill, leaving it to the Corporation of London to become the market authority, and failing the Corporation to the Commissioners. I hope I have given a plain answer to the question of the right hon. Gentleman—[No!"]—It may not be satisfactory to the hon. Gentleman who says "no"; but I have endeavoured to answer the question put to me as practically and as plainly as possible, and I hope the Bill will be allowed to proceed.

Mr. AYRTON said, he thought the answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had by no means been satisfactory as far as regarded the elucidation of the question raised by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton-under-Lyne. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members must make up their minds to allow the Bill to be discussed, or to postpone the debate. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that he was unable to proceed with this Bill owing to the machinations of Gentlemen on the Liberal side of the House. He (Mr. Ayrton) denied that such had been the case. The Government themselves were alone to blame for what had occurred. All the difficulties in connection with the Bill had arisen out of the fact that the Government, when they introduced the measure, did not deal frankly and fairly with the question. Had they proclaimed their design at the outset, the country would have been aroused and the Bill would have been defeated. But they kept back the material portion of their scheme until the measure was far advanced in Committee, and the financial scheme which they now brought forward as new they had under their notice when they first devised their scheme. They had therefore created the difficulties and were responsible for the reception which the Bill had met with.

Mr. NEATE said, if it was a matter of Imperial interest, that for the preservation of the food of the country, restrictions should be imposed on the importation of foreign cattle into the port of London, the public generally ought to contribute to meet the expenditure which would thus be

The Chancellor of the Exchequer

incurred, and the whole of the burden ought not to fall upon the inhabitants of the metropolis. He thought the agricultural interest had great cause of complaint against the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was willing to give them anything but money. The measure was in a most unsatisfactory condition, and had better be put off till next Session.

Colonel SYKES said, that looking at the amount of compensation that would be required, he doubted whether any persons would be found to undertake the duty of Commissioners. Recollecting the great loss which the country had suffered from the cattle plague, he had hitherto supported the Bill, but he should object to constitute the Metropolitan Board of Works as the market authority, because that body was already in debt, and was only able to get money the other day by the guarantee of the Government.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. LOCKE moved in page 2, line 16 to omit from "if" to the end of the clause. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had given the House no information as to the source whence the required funds were to come. It was quite certain that the City of London had refused to be the market authority. At the present moment the Corporation were losing £6,000 a year by the Copenhagen market, to which cattle of all kinds might be brought; and it was no wonder that they should decline to spend £750,000 or £1,000,000 upon establishing a new one, to which only foreign animals would come. The Committee, in their anxiety that nobody should be injured, said that everybody was to be compensated. The City knew very well what that meant. They would not undertake anything of the sort. It was really impossible to imagine what they would have to lay out, and they would be unworthy of public confidence if they undertook to establish this market for foreign cattle only. Their losses would be tremendous. He only looked at the clause in a common-sense point of view. It was evident that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was now in a more melancholy position financially than that in which he had been placed when that subject had last been under discussion. Then he had a prospect of getting money; now he could not hope for a penny. The Corporation of London had declined to accept the responsibility they had been invited to undertake, and it would be idle to expect that they would enter into any compact with the Government in reference to the matter. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them that he would provide no money to buy the land or to build the market; but that it might be done by mortgaging the tolls. But if the market were built it would never realize sufficient in tolls to meet the outlay. Land would have to be bought; both banks of the Thames would have to be compensated. When the City authorities, who had all the tolls of Copenhagen market, lost a large sum every year, would any man in his senses lend money on the prospect of such tolls? The whole thing was absurd and ridiculous, unless the Chancellor of the Exchequer would advance the money, which he would not, nor would the House agree to his doing so. Would the agriculturists, who were represented by hon. Members opposite, advance the money? As a metropolitan Member he would resist this clause to the utmost. Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to think that metropolitan Members had no feelings whatever in question where beef and mutton were concerned. If hon. Members opposite were not urged on by their constituents, they would take the same view that he did of this scheme, and agree to his Amendment.

Page 2, line 16, Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "if," to the end of the Clause.—(*Mr. Locke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. MOFFATT said, they were told that there were some negotiations pending between the Corporation of London and the Government upon the subject, and he thought it would be convenient if the House were informed as to the state of those negotiations.

Mr. HEADLAM said, the Government were seeking to establish a market in the largest town in the world, contrary to the wishes of the inhabitants, as expressed by their representatives — the executive government of that town having declined to carry out the Bill. He would not have it imputed to him that he had sanctioned such a course even by his silence. The security offered to those who were to build the market was the continuance of a separate foreign cattle market, but he should use whatever influence he possessed hereafter to injure and diminish that security by doing away with the system.

Mr. SHAW-LEFEVRE said, he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would inform the House who the persons in the City were whom he represented as ready to advance the funds for establishing this market on the security of the tolls. He did not think any man out of a lunatic asylum would be found ready to advance the money on tolls which really presented no security whatever; for what guarantee could be given that any cattle would come to the market at all. Certainly, if the respective Orders in Council should be repealed, the foreign cattle would go back to its old channels, to be sent to London *via* Harwich, Newhaven, and Southampton, without going near the new foreign cattle market at all. Sheep might now be imported into Harwich (in vessels which did not bring cattle), and the moment the restrictions were removed the importation of sheep into the port of Harwich had revived. That would be the case with cattle as soon as the restriction was removed. This Bill had been supported by hon. Members on the other side in the hope that it would restrict the number of cattle coming into the London market. If the importation was to be limited, how were the tolls contemplated by the Bill as a security for repayment of the expenses of the scheme to be raised?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that the opinions of hon. Members opposite were contradictory. They maintained, on the one hand, that the Bill would be inoperative if it became law; if so, it followed that it could do neither good nor harm. If that were their honest belief, why did they come down, day after day, to oppose the Bill, losing both their time and their temper in the operation?

Mr. SHAW-LEFEVRE said, that while he admitted his belief that the Bill would be inoperative, he opposed it because it would affirm a bad principle.

Mr. HENLEY said, that hon. Gentlemen opposite had been vehement in their objections to the creation of the market proposed by the Bill; they now asserted that the market could never be started, even if the Bill passed. Nothing would suit the Liberal opponents of the Bill. Why could they not allow it to pass? They would do so if they really believed, as they said, that none but lunatics would advance money under the Bill towards the expenses of the market. It might be true that the City of London were losing £6,000 a year by their market, but it must be remembered that that market was in the heart of London and in a most expensive locality, and it did not at all follow that a market seven miles out of London would not pay its expenses. If the Bill could not be carried into effect, why should there be so much opposition? Let the responsibility of such a great failure—if failure it was to be—rest with the Government who proposed the scheme. Considering, however, the support the Bill had received in that House, let the proposal be at least tried.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, that if the Bill was now inoperative it was because the exertions of hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House had made it so. They had succeeded in sweeping away the proposals to rate the inhabitants of the metropolis, and to raise the necessary security by increasing the tolls in the market at Islington; a concession had also been made in the case of sheep, and in those three important respects the Bill had thus been rendered innocuous. In fact the financial part of the scheme had completely broken down. The Bill must be a complete failure. He should be glad, however, to understand explicitly from the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) whether the report was correct that the Court of Common Council had refused to consider the Bill unless the compensation clauses were withdrawn, and further whether the noble Lord intended to secure the support of the City by abandoning those clauses, or to retain them and encounter the opposition of the City?

Mr. AYRTON said, the only object in pressing the Bill was to get the vicious principle it contained confirmed, and for that same reason he opposed it. ["Divide!"] As the Committee seemed indisposed to continue the discussion, he would move that they should report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 32; Noes 105: Majority 73.

Mr. AYRTON said, he must complain that while hon. Gentlemen opposite listened with great attention to charges brought against his side of the House, they met his vindication with persistent interruption. He was not disposed to submit to that. He maintained it was a false charge to say that his side of the House was doing what was absurd and inconsistent. There was nothing inconsistent in refusing to pass a measure that would not work, but which contained principles that were pernicious and mischievous. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had given some colour of practicability to the measure by telling the House that there were some commercial gentlemen who were willing to carry out the measure by contract. But what he wanted to know from the right hon. Gentleman was, whether they would undertake to pay for the compensations contained in the Bill?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I did not say we had received a tender; but that we had reason to believe that persons would come forward with the money.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON: Sir, I contend that this is a measure of confiscation. One individual will be deprived of property which, if sold in the market, would fetch £7,000 or £8,000. You are going to prevent the constituents of the Member for the Tower Hamlets from using their freehold property as the law allows them, though the Committee has decided that such a taking away of private property for the public benefit cannot be carried out without compensation.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I rise to Order. The question is, whether certain persons should be appointed Commissioners? and the hon. Gentleman is going into the question of compensation.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON: That is a reason why they should not be appointed.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: It is not competent now to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Amendment does not involve the question of compensation.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON: Well, then, you propose to appoint Commissioners; I object to your appointing Commissioners. And why do I object? Because you have told us distinctly that these Commissioners are not to be provided with any funds. If you appoint Commissioners to take away property for which the owners are entitled to compensation, those Commissioners must be provided with money to give that compensation. This measure reminds one of the times of the French Revolution. ["Oh, oh!"] It is all very well for hon. Gentlemen to cry "Oh!" whose estates are not going to be meddled with; but if they were the owners of valuable wharves and landing-places, and were told that Commissioners were to be appointed to take away their property without funds to compensate them, there would be a perfect rebellion amongst them. I stand here to resist this pernicious attempt to appoint Commissioners to take away private property without the consent of the owners, and without the means of compensating them. Is it necessary to have Commissioners to manage a dirty market, to be placed, as I understand, at the outlet of the main sewer, the most disagreeable place near the metropolis? ["Oh, oh!"] I deny that I am using arguments unfit to be heard in the House of Commons, though I may appear to be more energetic than I ought to be. The principle I advocate is a sound one—the principle you advocate is a dangerous one—a revolutionary one. I object to the appointment of Crown Commissioners to manage a cattle market. The proposition is ludicrous when we consider that these Royal Commissioners, with all their dignity, are not to have a farthing of money. I have another objection—I think it is a most objectionable principle to appoint Royal Commissioners to look after municipal affairs. A metropolitan market ought to be under the management of the metropolitan local authorities, and if there is a strong objection on the part of the municipal authorities to the scheme you propose, you have no right to force the municipality to carry it into effect, or to appoint Royal Commissioners to do so. If you cannot induce the local municipal authorities of the City to undertake your scheme, rely upon it they believe that scheme not to be for the benefit of their constituents. The opposition to the Bill has been successfully carried on in two respects. First, it was proposed by the Bill to exclude all foreign cattle and sheep. Some of the sheep are now to be let in. Then, with respect to the 2nd clause, which provided for the imposition of rates on the inhabitants of London for the support of the market, the Government has been induced to withdraw that obnoxious proposal to tax the ratepayers of London in order to carry out a Bill which was intended to increase the price of their meat. ["No, no!"] Why, the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council admitted that the Bill would have that effect, and I can prove, out of the mouths of the witnesses for the Bill, that its operations would have that pernicious effect. Indeed, I will confine myself exclusively, in my criticism of the Bill, to the evidence of the Government themselves. Now, with regard to the price of meat. ["Question, question!"]

THE CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman is out of Order.

MR. LOWE said, he was as favourable as the Government could be to the principle of this Bill, and he did not approve some of the means which had been used in the course of these discussions to defeat it. But he wanted to make an appeal to the Government. It was quite clear that the market, if it was to be established, would involve a large expenditure of money. If they were in earnest—and he was in earnest in wishing to see it established—they ought to provide money for it. It appeared to him that they must have one of three things—either they must have rinderpest continually in this country; or they must seriously interfere with the internal traffic in cattle; or they must have all foreign cattle killed on their arrival. He believed the last was the best course to adopt; but he thought that in bringing in a Bill with that object the Government ought not to ask the approval of Parliament to a measure which would have no effect. If the carrying out of the Bill would involve a large expenditure of money the Government ought to show Parliament there was some reasonable exectation that the money would be forthcoming. To do them justice, he must say they had tried to do so. They had first proposed that the money should come from a body having large estates—the Corporation of London—and that the Corporation should depend upon the prospect of being re-paid by tolls. But he understood it was now admitted—in this, perhaps, he might be wrong—that the Corporation were not willing to take the matter up.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: They are not willing to bind themselves.

MR. LOWE said, he was not astonished at that, because already they had a large market by which they were losing money. His right hon. Friend (Mr. Milner Gibson) had said that the Corporation resisted this Bill because it would not benefit their constituents. Not at all. They resisted it because they had an interest in another market. Then the Government had proposed that the market should be established by rates to be levied by the Metropolitan Board of Works; but he did not wonder that there should be a strong objection in the metropolis to have the expense of what was a national object thrown on the inhabitants of London alone. What, then, remained. As the Bill stood Commissioners, were to be appointed who would have power to charge tolls in the market when it was made, and who would have the power of borrowing money on the security of those tolls. The question, then, was, as to whether the security was adequate. The Commissioners would have the Act of Parliament empowering them to make the market; but the financial success of the market would depend upon its having a monopoly. What security would there be for its having a monopoly? The Orders of the Privy Council, which the Privy Council could at any time rescind or alter? That was not good mercantile security. It was not security on which to raise the large sum of money that would be necessary in this case. Therefore, what he would say to the Government was this—If they really thought this Bill one of great importance, as he really thought it was, let them be prepared to make some proposal, by means of which the money could be raised. It would be necessary to have, not only the security of the market itself, but also the security of a monopoly, which monopoly should not rest on the Orders of any Government. It seemed to him, therefore, to be essential that the whole subject should be dealt with by an Act of Parliament, and that the fate of the market should not be left to Orders in Council. If the Government were not prepared to adopt that course, the only other proposal they could make was one for providing the required funds out of the Revenue of the country. If the Government could not meet the difficulty to which he had directed their attention, he did not see any use in their proceeding with a measure which would be of no practical benefit.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he desired to know —supposing there was no difficulty about security—how the charge of £12,000 (4 per cent upon £300,000) a year was to be met for the first few years of the trust, and where the money was to come from to pay the interest of the money borrowed. If compensation was given, there would be no funds to pay the interest, and if the interest was paid there would be no money to pay the compensations.

Mr. DE GREY said, he thought it was evident that the intention of hon. Members on the other side was to defeat the measure by any means in their power. Their opposition was elaborately obstructive, and it might save time if the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government would give them an assurance that he was determined, under any circumstances, to pass the Bill, and that he would not advise Her Majesty to prorogue Parliament until the Bill was passed.

Mr. CANDLISH said, that the Bill, if carried, would probably be inoperative; and why, therefore, should it be pressed? ["No!"] Well, where was the money to be procured by means of which to carry out the provisions of the Bill?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the question had been repeatedly answered. He had stated several times that if the matter were left to the Commissioners they would have nothing but the tolls as a security for raising the money. The Corporation so raised money when the Islington Cattle Market Bill was passed. He had been assured that in the event of the Bill passing persons could be found who would be willing to advance money upon that security, and also that there would be no practical difficulty in constructing the market. In reply to remarks of the right hon. Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe), he could only say that a monopoly would be secured to the market as far as cattle coming into the port of London, and sheep coming with them, were concerned; though if the right hon. Gentleman were of opinion that the security was insufficient, it would, of course, be open to him to move that no cattle should come into the metropolitan area, except through that market.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he felt assured that his right hon. Friend the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) had no intention of interposing a difficulty. In his opinion, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had failed to give a satisfactory answer to the question as to how the money was to be raised. The right hon. Gentleman had stated, indeed, that he understood parties were ready to lend money on the security of the tolls; but he had omitted to mention how much money they were willing to lend, and for what purposes. This pecuniary part of the business had naturally been examined by the Common Council, who had estimated that £500,000 would be required to construct the market, and had arrived at the conclusion that, even if the interest was at a very moderate rate, there would be a deficiency on the Foreign Cattle Market Account of no less than £13,000 a year. It was true that in the case of the Islington Market the Corporation had had only the tolls to offer as security; but the result was that a deficiency of £7,000 a year had to be paid out of the general revenue of the Corporation, and that deficiency would be increased by the new market. It was not likely, therefore, that the Corporation would be willing to incur a fresh liability on account of the Foreign Cattle Market. Probably the gentlemen alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer might be willing to lend money for the purpose of building the market, but not for the purpose of paying the compensations. The last clause of the Bill provided that no compensation should become payable until the market was opened; and consequently it might be possible to find persons sanguine enough to advance money to build the market; but would they advance on the sole security of the tolls the £500,000 which, according to the lowest estimate, would be required for the construction of the market and compensation?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he understood that parties who obtained compensation would have a lien upon the tolls. A remedy was provided in the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, and he believed that any person entitled to compensation might, if necessary, appoint a receiver to take in his behalf the tolls of the market. ["No, no!"] At all events, he was of opinion that under the last clause every such person would have a legal mode of enforcing his rights. It was evident, therefore, that persons advancing money on the security of the tolls would take into consideration the circumstance that the individuals who were entitled to compensation would be able to enforce their rights and get possession of the revenues of the market. He did not know what would be the amount required for building the market, but he imagined it would be considerably less than the sum named by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone). He had been informed, indeed, that only £300,000 would be required for that purpose, though he could not say what the compensation would amount to. Persons concerned in promoting the Bill had informed him that £100,000 would be a very liberal estimate for purchasing the freehold of all the premises used in the cattle trade, and of course if those premises were devoted to other purposes, the amount of compensation would be very small. Under all the circumstances he thought the Committee need not be frightened by the sum of £500,000, which had been spoken of by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. In conclusion, he could only say he had been assured, during the last two days, that persons were willing to come forward with the money on the security of the tolls, even taking into consideration what would have to be paid by way of compensation.

MR. GOSCHEN said, that the persons advancing the money might probably require the rules to be made more stringent than they would be as the Bill now stood. At present the Privy Council could make rules as to slaughtering cattle, which would interfere with the market. He understood that the offer of money did not include capital for compensation.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, it was his opinion that no part of the money to be borrowed under the Bill would be applicable to compensation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was clearly wrong in his interpretation of the Bill. The mortgagees would have nothing to do with compensation. They would get an immediate first charge upon all the tolls, apart entirely from compensation, and in point of fact the Bill was entirely deficient in any means whatever for providing compensation.

MR. AYRTON said, he must again protest against the Bill being proceeded with, and the property of his constituents confiscated without any security for their being indemnified.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN moved that the Committee should report Progress. It was now half-past One, and he thought that at any rate the debate should be suspended till three o'clock, in order to allow the other Business on the Paper to proceed. When that Business had been disposed of, they might again resume the consideration of the Bill in Committee, and go on with it until the next morning. It was quite clear that, inasmuch as it contained near forty clauses, it would take two months to pass it.

Motion *negatived.*

MR. SAMUELSON said, that no means had been provided for making this market, and the Bill would be totally inoperative.

MR. FRESHFIELD said, he understood that parties were willing to lend the necessary funds, and that the market authority could create a mortgage on the tolls in respect of such loan.

MR. COWEN said, he was convinced

it was totally impossible to make this market by the means proposed by the Bill.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, the Bill provided for raising £300,000, which was £200,000 short of the sum required for opening the market. The people who advanced this would be empowered to sweep away the whole tolls of the market, and no means whatever of giving compensation were provided.

MR. FRESHFIELD said, that if the sum of £300,000 were not sufficient the figures might be altered, and a sum sufficient to build and to compensate inserted in the Bill. He thought that sum should be £500,000. If the market authority was not provided with the means of compensating there would be an end of the Bill.

MR. LEEMAN said, he regretted the want of security in the Bill for compensation.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that what had fallen from the hon. Member for Dover (Mr. Freshfield) had taken him by surprise. That Gentleman had said that the estimated cost of the market, including compensation, would amount to £500,000. That was not the case. The opinion of the financial agents of the Bill was that £300,000 would be an extravagant estimate, including compensation. Those agents stated that the fee simple of all the property for which compensation could be claimed would not amount to £100,000, and that those who claimed compensation would find it difficult to prove any appreciable loss of trade from the operation of the Bill.

MR. GOSCHEN said, he wished to know whether the clause relating to the Islington tolls that had been withdrawn was not in existence last winter?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, it was not in existence a week ago.

MR. AYRTON asked whether the substance of it had not been made known in the winter?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU replied in the negative.

MR. J. LOWTHER called attention to the fact that this clause was not in the Bill, and there was no necessity for discussing it.

MR. MILNER GIBSON said, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had brought up a Paper prepared by his agent which contained a statement of the sum required for compensation; but did the right hon. Gentleman vouch for its accuracy? And who is his agent? Did anyone ever hear of

the responsibility of a Minister being shifted to the shoulders of an unknown agent? He (Mr. Milner Gibson) had heard that the compensation would amount to £750,000. The name of the agent might give them some security that the calculation was correct.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the Parliamentary agent promoting the Bill was his authority for the figures he had laid before the Committee.

MR. AYRTON said, the best authority was the hon. Member for Dover (Mr. Freshfield), who was a Member of the Committee; and he told them the whole cost would be £500,000. They ought not to proceed with the Bill until they should learn what was the source from which the £200,000 required for compensations was to be derived.

MR. FRESHFIELD said, the Bill was a merely permissive measure, and could not be carried into effect unless the money were found. He therefore saw nothing to justify the pertinacious opposition it had encountered. That opposition seemed to him to be nothing short of factious.

MR. LOCKE said, that no one would advance money on the security afforded by the Bill. He hoped that the Committee would not stultify itself by appointing the proposed Commissioners.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 83; Noes 31: Majority 52.

On Question, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill?"

MR. AYRTON said, that this Question involved considerations which the Committee had not yet even approached. He moved that the Chairman report Progress.

MR. DISRAELI said, that he was on the point of rising to make the same Motion, and he need not therefore say that he assented to it.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he hoped that if the Motion were agreed to, the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets would give some assurance that he would not interpose these obstructions to the future progress of the Bill.

MR. AYRTON said, he had not the least desire to interpose obstructions, if hon. Members would only listen with patience to what he had to say.

SIR PERCY BURRELL said, he must complain of the manner in which the hon.

and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) had wasted the time of the Committee by repeating his arguments *usque ad nauseam.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

COMPULSORY CHURCH RATES ABOLITION BILL.

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered* (according to Order).

MR. GLADSTONE, having pointed out the alterations made in the Bill by the other House, said, that he had some doubts whether they were all improvements; but as none of them were inconsistent with the primary object of the Bill—the abolition of the compulsory collection of church rates — he was willing to accept them. He would, therefore, move to agree to the Amendments made by the Lords.

After a few observations from Mr. BERESFORD HOPE and Mr. HUBBARD,

Lords' Amendments *agreed to* [Special Entry].

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. HENNIKER-MAJOR asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, What course the Government, seeing the nature of the opposition to this Bill, intended to take upon it?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that since Progress had been reported Her Majesty's Government had considered the position in which they stood to this Bill, and had come to the conclusion that it was hopeless to proceed further with it this Session. The great majorities which had voted in repeated divisions had shown a very decided opinion on the part of the House in favour of the principle of the Bill and the necessity for such a measure. The difficulty, however, which had arisen in consequence of the City having declined to accept the market authority, and the very strong opposition to the further progress of the Bill, had put the Government in a position of so much difficulty that they did not feel justified in asking the House to spend any further time in discussing the measure during the present Session. The only course open to them, therefore, under the circumstances, was to bring in a Bill in a future Session of Parliament to carry out the object.

House adjourned at half after Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, July 25, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee*—Marriages Validity (Blakedown)* [250].
Report—Marriages Validity (Blakedown)* [250].
Considered as amended — Regulation of Railways [142]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland)* [210].
Third Reading—Regulation of Railways [142], and *passed.*
Withdrawn—Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market (*re-comm.*) [139].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

INCOME TAX COMMISSIONERS.

QUESTION.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government have had in contemplation the introduction of a measure to alter the present system of assessing Income Tax in country towns and districts by the aid of secret Commissioners selected from the district; whether, in the event of no legislative proceedings being contemplated, the Government have the power, without Parliamentary sanction, to alter the present much complained of sytem of secret Local Income Tax Commissioners; and whether, if they have the power, the Government intend to make any alteration in this respect?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said he supposed that by the term "Secret Commissioners" the hon. Member meant the Commissioners who took an oath of secresy not to divulge any matters they became acquainted with in the discharge of their duty. Those Secret Commissioners were selected by the whole body of Commissioners from among themselves, and the Government had nothing to do with them. He was not aware of the existence of any general discontent at the mode of their appointment, or the manner in which they performed their duty. He was aware that in the hon. Member's neighbourhood there was some agitation a few months ago in connection with the Income tax, but he hoped that agitation was now allayed. From inquiries he had made he had reason to believe that it arose more from objections to the Income Tax itself than to those who assessed it. The Government saw no reason to make any change in the law regarding the appointment of the Commissioners.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he would beg to ask if the names of the Commissioners will be published in future? their names were not known.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he was not aware that their names were kept secret.

METROPOLITAN FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Hunt.*)

[BILL 139.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, as his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated last night that, considering the great opposition that was offered to the measure, the Government had come to the determination of no longer asking hon. Members to put themselves to the inconvenience of attending the House for the further consideration of the Bill; he should, in accordance with that Resolution, move that the Order be discharged.

Mr. READ extremely regretted that the Bill was to be withdrawn; but, under the circumstances, he admitted that the Government had no other alternative than to give it up, considering the shortness of the time now at their disposal and the vigorous nature of the opposition to the measure. He had been taxed with being the author of the Bill; but he distinctly denied that such was the case. If he had been its author, he should have tried to make it a national and not a metropolitan measure; and if any compensation was to be paid he thought it should be paid out of the national Exchequer, instead of the payment being imposed on the metropolis. The Bill never was, in his opinion, a strong Bill; it was weakened in the Select Committee and rendered still more feeble in the House; but he hoped that the Vice President of the Council would not during the Recess listen to any request from any quarter to relax the present restrictions in the metropolitan area, if he wished to keep the cattle plague out of the country. With respect to two or three countries where rinderpest had never existed, he did not see why the same exception should not be extended to Denmark (proper), Sweden, and Norway, as had already been made in favour of Spain and Portugal.

Mr. AYRTON said, that what had just fallen from the hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Read) did justice to the views of those who opposed the Bill, because he had conceded the point they had been struggling for. It was only because the principle of the Act of last year was attempted to be departed from that the House became embarrassed by the course pursued by the Government. He was glad that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in withdrawing the Bill frankly recognized the grounds on which its opponents had thought right to discuss it, and admitted that the Government were not at first fully made aware of the true bearings of the case. With respect to the financial part of the scheme, it would have been a deplorable example, if Parliament had exercised its authority to confiscate property without providing compensation, and it was a great proof of the wisdom of the rules under which the Business of the House was conducted, that a minority, powerful in argument, reason, and justice—[" Oh, oh! "]—could withstand any sudden impulse by which the majority were overtaken to carry a measure pregnant with injustice and wrong. ["Oh!"] The minority upon this question represented the majority of the people. ["No, no!"]

Mr. SPEAKER begged to suggest to the House whether it was desirable after the ample discussion that had taken place upon the Bill to further prolong it?

General DUNNE said, he should certainly protest against the manner in which the Bill had been withdrawn after the majorities which voted in its favour; and he protested the more so because it tended to confirm the suspicion which all along existed on the independent Conservative Benches that it was never intended that the Bill should pass. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) said the minority which opposed the Bill represented the majority of the people, but that was not so—on the contrary the hon. and learned Gentleman represented only the London importers and butchers. There was a very large majority of the people of this kingdom in favour of it. It had, too, with one exception, the support of the Irish Members, who were anxious to save the country from the recurrence of a calamity which had cost Great Britain it was said £12,000,000, and from which they had preserved themselves by their own exertions and determination. There was no force in the arguments which were directed against the principle of this measure, but it was opposed on the pretence that it was so badly drawn, it could not work, and that it threw expense on localities that were not fairly liable. But the Government could have easily improved any objectionable provisions, leaving the Bill sufficient for its purpose, and supplied the very small sum of money which it was clear from the statements made, that speculators would undertake it was but trifling, if indeed required at all. But supposing these objections to be well-founded it was clear that if the Bill had failed it had fallen through solely on account of its imperfect nature and the apathy of the promoters. Every expedient was resorted to to waste the time of the House, and iteration and re-iteration proceeded to such lengths that the hon. and learned Gentleman repeated the same sentence eleven times over. The hon. and learned Gentleman also counted out the House. Now, he (General Dunne) did not object to the tactics of the minority; but he did regret that the Bill should have had to be rejected on account of the incapacity with which it was framed.

Mr. NORWOOD thanked the hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Read) for the advice which he had given to the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) with respect to relaxing the rule so far as to admit cattle from the countries where no plague existed, and he expressed a hope that it would be adopted by the noble Lord. He would undertake that, so far as it was in his power, there should be no stretch of any relaxations for an improper purpose at the port of Hull.

Mr. J. LOWTHER trusted the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be induced to introduce a measure on this important subject next Session. As a Member of the Committee which sat for several days during the dog-days, and with what result they then saw, he would venture to say the great evil of their Bill was the very system of which the hon. Member for East Norfolk desired the extension; it was the fear lest the Privy Council should step in and relax the restrictions that indisposed the City Corporation to become the market authority. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer could levy a sum of one or two sovereigns upon every hon. Member who repeated his arguments, as had been done during the discussion of this Bill, he would soon have sufficient funds for the construction of the market.

Mr. NEWDEGATE observed that in the discussions of last night it became manifest that the present system was liable to the grossest imputations of malversation. Over and over again the Government were accused of jobbing; and that suspicion was inseparable from proceedings by Orders in Council. He expressed a hope that a Bill would be introduced upon this subject at the earliest possible period; and better framed and better financially supported than this had been. Legislation was necessary for the protection of this country against the cattle plague, which he was afraid was spreading on the Continent. It was of the greatest importance that protection in this country from rinderpest should be established by Act of Parliament, and not by Orders in Council. He hope that Government would not be discouraged by their present position, and would renew their attempt to establish efficient means of inspection, for which the natural position of the country gave every facility.

Mr. COWEN said, he could answer for his constituents that they would not abuse any relaxation of the existing rules which might be granted to them. On a former occasion he suggested the withdrawal of the Bill, because it would be impossible to work it. He felt gratified that the Government had come to that determination, and he hoped it would be found that the powers at present possessed by the Privy Council would be found sufficient.

Colonel NORTH said, he hoped the Privy Council would not relax their regulations with regard to cattle during the Recess; and if the Government did not possess sufficiently stringent powers he hoped they would obtain them before they prorogued Parliament. When the rinderpest first broke out several deputations from Oxfordshire waited upon the Government, and they left with the impression that if they had the power they had not the inclination to put it into effect.

Mr. BLAKE said, he could not allow the Motion for discharging the Order to pass without protesting in the strongest manner against such a proceeding on the part of the Government, and calling on the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the absence of the Prime Minister, for an explanation of the extraordinary conduct which they had thought fit to pursue in the matter. He (Mr. Blake) considered that he had a right quite as much as anyone in the House to make this demand. He had supported the Government throughout on the Bill, had remained up often until two, and even past three in the morning, to assist them; had laboured, and, he might add, successfully too, to induce Irish Liberal Members to swell the large majorities which they had on every division up to the very last. He was disappointed and surprised beyond description at the withdrawal of the Bill, when there was an absolute certainty that, if persevered in, it would be carried. He was thunderstruck when the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced, at nearly four o'clock that morning, to a House of not a dozen Members, that Government had resolved to abandon the Bill. What the real reason for the Ministry taking this step was he was at a loss to divine. It was not on account of not having a majority to carry it, as they had even in the last division defeated their opponents by nearly 3 to 1. It was absurd to say that it was from an apprehension that persons having just claims to compensation would run any risk of not receiving it, as he was informed that persons of responsibility had undertaken to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to run all risk with regard to the market. Now that undertaking, of course, included every liability, compensation as well as everything else. [" Name ! "] The Chancellor of the Exchequer knew who they were, and that they were good security for what they proposed, and he challenged him to deny the accuracy of the statement he had made. He supported the Bill mainly because he thought it would prove a useful measure for Ireland. Irish cattle that came to London were placed in the same position as foreign cattle coming from diseased districts, and had to be slaughtered in London often at a great loss to the owners, who, at times, could sell them at greater profit in some of the markets around London. It was thus a great disadvantage also to the English dealers, who were deprived of the opportunity of purchasing Irish cattle in the London market. If his assertion was correct—and he again demanded from the Chancellor of the Exchequer a direct answer as to whether it was or was not—the conduct of the Government was most reprehensible in sacrificing, without sufficient cause, a most useful measure, and in throwing over himself and others who had most gallantly fought for them. Unless the Chancellor properly explained the matter, he could assure him it would be a long time before he would support him on any question again.

MR. J. STUART MILL wished only to make one suggestion, which he was sure the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) would take in good part—that if he drew up a new Bill, its provisions should be confined to cattle from suspected countries. If this were done there would very soon be no suspected countries. The two principal countries suspected were Holland and Prussia, both of which had a very valuable trade with us in their own cattle; and if they found that this trade was stopped because they allowed cattle from infected countries to pass through them, they would soon see the expediency of ceasing to do so. The proposed new market would then be superfluous, or could be made supplementary to the present market.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, it was most unusual, on the Motion for the withdrawal of a Bill, that there should be a sustained debate on the subject of it. He should not have taken part in the discussion but for the observations of the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Blake), and the hon. and gallant Member for Queen's County (General Dunne). It must be obvious to every impartial mind that the Government had used its most strenuous endeavours to carry through the Bill, and they had been driven at the last moment to abandon it from the insuperable obstacles which it had met with in its progress through the House. With reference to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Waterford, he stated last night that he understood parties were prepared to find the money for the construction of the market; but, in the communications he had with them, compensations were not included. Compensations were merely alluded to in that sort of conversation one heard in the Lobby. The City authorities declining to become the market authority, the financial difficulty assumed greater importance than before. The financial bearings of the measure were then very different from what they were when it went before the Committee. He repeated that every effort had been made to carry the Bill, and the suspicions which his hon. and gallant Friend (General Dunne) had expressed as to the want of sincerity on the part of the Government were in this case wholly unfounded.

MR. KENDALL was as much surprised as anyone could be at the withdrawal of the Bill, but, at the same time, he must say that the Government had fought the battle both ably and manfully. He hoped it would go to the country who were the parties who had obstructed the Bill. It was most unjust to charge those who approved of the Bill of a desire to increase the price of meat; no such intention had ever been entertained, and it was unfair and unjust to make such statements. The Bill was rendered necessary from a fear of the return of the disease to this country.

Order *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

REGULATION OF RAILWAYS BILL—[BILL 142.]

[*Lords.*] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. LEEMAN proposed, after Clause 19, to insert the following:—

> "The Company shall not, except under an insurance as hereinafter mentioned, be liable to pay any larger sums than the following in respect of any passenger killed or injured: (that is to say,) no greater sum in respect of any first-class passenger than four hundred pounds, in respect of any second-class passenger than three hundred pounds, in respect of any third-class passenger than two hundred pounds; but any sum so payable shall be in addition to any claim under an insurance."

A vast amount of evidence upon this subject was taken before the Royal Commissioners. Immense frauds were practised upon railway companies under the present system. A case had recently come under his own personal notice. A man, who was injured in a railway accident in the North of England, claimed £8,000 damages, and he laid his damages in an action in one of the Scotch Courts at £5,000; on the eve of the trial he offered to accept £1,750. The company paid £250 into Court, and the jury awarded him £88. That was the case of a person injured under circumstances where there was really no negligence on the part of the company; and it was only by having a detective to watch his motions for three months, that the company had been able to resist the fraud he had attempted to practise upon them. Besides, great injustice was done to the companies in another way. The position of railway companies was this—that whereas they received the same sum for fare from a poor person as from a person with an income of £10,000 a year, yet in case of an accident they had to compensate the latter according to his social position. Not one in ten of these compensation cases ever came before the public. The expenses attending trials were so great that the companies were driven to settle the great bulk of claims privately. This subject had been inquired into by the Royal Commission, who recommended that compensation should be awarded without relation to the income or social position of the party injured except so far as these might be indicated by the class of carriage in which he travelled. It had been said that there was no precedent for such a provision as that contained in the clause, but the Legislature had already interposed for the protection of carriers, both by sea and by land. The clause was founded upon the recommendations of the Commissioners, and as far as the figures were concerned he should be ready, on the part of railway companies, to assent to any alterations that the Government might propose, and to accept an absolute responsibility on their part for all injuries that occurred by accidents on their lines, whether occasioned by their negligence or not, to the extent of £400 for first-class, £300 for second-class, and £200 for third-class passengers. By a subsequent clause he proposed to render it compulsory upon the companies, should they be required by passengers to do so, to insure their lives to the extent of £3,000 for a first-class, £2,000 for a second-class, and £1,000 for a third-class passenger. He now moved the first part of the clause.

Clause (Liability for Accidents,)—(*Mr. Leeman,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

MR. STEPHEN CAVE said, this was a very difficult question. The hon. and learned Member had stated the case very ably on the part of the railway companies, and it could not be denied that excessive damages had been awarded in many instances. It was also true that the principle of limitation of liability had been conceded in the case of shipowners who were not actually in fault, where the liability, under certain circumstances, was confined to £15 a ton up to the value of the ship; so with regard to animals, by the Railway and Canal Act of 1854 as the hon. Member had stated, and in the more parallel case of the Metropolitan Railway Acts of 1864 which he had not mentioned, where the liability with respect to injury to passengers by cheap trains was limited to £100. On the other hand, it must be remembered that carriers of passengers were not like carriers of goods, insurers against all injuries except those by the act of God or the Queen's enemies. They did not undertake to carry with absolute safety, but only so far as human care and foresight would go. Consequently, the only injuries for which they were liable were those which were caused by negligence or misconduct, in itself no unimportant limitation. The principle of legislation had been to leave to railway managers the greatest freedom of action. The Board of Trade had no real control over them, and it was considered that the true safeguard of the public was the fear of heavy damages. As a witness said before a Select Committee on Railway Accidents, "Lord Campbell's Act was the only protection of the passenger." A Bill was brought in with the same object as these clauses in 1863, which was rejected by the House, and called "an appraisement of human life according to the valuation of railway directors." It was true that the Royal Commission reported in favour of limitation of liability; but then it also recommended that railway companies should be liable for all accidents, whether caused by negligence or not. The hon. Member had stated he was willing to accept this recommendation, but he perhaps did not know what had been mentioned to himself by an eminent Member of that Commission, the Member for the Tower Hamlets, that the ideas of the Commissioners as to compensation went far beyond this Amendment, and it was obvious that in this case much more difficulty would arise in framing a scale, because not only would it be necessary to appreciate the value of life, but the calculation of the amount of penalty for negligence or misconduct would be mixed up with it. Then it seemed to him that the principle of insurance was altogether misapplied in extending it to damages for wrong done. The true principle was that the insurer or underwriter received payment for assuming a liability to which he was not legally subject. But in this case he demanded payment for assuming a liability under which he already lay, and he asked the passenger to pay him for insuring him against his own wrongful acts. Then, again, there was no provision for securing the existence of such an insurance fund in the case of the insolvency of the company. The last objection which he would take was, that whereas all carriers, shipowners, coach proprietors—and there were still some coaches left — and others were subject to the Common Law as extended in its application by Lord Campbell's Act, this proposed relaxation applied only to railway companies. Now, it was clear that they ought not to be specially exempted ; and yet—as no doubt the hon. and learned Member felt—a general exemption would be beyond the scope of this Bill. Under the circumstances, he thought the hon. and learned Member would do well not to press these clauses, as it was evident they were too partial in their application, and he did not think the feeling of the country was at present in favour of an alteration of the law in this direction.

Mr. LAING said, he thought the latter argument of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. S. Cave) the only forcible one. He admitted that a law should not be made for railway companies which did not apply to coach proprietors and carriers generally. The railway companies desired nothing but what was fair and reasonable ; and he, for one, would rather see the figures fixed by Government. The railway companies wished to do all that was possible to ensure the safety of the passengers. He asked the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Leeman) to withdraw the clause, with a view to the introduction of a Bill, in the next Session of Parliament, on the whole subject of the responsibility to make good damages arising from accidents while travelling.

Mr. HENLEY hoped that if the Government did undertake to consider the subject during the Recess they would not be regarded as pledged to accept the principle of the clauses. He did not wish to see the settlement of claims taken away from the cognizance of juries. The subject was a large and difficult one. He could not conceive anything more objectionable than that every time a man went a journey he should be obliged to pay 6*d.* to prevent his neck being broken. It was enough to frighten the nervous ; and if it were carried the railway company ought to be compelled to give with the insurance receipt a glass of very good brandy to keep up the spirits of the passengers. What was wanted was vigilance on the part of the railway company to compel their servants to prevent accidents. If the company wanted funds it would be better for them to put an extra small amount on the price of the railway ticket.

MR. NORWOOD said, that Lord Campbell's Act had acted most injuriously upon passenger traffic in steam vessels, for many shipowners now refused to carry passengers upon any terms, for fear of the liability which that Act threw upon them in the event of an accident ensuing.

MR. CLAY pointed out that it was a common practice for passengers to insure their own lives when travelling by railway.

MR. NEATE said, he was in favour of a high minimum of compensation without relation to the class of carriage by which the person who was injured might travel. It should be put upon a general average.

MR. LEEMAN expressed himself satisfied with the assurance that had been given on the part of the Government, and withdrew his clauses.

Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. LEEMAN (for Mr. Watkin) moved the following clause (Costs, charges, &c., to be taxed and settled by masters of the Court of Queen's Bench):—

"That all disputed questions as to any costs, charges, and expenses of and incident to any arbitration or award made under the provisions of 'The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845,' or of any special Act of Parliament incorporating the same, whether the question in dispute arise as to compensation to be made for lands required to be purchased and actually taken by any Railway Company or any corporation, or in respect of the injurious affecting of other lands not taken, or otherwise in relation thereto, shall, if either party so requires, be taxed and settled as between the parties by one of the masters of the Court of Queen's Bench."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he had no objection to the reference to the masters of the Court of Queen's Bench; but he objected to the extension of the subject beyond railway companies, and suggested the omission of the words "or any corporation."

Clause (Costs, charges, &c. to be taxed and settled by masters of the Court of Queen's Bench,)—(*Mr. Watkin,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time; amended, and *added.*

MR. LEEMAN (in the absence of Mr. Serjeant Gaselee) moved a new clause (Company may apply to common law Judge at Westminster to hear cases of compensation under "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act").

Clause (Company may apply to common law judge at Westminster to hear cases of compensation under "Lands Clauses Consolidation Act,")—(*Mr. Watkin,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time; amended, and *added.*

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN moved a clause (Railway Companies in Ireland shall run one Passenger Train each way every Sunday). The hon. and learned Member said, that the insufficient Sunday accommodation of the Irish railways was a just cause of serious complaint. For instance, in the county he represented it was impossible to leave it between four o'clock on Saturday afternoon and eight o'clock Monday morning. He did not intend to press the clause on the present occasion; but he hoped that the attention of the Government would be directed to the matter.

MR. STACPOOLE seconded the clause.

Clause (Railway Companies in Ireland shall run one Passenger Train each way every Sunday,)—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

MR. BLAKE said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) had on this occasion showed more good sense than he exhibited when last he pressed a similar clause on the attention of the House. Were the hon. and learned Gentleman now prepared to pursue the same course, he (Mr. Blake) should have to appeal to the House to reject his clause. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Ennis (Mr. Stacpoole) said that the Waterford and Limerick Railway did everything it could to inconvenience the traffic of the country. Now what were the facts? The company referred to were working this line at a small profit to the shareholders, and on the Ennis line, in which the hon. Members for Clare and Ennis were interested, the traffic was conducted at a loss. He would add, too, that the line was kept up almost exclusively at the expense of a private individual, a friend of his own. He would like to ask the hon. Members who were in favour of having this line worked on Sundays what number of shares they had in it?

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN: None at all.

MR. STACPOOLE: None at all.

MR. BLAKE remarked that he thought that was the case. His hon. Friends were, doubtless, too sensible to invest their money in a speculation in which they would be unable to get a return for it, and yet they expected that that private gentleman to whom he referred, who worked the line for six days in the week at a loss, should work it on the seventh also, and that too for their own convenience when travelling about to see their constituents. It was a thing altogether unjustifiable that the 800 *employés* of that railway group should all be kept on duty during the Sunday in order to suit the convenience of some five-and-twenty persons who might travel just as well if they chose on the other days of the week. As there was no such law in force in England as that which his hon. and learned Friend desired to introduce in Ireland, he hoped the House would not sanction the proposition.

MR. STEPHEN CAVE observed that the law was the same in both countries. Neither in England nor in Ireland were companies compelled to run trains on Sundays. But it was provided that if any railway company ran a passenger train at all on Sunday it should also run a cheap train. He thought it better to leave the law as it stood. Such an alteration as the hon. and learned Baronet proposed would lead to great dissatisfaction in many quarters.

Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN then moved the following clause:—

"And all Railway Companies shall, from and after the passing of this Act, in every passenger train where there are more carriages than one of each class, provide smoking compartments for each class of passengers."

It was most desirable that the House should agree to this clause, as the inconvenience of the existing system respecting smoking in railway carriages was generally felt by persons travelling by railways.

Clause (Smoking compartments for all classes,)—(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

MR. LEEMAN opposed the clause, and thought that the better course would be to leave the matter in the hands of the directors of railway companies, who would always be sure to do that which was most convenient to the great body of those who travelled by their respective lines. If the House agreed to this clause the railway companies would be obliged to have smoking carriages attached to every train passing along their lines. This would lead to great expense, and would not be just to the companies.

MR. LAING thought that in the case of the main lines of the principal companies the custom already prevailed of providing smoking carriages; but on many of the cross country lines they were unnecessary; and it would be a cause of great expense if all companies, under all circumstances, were compelled to find special and separate accommodation for smokers. He thought that the better way would be for the House to leave the whole subject to be regulated by railway directors, who would, he was sure, do that which was most acceptable to the great body of the passengers using their lines.

MR. NEATE said, he was decidedly in favour of the clause, for he considered the proposal to provide smoking carriages on railway trains would be a great convenience, not only to those who desired to enjoy smoking, but to those who were opposed to its indulgence. He thought that they were by no means justified in leaving this matter in the hands of railway directors, who certainly were seldom distinguished by the desire to accommodate the public. The example of the Belgian and French railway companies in the providing of smoking carriages had hitherto been thrown away upon English directors, and they had been generally deaf to the repeated representations both of individuals and of the public Press. He could see no sort of objection to the adoption of the clause.

MR. GILPIN opposed the clause, and said, that the principle of having smoking carriages upon the Belgian and other foreign lines had not given such general satisfaction as was supposed. He had been as much inconvenienced by smoking in carriages which were not set apart for that purpose as in those that were. He thought that the matter should be left in the hands of the directors of railway companies, and that it would be impolitic to legislate upon this subject in the manner proposed. He objected to the clause altogether. It would lead to great expense to railway companies, ; for it was to be recollected that it was not that only one compartment was to be provided for the use of smokers on one particular train, but that each class in each train should be provided with such compartments.

MR. STACPOOLE supported the clause, and believed that it would be regarded as great a convenience to the non smoker as it would be to those who smoked.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK contended that the connivance at smoking by the directors was a breach of contract with those passengers who did not smoke.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON said, that the way in which the by-laws of the railway companies in reference to smoking in railway carriages had been systematically violated, and which caused much inconvenience to passengers, made it most desirable that some plan should be adopted by which the inconvenience could be got rid of and thought that the plan proposed by the hon. Member for Dudley (Mr. H. B. Sheridan) was the best that could be devised on the subject.

MR. WHALLEY also supported the clause, on the ground that it would be convenient to non-smokers as well as smokers.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he thought this clause would tend to prevent smoking rather than to facilitate it, because the smoking department would be reduced to its narrowest limits; and when that was full passengers would be allowed to smoke in no other. He thought that the subject was one which ought to be left to the directors of railways to settle; for he believed that those directors were in the habit of providing smoking carriages when it was proved to them that the passengers using their lines were desirous of having them.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH supported the clause. He could not understand the objection to the proposal before the House on the ground of expense, seeing that there was only to be one compartment for smoking attached to each train. He did not endorse the opinion given by the hon. Member (Mr. Gilpin) in reference to smoking on railways on the Continent. There the existing regulations on the subject were very inconvenient. It occurred in his case that a young gentleman travelling in the same carriage asked him if he objected to his smoking a cigar? He (Mr. Griffith) declined to reply to the question, which had the double effect of making him appear discourteous and of causing the young gentleman to manifest annoyance during the remainder of the journey.

MR. J. STUART MILL thought that the permission sought to be given to smokers travelling by railways, by the proposal before the House, was right and proper; and, for the reasons which had been already urged by hon. Members who had preceded him, he thought that the permission was especially desirous in the case of passengers going long journeys; but he thought that smoking compartments should be in connection with the hindermost carriages.

MR. LEVESON-GOWER said, he did not think smokers had justice done to them. He must say, so far as his own experience was concerned, he had never seen any gentleman smoking in a railway carriage who, if the practice were objected to, was not ready to discontinue it. Where that was not the case, railway companies had ample powers to enforce their penalties.

COLONEL WILSON-PATTEN suggested that, as the question under consideration was one that interested all persons travelling by railways, it would be better to leave it to be settled between the Board of Trade, and the directors of railways, who, after consultation, might be able to come to some understanding on the subject. There were difficulties to be overcome, and these would be more easily obviated by such an arrangement than by the adoption of a "hard and fast line," as proposed by this clause.

CAPTAIN VIVIAN said, he believed that three-fourths of the men who travelled by railway were smokers; and he feared there was too much truth in the representation that any arrangement such as was suggested by this clause was sure to be objected to by Directors, because it touched their pockets. If, however, those who represented the Board of Trade and the railway authorities would take this matter in hand and pledge themselves adequately to meet the convenience of the public, he would recommend his hon. Friend (Mr. H. B. Sheridan) to withdraw the clause.

MR. STEPHEN CAVE would rank himself among the non-smokers, and he thought there was very considerable inconvenience in the present system. It was unreasonable that people should be put in the position of either suffering great annoyance or appearing churlishly to interfere with the enjoyment of others. He thought the railway companies had been backward in consulting the convenience of the public in this respect. He should be happy to do all in his power to press on railway companies the absolute necessity of making some arrangements to meet the public complaints, and if they did not agree to do so, he would next Session support the hon. Gentleman in his efforts to obtain what must be admitted to be a consideration in railway travelling.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he must altogether decline to leave the matter in the hands of railway directors, and would therefore press the clause to a division.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 38; Noes 16: Majority 22.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN then said, that it ought to be inserted in the clause the day when it was to come into operation.

Mr. W. B. BEAUMONT moved an Amendment to the clause to the effect that the clause should only be applied by railway companies to their trains, "when so required by the Board of Trade."

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Clause, to add the words "when so required by the Board of Trade."—(*Mr. Beaumont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN objected to this addition that it would undo all that had already been agreed to. He had no objection to adopt a suggestion suggested by the hon. and learned Baronet (Sir Colman O'Loghlen), that the arrangement should begin on the 1st of October.

Mr. LEEMAN said, that there ought to be some limitation in regard to the application of the clause, for if it was made obligatory in respect to small lines of railways it would operate very oppressively.

Mr. LAING thought there should be a dispensing power in the Board of Trade.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN suggested that the words "unless exempted by the Board of Trade" would meet the difficulty —for this would make it obligatory on railway companies generally to have these smoking compartments attached to their trains, whereas, in the case of certain small railways, the Board of Trade would have an opportunity of excusing them if it thought fit to do so.

Mr. W. B. BEAUMONT then framed his Amendment in accordance with the suggestion, and also added the words

Mr. Stephen Cave

"first of October" as the period when the clause would come into operation, instead of "from and after the passing of this Act"—the original words in the clause.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause amended.

Clause, as amended, *added.*

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN then moved that the following clause be added to the Bill:—

> "It shall not be lawful for any Railway Company to increase any existing rate or charge, without having previously given three months' public notice of their intention so to do."

Clause (Rates or charges not to be increased without public notice,)—(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

Mr. LAING objected to the clause.

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE also objected to the clause, on the ground that it would throw an obstacle in the way of the reduction of the charges, which would be kept at a higher rate than they would be if the companies could raise them when they found the rate did not pay. The Parliamentary limits could not be exceeded in any case.

Mr. LEEMAN said, it was the most unjust clause ever submitted to the House.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL hoped, under all the circumstances, the hon. Gentleman would withdraw it.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he would withdraw the clause.

Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendments made.

Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

House adjourned at a quarter
before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 27, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (287); Danube Works Loan* (272); Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London,* (278).

Committee — Electric Telegraphs (282); Expiring Laws Continuance* (280); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4)* (273); Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation* (266); Registration (Ireland)* (281).

Report — Electric Telegraphs (282); Expiring Laws Continuance* (280); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4)* (273); Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation* (266); Registration (Ireland)* (281).

Third Reading—Public Schools* (288); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3)* (255), and *passed*.

NEW PEER.

Sir Robert Cornelis Napier, a Lieutenant General in Her Majesty's Army, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., Commander-in-Chief of the Army of Bombay—Having been created Baron Napier of Magdala in Abyssinia and of Caryngton in the County Palatine of Chester, was (in the usual Manner) *introduced.*

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

(NO. 287.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said: My Lords, if this Bill is to be considered a part of the great scheme of Parliamentary Reform which Her Majesty's Government have been labouring to bring about during the last two years, I may perhaps be permitted to say I consider it the most important portion of the scheme. I think so, my Lords, because I believe that the character of the House of Commons is of even greater importance than its organization, and there can be no doubt that the character of that House has been constantly, and perhaps not altogether unjustly, assailed by many persons, especially by those who are desirous of finding fault with our laws and Constitution. It has often been reproached of being elected in a corrupt manner—and having been so elected, of establishing a tribunal from its own body to try the Election Petitions, complaining of corrupt practices in this particular. Such a tribunal has therefore been looked upon as unsatisfactory. We have all read in history the various phases of corruption of which the Constitution has formerly been accused. About 130 or 140 years ago it was said that the Members of the House of Commons themselves were under the direct influence of corrupt motives and a corrupt system. Boroughs were subsequently bought and sold by and to the highest bidders, as if the right of returning their Members were part of the property. That period, however, happily passed away when the Reform Act of 1832 was passed. But it now appears that instead of boroughs being openly and shamelessly sold, since then many of them sell themselves. Such practices have naturally created great scandal, and consequently in every Session of Parliament since 1832 the House of Commons has been endeavouring to put an end to this system of corruption. I believe I shall not be saying anything offensive to the character or dignity of that House when I state that its attempts to effect that object have proved utterly futile, and it became evident that a tribunal constituted of the very men who were themselves exposed to the suspicion of being parties to these well-known electioneering tricks and corrupt practices, could not carry with it that entire confidence of the public which a tribunal that was perfectly independent in character and position, and entirely clear of any temptation to connect itself with these transactions, would secure. Well, at last the House of Commons has, I think, acted most wisely in removing that tribunal from their own body to one perfectly impartial and disinterested—namely, to the Judges of the land. This, I think, is the most important part of the Bill. This measure will hereafter place in the hands of certain Judges of the three Common Law Courts the trial of Election Petitions, whatever be the nature of the charges made in such Petitions. In taking this course there can be no doubt the House of Commons has acted most wisely, and strengthened its own powers, because being the great source of legislation it will thus naturally obtain greater influence in the country, additional respect, and a large augmentation of power. As to the details of the Bill, I will briefly place them before your Lordships. I do not think it necessary to describe the many phases through which the Bill has passed, only to say—what is very remarkable in it—it has come back to that which the Government at first proposed in the House of Commons. The House of Commons went into the consideration of the question with great care and industry, and proposed to refer the trials of Election Petitions to the ordinary Judges of the land. At that time there was a great indisposition manifested on the part of the learned Judges to undertake, in addition to their ordinary duties, the new duties which this measure would throw upon them. They therefore presented a protest to the Government, praying that these new duties should not be imposed upon them. The House of Commons accordingly re-considered their proposition; and it was suggested that a new tribunal from its own body should be specially created for the trial of Election Petitions. That proposal fell to the ground; and after the House and the Government had tried their hands at several proposals to amend the law upon the subject, they at last arrived at the conclusion that no course could be so safe or satisfactory as that which Her Majesty's Government had originally proposed. Therefore, as far as the House of Commons is concerned, the matter stands thus — The Bill provides that before a certain Petition complaining of an undue return shall be prosecuted, that the security of £1,000 shall be lodged for the due prosecution of the inquiry, and that the trial shall take place before a Puisne Judge of one of the Superior Courts of Common Law; such Judge to be selected from a *rota* to be framed by the Judges generally. The measure further empowers Her Majesty to appoint an additional Puisne Judge to each of the Courts of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer. It also provides that the trial of the Petition shall be held within the locality in which it is alleged the corrupt practices have taken place. This I think your Lordships will say is a most important and useful provision; for it is well known how effective have been the results when a Special Commission has been sent to any borough to prosecute the inquiry on the spot. The Judge is to report to the Speaker of the House of Commons the result of the trial, and to make a special Report if anything extraordinary should have occurred in the proceedings; and the House of Commons is to retain in itself the power of issuing the Writ for a new election. The Report of the Judge will be equivalent to the Report of the Election Committee now. The proceedings of the trial are to go on notwithstanding the prorogation of Parliament—the Judges are to be received, when they go down to the country to open those trials, with all the honours and dignity with which they were now received at the commencement of the assizes—the Sheriffs to receive them, &c. As to the witnesses, they will be subpœnaed in the same manner as they are subpœnaed on trials at *Nisi Prius*, and will be subject to the same penalties for non-attendance or false swearing. It the Petition be withdrawn, costs to be paid to the respondent, and the general costs of a Petition are to be defrayed by the parties in such a manner as the Judge shall determine. I now come to that part of the Bill which provides for the punishment of corrupt practices. Some of your Lordships may, perhaps, think these punishments rather severe. In the case of the candidate being convicted of bribery the punishment is exclusion from a seat in the House of Commons for a period of seven years. In the case of the voter the Bill declares that any person found guilty of accepting a bribe is to be deprived of the privilege of a voter either at Parliamentary or municipal Elections, and to be declared disqualified from holding any public office for a certain period, or from being appointed a justice of the peace. Such penalties, he thought, would prove effectual, to prevent a candidate from having resort to corrupt practices, and in the case of the voter would deter him from accepting bribes. This, my Lords, is the substance of this Bill, and I need not say more upon the subject. It has been a very difficult subject to handle, and it was with great difficulty passed through the House of Commons, because it was a subject upon which there were many different opinions both as to the main points involved in it and also as to what the punishment should be; but after a long time had been employed upon the matter the Government and the House of Commons have agreed upon this measure; and I trust that as it practically concerns the House of Commons more than it does this House — it concerns, indeed, the whole country, no doubt, for the whole country is interested in having its representatives free from all stain and suspicion —yet, as it practically applies principally to the House of Commons, I may ask your

Lordships to pass the Bill without Amendment.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

EARL RUSSELL said, he very much regretted that a Bill of such great importance, and which, according to his view, if it had come up earlier, might have been amended by their Lordships with very good effect, should have reached that House only on the 24th of July, at a time when the attendance was naturally so thin that it was impossible it could receive the attention which, under other circumstances, might have been given to it. With regard to the importance of the question, he entirely agreed with the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury). Nothing could be of more importance than that corrupt practices at elections should be prevented. When the Bill for the extension of the franchise was before the House last year he took the liberty of saying that he was afraid, not of the democratic influence which excited the apprehension of some of their Lordships, but of the increase of those corrupt practices which had hitherto done so much injury to our representative system; and he then pointed out that there had grown up a practice by which persons, perhaps coming home from the colonies or elsewhere, possessed of considerable sums of money, obtained seats in Parliament by means of large expenditure, often displacing persons who were connected with the boroughs in which they were elected. It too often happened that there is no difficulty in finding a man willing to spend £10,000 or more in obtaining a seat in the House of Commons—not for the promotion of any measure or any principle whose success might be beneficial to the public, but for the purpose of increasing his own individual importance in the country. He had, therefore, been very anxious that some legislation should be proposed by which that evil might have been checked, if not altogether stopped. The noble Earl had recommended that Bill to them, though without laying any great stress on any argument to show that corrupt practices would be put an end to by it. But there were very important considerations connected with the measure, and connected also with what had been the constitution of the House of Commons for more than 200 years. He (Earl Russell) entirely approved the principle by which the inquiry into corrupt practices was to be removed from Westminster and carried into the particular borough or place in which the complaint had arisen. He thought it far more likely that such corrupt practices would be detected at the place where they were alleged to exist than if the great expense and delay of an investigation at a distance had to be incurred — disadvantages which, under the present system, had often had the effect of preventing inquiry altogether, because candidates who had been put to heavy cost for a contest in which they had been unsuccessful, were frequently unwilling to meet the large additional expense of prosecuting a Petition. It was therefore very desirable to obtain a proper tribunal to try those questions on the spot where the corrupt practices were alleged to have been carried on. But there came next very grave constitutional questions, which he thought could hardly be passed over lightly by their Lordships. The House of Commons, since the reign of James I., asserted for themselves the privilege of deciding on the validity of the elections of the representatives of the people. At present they need not fear that influence on the part of the Crown in these matters which was formerly exercised; but they ought to take the greatest pains, if they departed from the principle that the representatives themselves should be the parties to decide whether Members had been duly elected to sit among them, and that there should be a proper tribunal to try the questions. Now, the first objection made to the present Bill, as originally introduced, was made by the Judges; and he held in his hand the Letter on that subject, written in February last, to the then Lord Chancellor, by the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench in his own behalf and in behalf of his brother Judges. In that letter the Lord Chief Justice spoke of the insuperable repugnance entertained by all the Judges to having these new duties thrust upon them, and expressed it as their unanimous opinion that the inevitable consequence of requiring them to try Election Petitions would be to lower and degrade the judicial office, and to destroy or impair the confidence of the public in their thorough impartiality and integrity when, in the course of their ordinary duties, political matters became incidentally involved. It was impossible for him (Earl Russell) to allude to the arguments urged with reference to the objections of the Judges in the forcible letter of the Lord Chief

Justice, without observing that within the last day or two they had lost a distinguished Member of their Lordships' House (Lord Cranworth), whose learning, whose judicial impartiality and calm judgment rendered his decease a matter of deep regret, he was sure, to them all. Their Lordships, he was convinced, would all feel that that House and the country had sustained a severe loss by the death of one whose opinion, from his high character and his great learning, was always entitled to great weight, and, who, from his long experience in judicial practice, would have been so well able to give advice on the present occasion. But, returning to the objections of the Judges, he believed the great majority of the judicial Bench still entertained those objections. The questions to be decided in proceedings to be taken under this Bill—the question whether a man is duly entitled to take his seat in the House of Commons — was one of a very delicate nature, and for himself he did not think it was possible for the Judges, however pure their conduct might be, to escape suspicion or imputations of partiality if they were called upon to decide these questions. No doubt Committees of the House of Commons belonging to one party or another, might sometimes have shown a bias with regard to an Election Petition. But that was quite a different thing from saying that a Judge, who was supposed to have been altogether removed from a political sphere, in which he had perhaps acted as a Law Officer of one Government or another, was to decide who was entitled and who was not entitled to a seat in the House of Commons. He therefore thought that objection was well founded, and that the imputations to which he had referred against the Judges, if they discharged these functions, would be made. He was far from saying that those imputations would be deserved. Unquestionably the Judges would take every care to weigh the special circumstances that might be brought before them, and endeavour to arrive at their decision with the greatest impartiality. But when a party found that a favourite candidate of theirs, brought forward with a great desire that he should obtain a seat in Parliament, was displaced on an Election Petition, and probably on the evidence of persons whom they would believe to be utterly unworthy of credit, it was impossible that imputations such as he had referred to would not be made. That, he thought, was the main objection to that proposal. He did not say that this objection was a conclusive one against the Bill, for he regarded the local inquiry as very beneficial, and he should be glad if his apprehensions with regard to imputations being cast on the Judges should prove to be unfounded. It was, however, he thought, a very grave objection. He was glad to find that the operation of the Bill was limited to three, or rather to four years; and if at the end of that period it should be held by general consent that the measure had failed, some other mode of repressing corrupt practices would have to be tried. Their Lordships would therefore, he thought, do wisely by agreeing to the Bill as an experiment, leaving it to time to decide whether the objections entertained by the Judges and others were well founded. The noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury) had explained the severe penalties which the Bill proposed to attach to persons who had taken part in corrupt practices. The 43rd, 44th, 45th, and 46th clauses contained certain disqualifications. The first was that a person who had been a consenting party to bribery or corrupt practices should be disqualified for seven years from sitting in Parliament. Now, this point had been settled by some in a very summary manner, for it had been asked whether, supposing a man had wilfully consented to corrupt practices, the punishment was too severe. This, however, was really not the question. The question was whether we could find a tribunal upon which we could implicitly rely that no man who was entirely innocent should be declared guilty of these practices. He could imagine a man going to a candidate and saying, "If you will give me £500 I will take care that fifty voters who are now wavering shall poll in your favour." The candidate might agree to this, and the whole thing might be hushed up, no third party ever knowing anything of it. Another candidate might reply that he would not give him £500, and he never would be a party to corrupting the electors, yet the very man who, had he received the money, would not have breathed a word of it, might go before the Judge and swear that he had received the money from the candidate, and spent it with his consent or at his suggestion in bribery. It might be said, indeed, that the Judge would not believe a man who thus perjured himself, and would be likely to come to a correct decision. Judges, however, even with the assistance of juries, were not infallible; and their Lordships would all remember that there had recently been at Manchester a very important trial, where five persons were tried for murder, or for being accessories to murder, and where one of those who were found guilty by the jury and sentenced by the Judge, it afterwards turned out, was entirely innocent. That was a recent case, and there were numerous cases of a similar character on record of men and women having been executed for crimes which they had never committed. Yet it was now proposed —not that a Judge and jury, but that a Judge sitting singly, should sentence a man, without any power of appeal to the Crown, to seven years' exclusion from Parliament, and should disqualify him from being registered as a voter, from holding judicial and certain other offices, and from acting as a justice of the peace. Now, these were formidable penalties degrading and reducing a man in position and rank; they were of the utmost importance to the person himself, and they were also of importance to the district in which he might have hoped to fill a position of honour or usefulness. He doubted whether it was right to give such power to a single Judge, and he had drawn up a proviso to the effect that any person reported by a Judge as guilty of any of the offences enumerated in the 43rd, 44th, 45th, and 46th clauses might, within three months, appeal to the Court of Common Pleas, where such appeal should be tried by the Chief Justice or some other Judge and a jury, whose verdict should be final. If such penalties were imposed there should be something more than the decision of a single Judge; for though that Judge might be very learned in the law, and might have devoted his whole life to the study of the theory and letter of the law, he might not be well versed in the ways of mankind and in the practices of those connected with elections, and who are conversant with bribery and corrupt practices. Such a Judge might be very credulous of the evidence given; and thus the opinion of a single Judge, learned in the law, but unversed in the ways of the world, and especially in the ways of the election world, might condemn an innocent man to stigma and disgrace and to exclusion from political life. He should not, however, trouble their Lordships by moving any Amendments in Committee, it being far too late in the Session to come to any adverse vote on the subject, and he should therefore simply place the proviso in the hands of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, who was qualified to consider the propriety of a single Judge deciding such questions. It was proposed that a single Judge should be put in the position now occupied by a Committee of five Members presided over by a competent Chairman. He thought their Lordships would all agree that in old times, when controverted elections were decided as party questions, very corrupt decisions were given. Mr. Grenville, in the middle of the last century, remedied this by substituting a tribunal consisting of five Members of the House of Commons. Now, he (Earl Russell) had repeatedly stated in the House of Commons that the effect of that change was that, instead of considering a seat in Parliament as a political and party matter, it became a matter like a question of property, to be decided between two claimants, each risking several thousand pounds, one in order to obtain the seat, and the other in defending it. It was treated too much as a question between two individuals, and not as a question in which the constituency and the public were concerned. This was a defect in the present system, and it made him the more willing to agree to some change; but he must confess he did not think electoral corruption would be rooted out or very much checked by this measure. It was quite right, however, that something of the kind should be tried; and, this plan having been agreed upon by the House of Commons, he cheerfully assented to it.

The present being about the last debate of the Session he would venture to put a question to the noble Earl on another subject. In 1841 the Government of the day brought forward a financial measure in relation to the sugar duties which was defeated by a majority, he thought, of 36. The Government immediately decided that they would dissolve Parliament; but they did not announce their decision, and Sir Robert Peel thought himself justified in moving, or called upon to move, a Vote of Want of Confidence. That was carried in a very full House by a majority of 1; after which Sir Robert Peel asked him for an assurance that as soon as the dissolution and the elections should be over the new Parliament should be called together. Feeling that his Colleagues and himself would not wish to remain in Office unless they possessed the confidence of the country, he at once and willingly gave that pledge, and the new Parliament accordingly met at as early a date as possible. There was a great majority against the then existing Ministry and there was an end of the Administration. And now Parliament was placed in a position still more peculiar, because for two years they had had a Government going on without the confidence of the House of Commons. He was not going to blame anyone for that; all he would say was this, that it would be for the public interest—and he was sure it would be more agreeable to the feelings of the noble Earl opposite and his Colleagues—that when the registration was completed and there would be an opportunity for a dissolution, Parliament should be called together again as soon as possible. He supposed the noble Earl opposite would have no hesitation in saying that that would be done. It was what he (Earl Russell) did when Minister in 1841.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: In offering to your Lordships a few observations on what has fallen from the noble Earl (Earl Russell) I must commence by responding very sincerely to the statement which he made at the outset with reference to the great loss which your Lordships have sustained since the last meeting of this House in the person of my late noble and learned Friend—Lord Cranworth. My Lords, of the loss of Lord Cranworth to those who have had the privilege of enjoying his friendship I feel it impossible for me to speak. But, my Lords, this I may say—that your Lordships and the public have in him lost one who passed through a long career of high judicial office without a tarnish on his name—one who, I venture to say, in the discharge of his great duties for courtesy, for candour, for careful and conscientious efficiency, and, above all, for sound and exquisite common sense, has never been surpassed by any person who ever before filled the same offices.

My Lords, with respect to the Bill now before your Lordships, most of the comments of the noble Earl (Earl Russell) as certainly might have been expected, have turned upon the character of the tribunal offered by the measure for the trial hereafter of Election Petitions. My Lords, upon that point I wish to say a word as to the changes which the proposition has from time to time undergone. When the Bill was introduced by Her Majesty's Government last year the proposition, I think, was that Commissioners to try Election Petitions should be nominated by the Speaker of the House of Commons. That proposition, in the discussions which arose, did not find favour with the House of Commons, and Her Majesty's Government proposed an alternative measure, that the trial of Election Petitions should be conducted before the Judges of the Superior Courts at Westminster. Before the opinion of the House of Commons was definitively taken upon that proposition Parliament was prorogued. At the commencement of the present year the Government through my noble and learned Friend (Lord Chelmsford), who then held the office which I have now the honour to hold, received a communication, to which the noble Earl has referred, from the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench on the part of all the Judges, deprecating very strongly the proposal that the trial of Election Petitions should be devolved upon the Judges. As well as I recollect, the grounds taken by the Judges were substantially two. The first was that, by the appointment of the Judges to try Election Petitions, involving matter of political feeling, the confidence of the public in the impartiality of the learned Judges in other matters would be shaken; and the second ground was that, with the great amount of business by which the Judges were already overweighted, it would be impossible for them to undertake the further duty of conducting the trial of Election Petitions, which might last for a considerable time in some years or every year. These objections they stated with so much force that the Government felt it was necessary to refer them to Parliament, and to propose again an alternative measure. The next proposition laid before Parliament—and I mention these proposals to show the various schemes the House of Commons has had before it—was that three Election Judges should be appointed from time to time by the Government to try the Petitions. That, again, was objected to on the ground that instead of delegating their functions to the judicial Bench, it would be placing the power of deciding upon elections in three officers chosen by the Government of the day. In order to avoid, if possible, that difficulty, the Government made this proposition in the next place, that out of the present Judges in Westminster Hall two should be selected who would receive a somewhat higher position than the other Judges—probably receiving the rank of Privy Councillors—and that those thus chosen from the limited number of existing Judges, having given proof of their capacity in the discharge of judicial business, should be appointed to try Election Petitions when there were any to be tried, and at other times should sit on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. That proposal the House of Commons again objected to, and a very strong opinion was manifested that the reasons given by the learned Judges for deprecating the office of trying Election Petitions ought not to be allowed to weigh, and that the Legislature was the proper authority to decide what were the duties which the Judges ought to discharge. That was not only the opinion, but was supported by the vote of the House of Commons, and by a very considerable majority the proposition to assign two special Judges to try Election Petitions was negatived. At the same time a very strong inclination was shown to authorize the appointment of further Judges in the various Courts, to have the Bill re-modelled, and Election Petitions tried by the Judges very much in the manner originally proposed. Consequently the Bill was brought nearly into the shape your Lordships now have it, and in that shape received the sanction of the House of Commons. There was one proposition of Her Majesty's Government which did not receive the sanction of the House of Commons, but which I wish to mention more particularly. We proposed that, at the same time that the numbers of each Court were increased from five to six, the Court should select the particular Judge that was to try Election Petitions, and that the Judge so selected should, in addition to his present salary, receive a sum of £500 for each year that he was so employed, and if employed for a certain time, should be released from the duty of going on circuit that year. That proposal was rejected by the House of Commons. I am anxious to make this explanation, because some misapprehension appears to have prevailed on the subject out-of-doors. It would have been my duty to be the medium of communication with the learned Judges, and I wish therefore to say to your Lordships that neither directly nor indirectly was any mention made to the learned Judges that they were to receive an additional salary for the performance of the duties proposed; and therefore the observations that the learned Judges were willing to accept an additional £500 a year as "a bribe," as it was said, is a statement altogether without foundation. In point of fact, my Lords, after the division in the House of Commons, negativing the proposal with respect to the two specific Judges, it would have been utterly impossible for me to communicate with them; but, in addition to that, it appeared to me that it would have been very much better to avoid making any proposition to the Judges about the increase of salary; that if the House of Commons were willing to increase their salary, it would be a very fit and very proper thing to do, but it would not be proper to make any communication to the Judges, whether directly or indirectly, on the subject. I am bound to say that I regret very much that the House of Commons has negatived that proposal. The position of the existing Judges in the Superior Courts is very peculiar. They are learned persons who have surrendered large and lucrative private practice; they have accepted the office they now hold, knowing at the time the duties both on the Bench and on circuit they would be expected to perform, and knowing who would be associated with them on the Bench, and whose advice and assistance they would have the benefit of. For persons who have accepted office on that footing to have their duties changed without offering any terms by way of compensation is a proceeding that I must think very unfair. And although the trial of those Election Petitions is very much of the nature of the business on circuit, yet I am bound to say that the two things would be very different. It is one thing to preside on circuit where proper arrangements have been made for their reception, where they have the society of a large Bar during the time the circuit continues, and it is quite another thing to send a single Judge alone into various parts of the country, where Judges have not been in the habit of going, where there is no kind of fitting accommodation for them, and where they may be kept at a distance from their houses and families it may be for two or three months. It appears to me that to men who have accepted office on very different conditions there would be an irksomeness in the new duties which they might very fairly deprecate. I very greatly fear that the result will be that, whereas if the House of Commons had increased the salaries some of the existing Judges would have been found willing to undertake the duty, these Election Inquiries will be thrown in the various Courts on the new Judges who accept office with their eyes open, and that the public will not have the benefit of the experience of the elder Judges. I do not propose to follow the noble Earl (Earl Russell) at any length in his criticism of the tribunal which it is proposed to constitute. He says, and says truly, that this is a very great power to place in the hands of a single Judge without a jury, and that the punishments to be inflicted under this Bill for bribery and other cognate offences are punishments of a very grave character. In that opinion I entirely concur. But what is the alternative offered for your Lordships' consideration in this case? Before we criticize or condemn the tribunal proposed by this Bill we must ask what other tribunal we are to propose and to weigh in the scale against it? The House of Commons have declined any longer to provide out of their own body a tribunal for the trial of Election Petitions — the fact of their passing this Bill shows that they wish to devolve that duty upon some other tribunal. What, then, is the suggestion we are to make to them in preference to the plan contained in this Bill? The noble Earl agrees in the propriety of a local inquiry. But does he really think that that inquiry will be improved by empanelling a jury of the vicinage, where politics run high, and the question is as to the conduct of parties in the election? Does he really propose that a jury shall be summoned from the neighbourhood, not to assist the Judge, but to decide the questions which come before the Court?

Earl RUSSELL said, that what he proposed was to leave these questions to be decided on appeal by a Judge and jury sitting at Westminster.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: I am going by steps through the noble Earl's argument, and am dealing first with the local inquiry. He said this was a very strong power to entrust to a single Judge without a jury; but I do not suppose he would think the tribunal improved by a jury of the vicinage. But then the noble Earl would allow any person affected by a certificate from a Judge conducting one of these local inquiries to appeal within three months from that decision, and he would provide that the appeal should be heard at Westminster before the Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas and another Judge and jury. Now, let us consider that proposal. Your Lordships must assume that in every single case there would be an appeal from the certificate of a Judge finding the offences specified in this Bill. Every person so found guilty would endeavour to avail himself of this power of appeal, because he could not be the worse, and he might be the better for it. I would ask whether the decision of this Court is to be based upon evidence brought before it, or on evidence taken in the country? The noble Earl says that one of the merits of this Bill is that the truth will be more effectually ascertained on the spot. Therefore his proposal is that the local inquiry—which the noble Earl admits is the best for ascertaining the truth—should be brought under review by another inquiry, not conducted in the locality, but at Westminster, where the same means of ascertaining the truth will not exist.

Earl RUSSELL: The Court of Appeal at Westminster will have before it the evidence taken at the local inquiry.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: Well, then, the jury are not to decide upon evidence taken before them, but upon the record of *vivâ voce* evidence taken before a Judge elsewhere. Now, in hearing evidence very much depends upon the demeanour of witnesses. A jury should hear the evidence given; they should be able to judge from the sight, and by the tone of a witness, and the manner in which he gives his evidence, whether that evidence is or is not worthy of belief. But the noble Earl would propose that the decision of the Judge who has actually heard the evidence should be brought under review, not by another Judge, but by a jury at Westminster, who have seen none of the witnesses, and are simply to decide upon written evidence. I think that any tribunal of that kind would be the very worst that could possibly be devised; and although I should be glad to see the tribunal suggested in this Bill fenced round by every reasonable precaution, I feel satisfied that upon consideration the noble Earl will hesitate before seriously proposing another tribunal of the kind which he has suggested.

Leaving the Bill now before your Lordships, the noble Earl referred to a topic of more general interest. He said that the Government had for two years conducted the government of the country without the confidence of the House of

Commons. Now, I must demur entirely to that statement. I believe, on the contrary, that the Government have had the confidence of the House of Commons; and I believe it for this reason—because, in a case where the Government for so long a period have not had the confidence of the House of Commons, I have never known the House of Commons abstain from expressing their opinion to that effect; and inasmuch as the House of Commons have never expressed such an opinion with regard to the present Administration, and as, when a member of the party with which the noble Earl is connected, placed upon the Notice Paper during the present year a Motion of Want of Confidence, he never had the courage to bring it forward, I venture to think that the view of the noble Earl on this subject is entirely an erroneous one. But the noble Earl has asked whether a statement would be made by the Government analogous to that made by Sir Robert Peel relative to a dissolution of Parliament in 1841. Why, that statement has been made for some time past pretty nearly every week, sometimes in this and sometimes in the other House of Parliament. When the Registration Bill passed through Committee your Lordships were told that the subject had been carefully considered with a view to lead up to and make possible a dissolution at the earliest possible moment; and it was with that object your Lordships were asked to give a somewhat hurried consideration to the Bill in order that it might receive the Royal Assent at the necessary period.

LORD ROMILLY: My Lords, it is not my intention to discuss the Bill now before your Lordships, which it is important should pass without the danger of involving any difference with the other House or any chance of delay. But my right hon. Friend the Lord Chief Justice has requested me, on behalf of himself and of all the other Judges, to say that though when first consulted they disapproved very much of these functions being imposed upon them because they thought it would be injurious to the authority and reputation of their office that the Judges should be mixed up in election matters, and though they retain that opinion up to the present moment, nevertheless they desire it be known that, if Parliament think fit to require them to perform these duties, they will cheerfully and readily perform them to the best of their ability. Besides this, my right hon. Friend desired me to confirm to your Lordships that which we have heard from my noble and learned Friend—that they were never consulted upon the subject of whether an additional sum of £500 should be given to the Judges to be selected for the purpose of conducting these inquiries; that, so far from its being the fact, according to the very injurious rumours which got abroad, that this provision had been introduced with their sanction for the purpose of making things smooth, nothing of the sort had occurred; and that if such a proposition had been made to them my right hon. Friend, on behalf of himself and every one of his Colleagues, declared that they should have unanimously rejected it. Though, however, under the circumstances, that is a very natural feeling on the part of the Judges, I cannot but assent to a part of what has fallen from my noble and learned Friend—not that it would have been right to give an additional £500 a year to particular Judges to be selected for this purpose, which would have been in the nature of a bribe for the performance of those duties, but that, considering the additional functions imposed upon them all, which they would all readily and cheerfully undertake, however much they disapproved them, this addition to the judicial salary would have been a very fit and proper proceeding. I said that I did not intend to discuss the Bill, although it seems to me to contain very crude provisions, and to be a Bill likely to have a very ignominious conclusion; but I wish to point out that my noble and learned Friend (the Lord Chancellor) has misapprehended the proposal made by my noble Friend below me (Earl Russell). It was never proposed by him, as I understood, that the inquiry at Westminster should be substituted for the local inquiry, nor that it should be founded upon the written evidence taken in the course of the local inquiry; but that in every case of appeal the same witnesses should be re-examined and the former evidence tested, and, if necessary, additional evidence given in a further and more minute inquiry before a jury. Now, whether that would be a beneficial measure or not I will not stay to inquire, because it appears to be generally understood that at this period of the Session it is not desirable to introduce into the Bill any Amendments which might delay the prorogation, but I thought it necessary to correct this misapprehension on the part of my noble and learned Friend.

I cannot conclude my remarks without expressing the deep regret I feel at the loss of a valued Friend with whom I have been more or less intimately associated for the last thirty years. I have been repeatedly his junior before your Lordships' House and in the Court of Chancery, I have been constantly engaged with him in public and legal business, and I always received from him the utmost kindness. He was preeminently distinguished for three qualities —his candour and fairness, his common sense, and his gentlemanly feeling and bearing towards all with whom he was brought into contact. No one can regret more than I do the loss which this House has sustained, and I cannot refrain from adding my testimony to the character and qualities of the noble and learned Lord who has been thus suddenly removed from the midst of us.

The Earl of HARROWBY said, he did not regard the transference of jurisdiction in the matter of Election Petitions as a confession on the part of the House of Commons that it was incompetent to conduct these inquiries with fairness, for he had had no small experience on Election Committees, and he must bear his testimony to the general fairness with which their inquiries were conducted. Electoral corruption was different from almost any other offence or crime, for it had not yet received that mark of individual reprobation which made it to be considered a crime by those who committed it and by those who were the objects of it. It was difficult to invest the offence with that feeling of gravity and that weight on the conscience which enabled those who made investigations respecting it to do so with a sense of responsibility, and to conduct the inquiries in such a manner as to impress others with a due sense of gravity. Hitherto corruption had been considered by those who committed it, and by those who were the objects of it, a positive rather than a moral offence, created by the law rather than existing in the nature of things; and under these circumstances it was difficult to invest an inquiry with that solemnity with which it ought to be surrounded. As he understood it we were now about to make the experiment, by transferring the jurisdiction to another tribunal, and adopting a different mode of procedure, to create a moral sense on the subject, and he agreed that it was only by creating such moral sense that we had any chance of putting an end to corruption. If the object aimed at had been to make inquiry more searching and complete, then he believed the transfer of tribunal would have an opposite effect, for in his opinion the irregular jurisdiction and proceedings of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, not bound by any rules of evidence or practice, were far more likely to effect a penetrating and searching inquiry than a regular Court presided over by a Common Law Judge. But he was prepared to admit the probability that the substitute of one of the Superior Judges for the Commissioners, whose Courts presented the aspect of a dramatic entertainment in which the audience were frequently "convulsed with laughter," was much more likely to create a moral sense than the present method of inquiry. The experiment was a great one, and he hoped it would bear fruits.

Viscount STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE said, he must congratulate the House and the country on the step which had been taken by the House of Commons with the object of putting a stop to electoral corruption. To his mind it was highly creditable to the House of Commons that they should have taken such a step in order to free themselves from any suspicion of sympathizing with bribery; and that in the last moments of its existence it should have passed a measure divesting itself of its right of trying Election Petitions, and transferring its authority to another tribunal. It was equally creditable to the Government of the day that they had done their best to forward the measure and to encourage the House of Commons to pass it. With respect to the evil against which the measure was directed, it had taken root so deeply in the habits of the country that it was an extravagant expectation to hope that the Bill would put a stop to it entirely; but it was to be hoped that the change of tribunal would have a great moral effect, would impress people with the gravity of the offence, and would cause them to reflect on the injury done to the country by those who committed it. He had some personal recollections which showed how deeply corrupt practices were rooted. Once, when he was a candidate for a borough now extinct, he called upon a voter, who being at dinner held up his knife and warned him to be off, well-knowing that he was about to lose the £10 bribe he had pocketed at former elections. On another occasion, when he contested Lynn Regis, a shoemaker of his party declined a bribe; and when his procession, as one of the successful candidates, passed the shoemaker's shop, a shoe was hoisted on a pole and three cheers given in recognition of what was regarded as an extraordinary instance of public virtue. Such instances could, no doubt, be multiplied. He thought that the amount of security required in reference to the presentation of Election Petitions might discourage persons from presenting them; but with regard to the penalty imposed for corrupt practices, he had no hesitation in saying that, regard being had to the nature of the offence, the penalty could hardly be too great. However, in the present temper of the country, it might be well to go no further than was now proposed, and to wait until some additional moral effect should be produced by the operation of the Bill.

He could not sit down without adding a word to the tribute of regret so generally expressed for the loss of the eminent man whose recent death had been referred to in the course of the present discussion. He had known Lord Cranworth in private life long before he attained the high position which he ultimately reached. If he was always an honest politician, he was equally remarkable as a sincere, straightforward, single-minded man; and it was impossible for any one to go to his grave with a nobler or more estimable character.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS BILL—(No. 282.)

(*The Duke of Montrose.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Lord REDESDALE said, that one of the provisions in reference to the purchase of the telegraphs sanctioned the payment of any sums voted by the shareholders as a recognition of special services; and it had been suggested that as directors could generally command the votes of a large number of the shareholders, they might by that provision secure to themselves the payment of sums voted under the head of special services. He thought the shareholders required some protection against abuse in this matter.

The Duke of SOMERSET said, that the railway companies were only to be allowed under the Bill to use the telegraphic wires on the railway lines in connection with the working of their trains; but great inconvenience might arise if a person, on arriving at a railway station, found that his luggage had been left behind, and was not permitted to employ the telegraphic apparatus at the station to give directions for its transmission. He thought that the use of the railway lines ought to be permitted in some cases; for instance, where the Post Office telegraph was not near the station.

The Duke of MONTROSE thought there would be no difficulty in carrying out the object desired by the noble Duke.

House in Committee; Bill *reported,* without Amendment; and to be read 3^a *To-morrow.*

ABYSSINIA—THE ENVOYS.

QUESTION.

Lord HOUGHTON: I wish to ask, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to recognize in any special manner the services and sufferings of Her Majesty's Envoys to the late King of Abyssinia? All the persons connected with the recent Expedition have received the full measure of our esteem and praise; and the manner in which we received the hero of that enterprize this evening has shown our full sense of the manner in which that campaign was planned and carried out. But there are humbler persons engaged in the Expedition to whom I think public attention has not been so much directed as it ought, and on whose behalf I have placed my Question upon the Notice Paper. I trust that Her Majesty's Government, if they can, will in some way compensate those who were detained prisoners in Abyssinia, and who have suffered very greatly for their country's behoof. I myself have had the pleasure of Consul Cameron's acquaintance for a long time, and I know that he is a man who, if he has committed any error, has done so not from personal considerations, but has acted from a deep sense of public duty. He is a gentleman of great courage, and under any circumstances would do all he could to maintain what he conceived to be the honour and interests of his country. He has just landed in England with his constitution broken by the miseries he has suffered, and his health is utterly shattered. I trust that Her Majesty's Foreign Office will see that he is a public servant fully deserving of their confidence, and will recognize the claims which he has upon that Department of the public service. The case of Consul Cameron apart, however, I wish to call attention to the case of persons against whom no accusation can be drawn of their having in the slightest degree been the cause of their own sufferings. These gentlemen were sent out to King Theodore by Her Majesty's Government in the year 1864. The mission consisted of three persons, who at that time held important places under the Indian Government—namely, Mr. Rassam, Assistant Resident at Aden, Dr. Blane, of the Medical Staff, and Lieutenant Prideaux, of the Bombay Staff Corps. These gentlemen were transferred from the Indian to the British service, and went out to Massowah. Having remained there a year they received the consent of King Theodore to visit him, and they proceeded to his court. There everything went on well for a time; but latterly the strange humour of the unhappy monarch changed, and these persons who represented the official dignity of England were placed in chains and treated, if not with great cruelty, at least with great discomfort. They remained in chains for eighteen months, during which period they bore their misfortunes with great courage, endurance, and high spirit. During the whole of that time they were compelled to support themselves at their own expense. They received no money from the Government, but maintained their servants and their establishments out of their own funds. For two years it may be said that they underwent great misery and received nothing which could be considered in any way as adequate satisfaction or remuneration. It may be urged that these persons did not succeed in their mission; but it is allowed on all sides that that want of success was in no wise due to any want of tact or ability on their part, and it would be generally allowed, he thought, that it was mainly due to the influence of Mr. Rassam over the mind of that savage chief that King Theodore did not destroy the captives in his fury. In calling attention, therefore, to the case of those men, he trusted it would not be thought he wished to dictate any particular course to Her Majesty's Government. The noble Lord the Privy Seal had distinguished himself from the very first by taking a deep interest in the Abyssinian question; and he therefore desired to ask him whether it was the intention of the Government to recognize in any special manner the sufferings of those gentlemen?

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, the noble Lord naturally expected that Her Majesty's Government, after what they had done for those unfortunate captives, was not very likely to desert them now. But the fact was that with the best possible intentions towards them the Government had not yet received an official Report that would justify any proceedings of the nature to which the noble Lord alluded. Mr. Rassam was now engaged in drawing up such a Report; but his Papers, whether by mistake or otherwise was uncertain, had gone to Aden, and the Government were not in possession of the information which it was necessary they should have before they acted.

House adjourned at a quarter past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 27, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Prisons (Ireland).*
First Reading—Prisons (Ireland)* [256].
Second Reading—Woods and Game Assessment* [242].
Committee—Poor Relief [186].
Report—Poor Relief [186].
Third Reading—Salmon Fisheries (Scotland)* [210]; Marriages Validity (Blakedown)* [250], and *passed.*
Withdrawn—Government of India Act Amendment [91]; Governor General of India* [92].

ARMY—FORTIFICATIONS.—QUESTION.

COLONEL SYKES said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in reference to the Fortifications Return, No. 157, of the 26th March 1867, in which it is stated that 987 large rifled guns, and 1,104 guns of 95 cwt., at a cost of £1,883,722, will be required for the armament of the said Fortifications, it is his intention to apply the Plymouth Iron Shield, said to weigh 33 tons, or the Gibraltar Shield of 32 tons, or any other iron shield, to the embrasures of the 2,093 guns required for the Fortifications, or to what number of embrasures, and at what cost per shield, and the total cost?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that it was not in his power to give the hon. and gallant Gentleman a decided Answer to his Question. At present no decision upon the subject had been come to, and it would be impossible to come to such a decision until the Government had received the Report of the Committee which was now engaged in considering the late experiments at Shoeburyness. Before any decision was come to it would be desirable that further consideration should be given to the invention of Captain Moncreiff, which might have a very serious effect upon the question of the adoption of iron shields in fortifications.

ARMY—M. CHARLIER'S METHOD OF SHOEING HORSES.—QUESTION.

MR. ST. AUBYN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has yet received the Report which he expected from the Principal Veterinary Surgeon of the Army with reference to the mode of Shoeing Horses invented by M. Charlier, and extensively adopted in Paris; and, if so, what is the nature of that Report, and what are his intentions on the subject?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, he had received the Report referred to by the hon. Member, and had given it careful consideration. The Principal Veterinary Surgeon of the Army had attended at the establishment of M. Charlier in Paris, and had watched the manner in which the new mode of shoeing horses was conducted, but his opinion was unfavourable to the adoption of the system in this country. He should not, however, regard himself as being bound by that opinion, as in consequence of the success which was said to have attended the adoption of the system in Paris, it might be desirable before coming to a conclusion upon the subject to make some trial of it in England.

MR. ST. AUBYN said, he wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman has any objection to place the Report upon the Table of the House?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had no objection to do so, but thought it desirable that the Report of Captain Cockerill, which was favourable to the system, should also be laid upon the table.

NAVY—OLD UNARMOURED SHIPS. QUESTION.

CAPTAIN MACKINNON said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the Admiralty have arrived at any decision as to the utilization or disposal of the many millions' worth of unarmoured Screw Line-of-Battle Ships now unused?

ADMIRAL SEYMOUR said, in the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty, he would answer the Question of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. There were certainly a considerable number of the ships to which the hon. and gallant Gentleman referred in our ports, but he was afraid the hon. and gallant Member had been greatly misinformed as to their saleable value when he spoke of their being worth millions. The fact was there was no market whatever for those ships, although there was a demand for them as guard, drill, and hospital ships. The subject was now under consideration by the Select Committee upstairs, and in all probability the evidence taken before the Committee would be placed in the hands of Members in a few days.

SIERRA LEONE—APPOINTMENT OF MR. HUGGINS.—QUESTION.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Petitions have not recently been received from the inhabitants of Sierra Leone against the appointment of Mr. Horatio James Huggins as Assistant Judge of the Supreme Court of that Colony; and, if so, what course Her Majesty's Government intend to pursue relative to the facts set forth in the said Petitions; and, whether and what Correspondence has arisen on the subject-matter of these Petitions between the authorities and influential persons resident in that Colony and the Colonial Office?

MR. ADDERLEY said, in reply, that Memorials had been received from certain persons against the appointment of Mr. Huggins, but, as he had informed the hon. Member on a previous occasion, the allegations in those Memorials had been inquired into, and they had been ascertained to be unfounded.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he wished to know whether any fresh complaints have not been received since he had put his former Question upon the subject?

Mr. ADDERLEY said, no fresh complaints have been received upon the subject.

EXPENSES OF WITNESSES.—QUESTION.

Mr. BEACH said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Why the expenses of witnesses that attended in Court for the defence at the Hampshire Quarter Sessions, which were authorized to be repaid to the County Treasurer by "The Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1867," have been disallowed by the Treasury?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, as this was a subject which would probably be interesting to other counties besides Hampshire, he would state that, although the Criminal Law Amendment Act of last year had for the first time authorized the expenses of witnesses for the defence being defrayed by the Treasury, objection was taken in the House to the probable cost of such payments; and his right hon. Friend who had charge of the Bill undertook that no money should be paid on that account until a Vote for the purpose was passed by the House of Commons. A Vote for that purpose was accordingly inserted in the Estimates for the year, and the House did not pass that Vote until the first week in June. The account sent in by the Treasurer of Hampshire was presented before that time, and in accordance with what had occurred with regard to other counties, the charge made for witnesses for the defence was ordered to stand over, and might therefore technically be said to have been disallowed. There never was, however, any intention to disallow the charge further than until the House of Commons should pass a Vote approving the policy of the legislation of last year.

CLERGY ACT OF BRITISH GUIANA.
QUESTION.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Clergy Act of British Guiana has been forwarded to this Country, for the purpose of receiving Her Majesty's Assent; and, if so, whether he will lay the same before Parliament?

Mr. ADDERLEY said, that the Act to which the hon. Member referred had not yet been received in this country, although it was at the same time known that such an Act had been passed for the purpose of substituting a provision for the clergy of British Guiana upon the expiry of the present Act next December. The new Act would come into force in January next, and its object was to supply more largely funds for the maintenance of religion in British Guiana when the charge upon the Consolidated Fund of this country for that purpose should cease. The Act, so far from tending to disendow religion in that colony, would have the effect of largely increasing the religious endowments from local resources.

CLERGY ACT OF JAMAICA.—QUESTION.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether there has been any Correspondence between the Colonial Office and the Governor of Jamaica relative to the renewal of the Clergy Act, which expires next year; and, if so, whether he has any objection to lay the same before Parliament?

Mr. ADDERLEY said, in reply, that a Memorial had been received from Jamaica objecting to the reduction proposed by the Government in the general religious endowments. No Correspondence had, however, been received. When Correspondence was received there would be no objection to place both it and the Memorial on the table of the House.

SPAIN—CASE OF THE "TORNADO."
QUESTION.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Spanish Authorities have arrived at any decision in the case of the "Tornado"; whether the owners of that ship have had the benefit of "a proper judicial investigation" and an appeal, as stipulated for in his Lordship's Despatches to Sir John Crampton of 25th and 30th of May, 1867; and, whether there would be any objection to produce all the Correspondence on this subject not yet laid before Parliament?

Lord STANLEY said, in reply, that he had received information that the *Tornado* had been condemned by the Prize Court at Cadiz, and he had heard a rumour that the decision had been confirmed by the Council of State, but he had received no official information on the latter point. With regard to the second part of the hon. Member's Question, he was waiting the

Report of the Law Officers of the Crown, to whom the case had been referred, and until he received their Report it was impossible for him to say whether or not any irregularity had arisen in the proceedings. When he received that Report, it would be his duty to consider it, and he should then have no objection to lay upon the table all the Papers relating to the matter which had not reached his hands at the date of the last publication.

ARMY—RETIREMENT OF ARTILLERY OFFICERS.—QUESTION.

GENERAL DUNNE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it be true that £5,000, the moiety of an increase of £10,000, sanctioned by the Treasury to be applied to the Retirement of Officers of Artillery, is to be suspended until a scheme for retirement on some other basis has been substituted, while the total sum calculated to be the proportion for the Royal Engineers has been properly applied to the promotion of that corps?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, it would be in the recollection of the hon. and gallant Gentleman that a short time since the hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) had put a similar Question to him. As there appeared to have been some misunderstanding with respect to his Answer on that occasion, he had entered into correspondence with the hon. Member respecting it. His answer now was that he did not wish to fetter himself with any distinct engagement upon this subject at present, but desired rather to reserve to himself the power of acting in accordance with what the fair requirements of promotion in the Royal Artillery might demand, and with reference to the plan which he hoped the House would adopt.

ARMY—MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. O'BEIRNE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been directed to the slow and unsatisfactory promotion which takes place from the rank of Assistant Surgeon in the Army Medical Department; and, whether he is of opinion that measures should be taken to assimilate the system of promotion in that branch of the Service to that which exists in the Indian Medical Service, where it is obtained after a period of twelve years?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, he could not help taking exception to the first portion of the hon. Member's Question. The hon. Gentleman could, he imagined, have scarcely been aware of the fact that last year no less than sixty-five Assistant Surgeons were promoted, while in no year during the ten preceding years had the average of promotions exceeded forty. Instead, therefore, of the promotion being "slow and unsatisfactory," it had never been more rapid or more satisfactory than it was at the present time. With reference to the latter portion of the hon. Member's Question, he might remind the hon. Gentleman that the whole of this subject was carefully considered by a Select Committee as lately as 1866, and under the circumstances he did not see that any measures such as those suggested by the hon. Gentleman were required.

FEES ON ORDINATIONS.—QUESTION.

MR. MONK said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Table of Fees to be taken on Consecrations and Ordinations under the Provisions of the Act 31 *Vict.* c. 135, has been submitted by the Archbishops to the Lords of the Treasury for their sanction?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH replied that no such Table of Fees had as yet been presented to the Lords of the Treasury. Some months ago, when the hon. Gentleman made a similar inquiry, he had informed the hon. Gentleman, on the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, that such a Table was in preparation. He had, however, received no further information, and, although he had sent a communication to the Archbishop, he did not anticipate an immediate answer on account of the absence from town and the indisposition of the most rev. Prelate.

INDIA—INDIAN SERVICE MEDALS.

QUESTION.

MR. KINNAIRD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, Whether any decision has been arrived at as to granting a Frontier Service Medal to the Punjab Irregular Forces and Regular Troops, European and Native, engaged in important expeditions for the defence of the North West Frontier against the Hill tribes of Afghanistan since the annexation of the Punjab to British India in 1849?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE replied that the matter was not one in which the Secretary of State could take the initiative. He apprehended that any steps which might be taken in the matter must be taken by the Government of India. He had no reason for stating that a proposition on the subject would be made; but he thought it not improbable that there would be, and as he was disposed to give every encouragement to the system of granting Service Medals whenever it could properly be done, if any proposition of the kind should come before him in this case he would give it his favourable consideration.

COLONEL SYKES said, he would beg to ask, Whether, considering that a Medal had been granted to the Troops serving in the New Zealand campaign, in 1863, it was intended to grant one to the Troops who served in the campaign of Umballah, where the loss in three months was greater than that which had occurred in three years in New Zealand?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, in reply, that he must repeat that he could not officially take the initiative, but he would communicate privately with the Governor General on the subject.

THE CIRCUITS IN YORKSHIRE.

QUESTION.

VISCOUNT MILTON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether considerable changes are not contemplated in the Circuits of the Judges for the Midland and Northern Districts; and whether Her Majesty's Government, in the event of any change, will consider the necessity of holding assizes at some convenient place within the Southern Division of the West Riding of Yorkshire?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that he was not aware that any changes were contemplated, unless changes might be contemplated by the Judicial Commission now sitting. No steps in the matter would be taken by the Government without considering the Report of that Commission, which was now pursuing its inquiries.

ARMY—7TH SURREY VOLUNTEERS.

QUESTION.

MR. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to a Letter addressed by him to the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Surrey, dated the 21st instant, and relating to a complaint on the part of the Commanding Officer of the 7th Surrey Volunteers of conduct of Colonel Colville, one of the Inspecting Officers of Volunteers, Whether it is in accordance with the rules of the Service that an Inspecting Officer should make injurious comments as to the discipline of any one Regiment, in his official capacity, to another Regiment, and that, too, without notice or intimation to the Commanding Officer of the Regiment so spoken of?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: Sir, in answering this Question, I cannot help saying that it is much to be regretted that the hon. Member in the shape of a Question has made what is, in effect, an *ex parte* statement; and not only an *ex parte* statement, but a statement in regard to a transaction still incomplete. The letter referred to in the beginning of the Question was one referring to complaints that had been made by the commanding officer of the 7th Surrey Volunteers with regard to the conduct of Colonel Colville. They were made in a very irregular manner, and the substance of my letter was to request that the Lord Lieutenant would call upon the commanding officer of the 7th Surrey Volunteers to make any complaints which he might choose to bring forward against Colonel Colville in a regular and proper manner. I have not yet received any answer to my recommendation. I have only to add that Colonel Colville entirely denies the imputations referred to in the latter part of the Question, and I am bound to say that Colonel Colville is one of the most able, valuable, and experienced of our inspecting officers.

MR. WHALLEY attempted to offer some explanation, but was compelled to resume his seat amidst loud cries of "Order."

BRITISH FACTORY AT ST. PETERSBURG.—QUESTION.

MR. CLAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the British Factory at St. Petersburg is a body officially recognized by the British Ambassador?

LORD STANLEY said, in reply, that the British factory was only a voluntary association of British merchants, nearly all of whom were, he believed, members of the Russia Company to which he had alluded on a former occasion. As such a voluntary association it was undoubtedly recognized.

He was not aware that it enjoyed any peculiar rights or privileges. Any sums of money raised and administered by the society were, he believed, raised by the enterprize of the members of the factory themselves.

RELATIONS WITH MEXICO.

QUESTION.

MR. KINGLAKE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What obstacles now impede the establishment of Diplomatic Relations between this Country and the Republic of Mexico?

LORD STANLEY: Sir, the relations at present existing between England and Mexico are not of a satisfactory character. We have no diplomatic intercourse with that Republic, and, consequently, we have no direct means of affording that protection which we should wish to give to British subjects resident in Mexico. But I wish to point out—though I think I stated it before in this House—that though this state of things is one which Her Majesty's Government regret, it is not directly or indirectly their doing. The fact is that the present Government of Mexico, acting, as I venture to think, not very wisely, but acting, no doubt, within their right, chose to consider the recognition by England of the Mexican Empire an act of hostility against the Mexican Republic, which, they contend, was the only legitimate Government ever in existence in that country, though, of course, during the time when the Empire of Mexico was *de facto* established, it must necessarily have been in abeyance. They therefore upon this ground thought fit to break off diplomatic relations with this country. We cannot deny their right to do that. Neither do I think it would be — I will not say suitable to the dignity, but consistent with the self-respect of this country, they having taken that step, that we should ask them to re-consider it, and admit us again to friendly intercourse. All I can say is, that whenever they may think it right to take what I will venture to call a more rational view, and show a wish to make up this difference, they will not find any difficulty in the way of a reconciliation on our part. But I think the House will agree with me that the first overtures ought to come from them, and not from us.

CASE OF MR. CASTLE.—QUESTION.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is now in possession of any information respecting the circumstances under which Mr. Castle, of Melton Mowbray, was sentenced to imprisonment and hard labour for non-payment of costs?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, I have received some information on the subject, from which it appears that Mr. Castle had taken proceedings against a man for using threatening and abusive language. The summons was dismissed, and Mr. Castle was ordered to pay the costs, or to be imprisoned with hard labour. I may mention that the Act, commonly known as Jervis's Act, gives the magistrate discretionary power to impose imprisonment with or without hard labour. Mr. Castle, it further appears, has been several times imprisoned for non-payment of costs, or things of that sort. On this occasion, however, somebody, to prevent his going to prison, came forward and paid the costs for him, and therefore he was not imprisoned at all, nor was he put to the slightest inconvenience, though he protested loudly against the interference of his friends, and professed himself very desirous of undergoing imprisonment.

ARMY—STOREHOUSES FOR THE WAR OFFICE.—QUESTION.

MR. ADAM said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. Childers) he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether the Treasury have yet decided between the Admiralty and the War Office, as to the proposal to purchase land and erect storehouses for the latter Department at Woolwich, while accommodation for that purpose can be obtained at comparatively small cost in the naval property at Deptford?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that the question was not yet decided, and up to the present time the Treasury had taken no part in the discussion. The Admiralty had offered to the War Office a spot in Deptford Dockyard; it, however, was not deemed so suitable for the purpose as the spot that had been originally applied for. It was now proposed that a joint Committee of the Admiralty, War Office, and Treasury would consider the matter, and he had no doubt that in this way a satisfactory arrangement would be arrived at, and that ground for military storehouses would be provided at Deptford Dockyard.

ARMY—KNAPSACKS FOR THE TROOPS.

QUESTION.

MR. WARNER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether the 92d Regiment has reported favourably of Colonel Carter's Knapsack, and preferred it, after a careful trial, to the plan of equipment invented and put forward by a Committee sitting at the War Office; whether the Officer commanding the Brigade of Guards has applied to the Horse Guards, consequent upon a limited trial, to have a further and more extended trial of Colonel Carter's equipment, and the nature of the reply given to his application; and, whether the Secretary of State for War will direct that Colonel Carter's equipment, now excluded from trial, be fairly tried, in competition or otherwise, before any new equipment is finally decided upon for the Army?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: Sir, I am extremely glad to have this opportunity of stating that there is not the least disposition on the part of the authorities either at the Horse Guards or the War Office to deprive the army of whatever knapsack may turn out to be the best and the most convenient. It is quite true that the 92d Regiment has reported favourably of the trials they have made of Colonel Carter's knapsack, and it is intended that the trial shall be extended to the other Highland regiments, as it appears that Colonel Carter's knapsack is better adapted for the uniform and equipments of the Highland regiments than for the army generally. It is also true that the officer commanding the Brigade of Guards has applied to the Horse Guards to have a further and more extended trial of Colonel Carter's knapsack. This, however, was before a trial had been made of the knapsack invented by a Committee appointed for the purpose. The latter, as far as it has been tried, has given great satisfaction. There is no objection whatever to a further trial of Colonel Carter's knapsack being made, if it be thought desirable, as the sole wish of the authorities is to obtain the best and most convenient knapsack for the army.

ARMY—MARCH OF TROOPS FROM ALDERSHOT TO SANDHURST.

QUESTION.

MR. OSBORNE: I wish, Sir, to put a Question to the Secretary of State for War respecting a statement which appears in the evening papers. It is stated that on Wednesday last, during the great heat of that tropical day, a flying column was sent out from Aldershot, that nine of the men forming part of it experienced sunstrokes, and that eighty-seven of the men had to be sent to hospital. I want to know, Whether there is any truth in that report, and if there is, whether the right hon. Gentleman has taken any steps—which he usually does in the case of flagrant outrages of this sort—to prevent troops being sent out in flying columns in the heat of the day?

MR. BUXTON: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers this Question, I wish to say that I have been informed that when the flying column arrived at Sandhurst there was no provision whatever to give them shelter from the intense heat of the sun. A friend of mine was present, and he states that the troops were completely exhausted when they marched on to the ground at Sandhurst, and that there was no shelter or shade of any sort provided for them; there were no tents, nor were they taken into a neighbouring wood where shade might have been obtained.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: Sir, I have had no information on the subject to which the hon. Gentleman refers. The House, therefore, will not expect me to answer the Question now. If the hon. Member will repeat it to-morrow, I shall by that time be adequately informed of the circumstances, and will give him an answer.

SMALLPOX AMONG SHEEP IN SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.

QUESTION.

COLONEL NORTH said, he wished to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council, Whether it is true that a severe attack of Smallpox has broken out among the sheep in Schleswig-Holstein; and if so, whether it is proposed to take steps to prevent the importation of sheep from that country?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU replied that official information had been received of an outbreak of smallpox in sheep in Schleswig-Holstein, whence we were receiving upwards of 2,000 sheep per week. An Order of Her Majesty in Council might prohibit the importation from that country, but it was feared that the sheep would still come through some of the Dutch or Belgian ports. Extra inspection had, however, been ordered, but as the disease had a period of incubation of eight days, during which it was impossible to detect that the animals were infected, this did not appear to be any security against diseased animals getting into the country. A quarantine of ten days offered more security, but it must be general, and this would be hard on importers of healthy sheep from uninfected parts of the country. The Privy Council were carefully watching the matter in order to take immediate steps to check the importation of the disease should it appear to warrant severe measures.

THE LATE LORD BROUGHAM.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ROEBUCK, who had given Notice to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, in consideration of the great public services of Lord Brougham, it is the intention of the Government to propose the erection of a monument to his memory, in Westminster Abbey? said: I feel, Sir, so great an interest in the Question that I am about to put to the Government, that I do not wish it to be put with the usual dry formality, and I will therefore conclude with a Motion, though I promise the House not to avail myself of the privilege which I shall thus obtain by indulging in any very large number of words. I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in his opinion, there ought not to be erected a monument to the memory of the late Lord Brougham, expressive of the admiration in which that great man was regarded by the country? I make this Motion for two purposes—one because, from my very intimate relations with that noble Lord, I have felt the greatest regard and veneration for his memory, and I therefore trust that the House will permit me to express my own feelings on the matter, and the other because it will give the right hon. Gentleman in his reply—supporting as I hope he will the proposal that I make—an opportunity of expressing in a few apt and eloquent sentences, such as he always has at his command, his own feelings with regard to that noble Lord. I have waited long — I cannot say that I have waited patiently—in the hope that some one more competent to perform this task—for I am fully sensible of my own inadequacy—would undertake the duty. But, Sir, no one has come forward for that purpose. The Session approaches its end, and I feel myself obliged to ask the Question of which I have given Notice, and in a few feeble words to express my own convictions with regard to this subject. The character of Lord Brougham's mind was one of vast extent and great perspicuity. He was not merely a philosopher, but a philosopher whose power of teaching was unexampled by any man of his time. He was not merely a philosopher, for as an orator he was able to guide, instruct, and I fear very often to frighten one of the first legislative bodies that now exists upon the face of the earth. And it should be recollected that those great powers of Lord Brougham's mind were always exercised for the good of mankind. It was not merely a personal object that he had in view. I have no doubt that, as is the case with every man, he had personal objects, but whatever powers he enjoyed were devoted to the benefit of mankind. It should also be remembered that when he began his career it was not so easy a task to be the friend of the people as it is now, when that character is frequently assumed as a road to wealth and popularity. At that time he who would be a friend of the people had before him a thorny path. It was Lord Brougham's lot to have frequently to contend with foes of vast power and great influence in this country, and he ran great risk, I do not mean bodily risk, but personal risk, in undertaking the cause for which he so gallantly contended. No matter in what clime oppression appeared Lord Brougham was always to be found on the side of the oppressed. Who will forget what he did on behalf of the African slave? He lent his great powers — not alone, but in companionship with other great men—to strike off the chains from the African slave; and ignorance in every part of the world, and more particularly in his own country, found in him an ever ready and unceasing opponent. There was no man who understood so completely as he did the instruction of the people. He stood alone — he towered above all the statesmen of his time—in his appreciation of the danger arising from popular ignorance, and he did all in his power to do away with that ignorance, and to support in every shape the principles of civil and religious liberty. Every person who could justly feel himself aggrieved knew that he would find in Lord Brougham, in Mr. Brougham, in Henry Brougham, a friend full of counsel and sympathy. I will conclude my observations by remarking that he was a wise, a great, and a good man, that he was one of England's greatest sons, and I think it is the duty of our country to pay that tribute to his memory for which I now ask, to show how greatly he was honoured and admired by his country.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Roebuck.*)

Sir GEORGE BOWYER: I cannot help, Sir, expressing my opinion that in all countries the circumstances attending the funeral of the late Lord Brougham were regarded with regret, and something like humiliation. He who was the greatest man of his time as an orator, and in the extent of his knowledge and Parliamentary services, now lies buried in a foreign land, among strangers, while to men far inferior to Lord Brougham the honour of a monument in Westminster Abbey has been accorded. There is a great delicacy, I know, in interfering with the expressed wishes of one who is dead, and I am told, with what truth I do not know, that Lord Brougham expressed a wish to be buried at Cannes. That wish, if it were expressed, arose probably from feelings of humility on the part of that distinguished man, and though we are accustomed always to respect the wishes of the dead, this is, I think, one of those occasions on which the performance of those wishes might be dispensed with. I think the feelings of the nation would be gratified by the remains of Henry Brougham being transferred to this country. His wishes have been complied with, for he has been buried at Cannes; but I trust, for the honour of this country, his remains may now be translated to Westminster Abbey.

Mr. OSBORNE: No man, Sir, could, in my opinion, have given expression to remarks which would have been more acceptable to the late Lord Brougham had he now been alive than those of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck); while none, perhaps, would have been more unacceptable to him than those which have fallen from the hon. Baronet the Member for Dundalk (Sir George Bowyer). I rise merely for the purpose of pointing out, though I should fully concur in voting any sum that might be necessary for the erection of such a monument as would form a fitting tribute of respect on the part of this House, that the country did not fail to recognize his great merits while he was living. One of the greatest marks of respect ever paid by the House of Commons to any public man in his lifetime was paid to Lord Brougham, the only other instance being, I believe, in the case of Lord Nelson. The patent of Lord Brougham's peerage was made out "for public services," and by the insertion of those words in the patent of his peerage he received a compliment which has, I believe, only been paid to himself and to Lord Nelson. No fees were demanded for that patent, the fees being paid by the country on account of his public services. The House ought to bear that in mind. The peerage was also granted on very unusual terms. I believe two elder brothers were passed over in favour of the present possessor of the title. I quite coincide in the remarks of my hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield, and I equally dissent from what has fallen from the hon. Baronet the Member for Dundalk. But I do trust that it will go forth to the country that the House showed in Lord Brougham's lifetime that they were not unmindful of his eminent and distinguished services.

Mr. BUXTON: I desire to say a word or two, Sir, in support of the Motion made by the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck), not only on account of the strong personal regard which I entertained for Lord Brougham, but because I certainly believe that he was one of the most remarkable men that this country has produced. While enjoying intellectual powers of a most extraordinary character, few men were more tenderly alive to the feelings of humanity or more uncompromising in their attempts to put down oppression and its causes. He was, if I remember rightly, almost the only one who, having fought side by side with Wilberforce with the greatest energy for the abolition of our slave trade with Africa, was able to take a prominent part in the efforts made for the abolition of slavery throughout the whole of the British dominions; and to the latest day of his life he employed his great powers for the abolition of slavery throughout the world. No doubt he had great faults, but he was cast in a gigantic mould, and all his characteristics, whether good or bad, were striking in the extreme.

It will not, therefore, be to the credit of the House or the country if we do not make some very decided manifestation of the great esteem in which he has been held.

Mr. DISRAELI: I quite agree with the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) that it is desirable there should be some public recognition of the career and character of Lord Brougham, such as is indicated by the Question he has placed before the House, one which, through the influence of art, shall produce a lasting impression upon the public mind, and keep within its continual recollection the memory of the great deeds of a man who was, no doubt, one of the most considerable persons this country has ever produced. The hon. and learned Gentleman has, with the terseness of which he is a master, but with complete propriety, placed before the House a sketch of the career of Lord Brougham, and made it unnecessary for me to dilate upon it. It may be truly said of Lord Brougham that none more completely represented his age, and no one more contributed to the progress of the times in which he lived. He had two qualities, almost in excess, which are rarely combined in the same person; one was energy, and the other versatility. The influence which creative power gave him, combined with strength of character, alone sustained him in a career which for its duration, as well as for its dazzling feats, has rarely been equalled in this Empire. But, Sir, when I have to consider on the part of the Government how and by what means we can do honour to Lord Brougham's memory in such a manner as to satisfy the wishes of the country—whether by raising some monument or some statue to him—I am painfully impressed with the failure of most efforts of a similar nature that have been made to perpetuate the memory of great men. Her Majesty's Government are extremely anxious if possible to avoid adding to those unsatisfactory demonstrations of which we have already had too many instances. But this subject has not really been neglected by the Government, for at the time the hon. and learned Gentleman placed his Motion on the Paper—now some months ago—I mentioned the subject to my Colleagues and there was a unanimous feeling in favour of setting up some memorial of the kind referred to if it could be done in a satisfactory manner. I would at this moment also remind the House that another great man has this year left us, whose merits should be recognized in a manner such as the hon. and learned Gentleman has intimated. I refer to one of a very different character from Lord Brougham, but one of whom it may be said, without disparaging the high qualities of that remarkable statesman, that he was not inferior probably to any Englishman who ever lived, but that he towers among the statesmen and poets and orators who have graced our land. I mean Faraday, the greatest discoverer since Newton. There has been a very anxious wish expressed by men eminent in science that a statue should be raised to Faraday. I have had the honour of receiving a deputation on the subject, and her Majesty's Government entirely respond to the wish. But the same difficulty has been in our path in both instances, and the consequence has been that we have not made any proposition to the House on the subject. I do not, however, despair of being able to suggest a plan by which our common object can be satisfactorily accomplished. The subject, the House may rest assured, is not thrown aside by Her Majesty's Government, especially in the case which has been brought under our notice in so striking a manner by the hon. and learned Gentleman. We shall give particular attention to the matter, in the belief that we shall be performing only a public duty, and one of no mean character, if we can in a manner satisfactory to the taste and feelings of the country propose some arrangement which shall commemorate the form as well as the character and services of men so eminent as those to whom I have referred.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, we must all feel indebted to the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) for having given Members of the House an opportunity of expressing the deep sympathy and admiration with which the House regards the career of Lord Brougham. Nothing could have been more becoming and appropriate than the observations of my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Roebuck). I had the high honour of enjoying the friendship of Lord Brougham during many of the later years of his life, and I very cordially echo what has been said, better than I could say it, both of his public and his personal qualities. It may, perhaps, not readily have been inferred by those who knew Lord Brougham chiefly from the part he took in the most stormy debates of his times, that there was in him, as my hon. and learned Friend had said. an overflowing affectionateness of character, I can testify that that is strictly true. That characteristic entered into beautiful combination with the strong, vigorous, masculine, and even ruder parts of his mental and political composition. Lord Brougham was eminently happy in the length and consistency of his career; in most of the great undertakings of his life he addressed himself to purposes in which his countrymen could not but recognize an ardent love of liberty, a determined hatred of corruption and abuse, and remarkable disinterestedness. It seemed as if a certain instinct led Lord Brougham continually to deviate from the path of mere party politics for the purpose of anticipating the wants of coming generations, and preparing the paths which after-coming men were to tread. The fame of Lord Brougham is a great and secure fame. It would be presumptuous in me to refer in detail to one point that has scarcely been mentioned; but I believe all those who take an interest in the improvement of the laws of this country will ever be glad to own the name of Lord Brougham as one among the earliest, most energetic, and most effective of all those who have laboured in that great and open field. With regard to the mode in which public feeling may be exhibited, I own to sharing the feeling expressed by the hon. and learned Baronet the Member for Dundalk (Sir George Bowyer); and probably the hon. Member for Nottingham (Mr. Osborne) shares it also to this extent, that it is a matter for deep regret that this great and distinguished son of our country should not have his remains deposited among us. That I entirely concur in, and without inquiring into the causes of the misfortune, I would add it must also be a subject for regret that it is a matter which has passed beyond our cognizance. With respect to the declaration of the right hon. Gentleman the First Minister of the Crown, I would not press upon him any proposition because, as with the prerogative of mercy so with the prerogative of honour, we, as independent Members, should put strong restraints upon our own feelings, and should not endeavour to anticipate or to direct the Advisers of the Crown regarding the bestowal of tributes of public honour. The right hon. Gentleman has adverted to a difficulty which stands in his way. Now, although I do not admit that all, at least, of the recent efforts of monumental art among us have been unsuccessful, because I could point to one or two erected within the last few years which have been eminently otherwise, yet no doubt the right hon. Gentleman has spoken with justice to the difficulty with which he labours when he desires to make sure the result for which he proposes to ask a grant of public money will be satisfactory. The right hon. Gentleman will, I am afraid, have to take another point into consideration, and that is, the character in which a grant of public money is to be proposed for the monument of Lord Brougham. In the case of persons whose fame has been simply political every Member of this House must be aware that it has been our policy for a long time past to act with singular reserve; the cases are surprisingly few in which statesmen who have been only statesmen have had the honour of a public recognition in the form suggested for the honour of Lord Bougham. It is, however, for the Government, and the Government alone, to decide whether the fame and distinguished acts of Lord Brougham, though confined to statesmanship, may warrant them in making a proposal of that nature. The right hon. Gentleman has adverted to a very illustrious name in science—the late Professor Faraday—and, although we may not think of placing the name of Lord Brougham, in competition with that of Faraday, yet it will be right for him to consider whether the great efforts made by Lord Brougham and continued with almost superhuman energy down to almost the latest moments of his life for the public weal by means which, in many cases, were beyond the sphere of politics, do not enable the right hon. Gentleman to escape from the trammels of those precedents which impose very strict and narrow limitations with regard to the monuments of statesmen who are statesmen alone. I am sure the question will be carefully considered, and I have no doubt I shall be able cordially to concur in the proposal of the Government, whatever it may be; but in the meantime I express many thanks to my hon. and learned Friend for having offered me an occasion on which I can express my feelings regarding this most remarkable man—a man of whom I wish to take this opportunity of placing it upon record that, although he had lived a life not only of activity, but of contention, I, who knew him well, and knew him only during the years of his retirement, can scarcely ever recollect to have heard him mention any person, either friend or foe, except in terms either of admiration or kindness.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

INDIA—EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.—COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Mr. Dodson, I think there is nothing in the statement with which I shall have to trouble the Committee to-day which calls for any very lengthened remarks from me. I must express my obligations to my right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) for having allowed the House to proceed with the Business of the day without raising a preliminary discussion in accordance with the Notice which he placed on the Paper. As I just now remarked, I shall have very little to say; but at the outset I must take the opportunity of expressing my regret that this is the last financial statement on which any Minister of State will have to comment which has been drawn up by my right hon. Friend Mr. Massey. As the Committee is doubtless aware, Mr. Massey has left India and returned to this country, although the period during which he might have expected to hold the position of Finance Minister of India has not yet expired. I am anxious to express my great regret that India has been deprived of the services of Mr. Massey; although, looking at the matter from a purely English point of view, I am sure the Committee will rejoice with me at Mr. Massey having again come among us, and will concur with me in expressing a hope that we may see him once more a Member of the House of Commons. I am quite sure that whenever Mr. Massey takes his place among us again, India will feel the advantage of there being present in the House of Commons another statesman who is able to speak with personal information and personal knowledge of the state of that Empire. These intercommunications between England and India are, I feel satisfied, very advantageous to both countries; and I must express a hope that in future we may have the advantage of Mr. Massey's frequent advice upon Indian affairs. I am particularly sorry, however, that Mr. Massey's retirement should have occurred at this particular moment; because at the time he left India he was engaged in prosecuting an inquiry in reference to a reform in the system of the financial arrangements between the central Government of India and the local Governments. This is a reform to which I attach very great importance; and I think he would, perhaps, have been better able than anyone else to effect it. However, the matter has been set on foot, and by-and-by I shall have occasion to refer to it more particularly. The good work which Mr. Massey has initiated will, I trust, not be allowed to fall through.

And now, Mr. Dodson, I will begin, according to the usual practice, by referring very briefly to the actual accounts which we have received for the year 1866-7—that is, the year ending on the 31st March, 1867. The Committee are aware that the statement made last year with regard to these accounts was a statement founded partly on information and partly on Estimates. It was founded on information extending over about eight months of the year, and on Estimates for the remaining four. Now that we have the actual accounts we shall, of course, find some slight difference in the results, though it will not be so striking as the difference on which I had occasion to comment last year between the actual accounts and the Budget Estimates of the preceding year, 1865-6. Last year it was estimated that the revenue of the eleven months ending the 31st March, 1867, would be, in round numbers, £42,000,000, and the expenditure £44,300,000. The actual accounts show that the revenue for that period was £42,013,000, and the expenditure, including that for public works extraordinary, was £44,530,000. Therefore, there is an excess of expenditure of £2,517,000, against the expected excess of £2,300,000; and the difference may be explained by the difficulty of making a clear estimate when one month of the year is omitted. I now turn to what is of more importance—the regular Estimate for the year 1867-8. Last year we had before us the Budget statement or Estimate for the year ending the 31st March, 1868, showing that the revenues and receipts would probably amount to £46,783,000, and the charges and expenditure of all kinds, including public works extraordinary, to £48,610,000; showing, therefore, a deficit, according to that calculation, of £1,827,000. The account which we now receive shows that the revenues and receipts are estimated at £48,258,000, being an improvement of very nearly £1,500,000 upon the revenues. But, on the other hand, the regular Estimate for charges and expenditure of all kinds stands at £49,364,000, instead of £48,610,000, showing an increase of £754,000. The general result, therefore, is that, instead of a deficiency of £1,827,000, which we expected, the account for the years 1867-8 only shows a deficiency of £1,106,000. The Committee must understand that when I speak of a deficiency I am indicating the difference between the estimated revenue and the estimated total expenditure of the year, including the public works extraordinary, But it was never intended or contemplated that the revenue would be sufficient to cover all the charges for public works extraordinary. Nor has it been usual to include the public works extraordinary in these comparative statements of revenue and expenditure; but it has now been considered more convenient that I should take them in this form. I only wish to put this caution before the Committee that they may not be alarmed when I speak of deficiencies to such a large amount; for if you exclude these public works extraordinary, and charge their cost to capital, then the accounts would show a large surplus, instead of a deficiency. I put, then, the revenue as £1,500,000 better, and the expenditure as £750,000 greater by the accounts which are just received. Now, what are the items on which the improvement of revenue has taken place? There are three principal items on which almost the whole of the increase has arisen. There is, first, a better return from the Licence Tax, which was estimated to produce £500,000, but which is now estimated to produce £658,000. There is next a gain under the head of Customs of £188,000; and the last is the most important increase of the whole—on the item of opium the increase has been no less than £1,100,000. Opium is estimated to produce £8,814,000, which is decidedly the largest amount that opium has produced for a great number of years past. [Colonel SYKES: Unhappily.] The increase on the whole of these items amounts to £1,446,000, which is very nearly the whole amount of improvement on the revenue. At the same time some changes have taken place in other items; some have increased and others have fallen off—the increase and decrease nearly balancing each other. There has been an increase under the heads of "Land Revenue," "Excise," "the Post Office," "Miscellaneous," and some others; and, on the other hand, there is a decrease in "Salt," "Stamps," "Mint," "Telegraphs," and one or two others—I mean a decrease as compared with the Budget Estimate, not that the revenue itself has decreased as compared with the revenue of former years. Stamps, for instance, have fallen short by £93,000 of the Estimate of last year; but, in point of fact, the revision of the judicial stamps has proved financially a very satisfactory measure, and has led apparently to an increase in the revenue of some £400,000. The item of Customs shows, I think, a very satisfactory improvement. Comparing the revenue—as far as it has yet been estimated—for the year 1867-8, with the year 1865-6, the last complete year—for the intermediate period of eleven months was a broken year, when a change was made in the date of closing the accounts—I find that in the year 1865-6 the revenue under this head was £2,279,000, and the actual Estimate for this year is £2,545,000, showing an improvement in the recent yield of Customs of some £270,000. Considering what depression there has recently been in India, consequent upon the cessation of the cotton demand, and upon the various other troubles, of which this House is aware, I think we may consider it very satisfactory that there has been this improvement, more especially when we remember that the whole system of Customs duties has recently been revised, a great number of duties done away with, and the tariff reduced to great simplicity. It is also satisfactory to observe that the addition made to the export duty on grain—of which I expressed doubts last year—has not been attended with any evil effect. Mr. Massey, in his statement, makes this observation—

> "From the accounts we have received at the Custom House, it will be found that during the eleven months the increased duty has been in operation the exportation of grain has increased from 355,000 maunds to 645,000 maunds, so that it is clear that the increased duty on exportation has not caused any diminution in the quantity exported, but that the exportation has gone on and increased very largely."

Under these circumstances, Mr. Massey naturally says that he is not inclined to take off or to alter the duty. But I feel bound to say that, upon general principles, I regret that there should be any imposition of export duties, and I hope that in process of time it may be found possible to dispense with them, and that we shall find the benefit in the encouragement of trade as soon as these duties are taken off. This, however, is matter of theory; in practice I am bound to admit they have not worked badly.

To convey a complete view of the case to the Committee, I must now inquire under what heads the expenditure has increased by £750,000 or thereabouts. Indian expenditure is divisible roughly under four heads. There are, first of all, the ordinary charges of India, including the whole of the army and public services of the country; then there are the charges for public works extraordinary; then the head for the net expenditure in England, which includes the stores sent out to India; and, lastly, the head of guaranteed interest upon railway capital. Upon three of these four heads I find that there has been an excess, and a saving only on the fourth. I am sorry to say that the saving is upon the one head on which I would have gladly seen an excess, and that is the head of public works extraordinary. Under that head the Budget Estimate provided for a sum of £3,513,000, but the regular Estimate only anticipates an expenditure of £2,761,000, so that there is a difference of about £750,000 between the expenditure as originally estimated and as afterwards determined on. [Colonel SYKES: Is that decided on by the excess of revenue?] It has nothing to do with revenue. There is an increase in the ordinary charges in India of £265,000; there is an increase in the net expenditure in England of £580,000, and there is an increase in the guaranteed interest (less traffic receipts) on railways in India of £660,000. On these three items, put together, there is an increase of £1,400,000 or £1,500,000, which would pretty nearly have balanced the improvement in the revenue. In fact, if there had not been the reduction in the account on public works extraordinary the great increase on opium and the Licence Tax and Customs would have been entirely swallowed up by the increase in the expenditure under those three heads. That is certainly not a satisfactory statement. I have looked into the causes of this increase; and first, as to the increase under the head of ordinary charges in India, which amounts to £265,000, the increase is due, in the first place, to some considerable advance under the head of opium. The large receipts from opium may have caused some increase in the charges in respect to it. I find it stated that the increased receipt under opium is due to the sale of an increased quantity at a higher price, while the increased expenditure is due to the payment of arrears of the past year and advances to cultivators. There is also an increase in the marine charges; but it is chiefly due to expenditure in the purchase of stores at Bombay, probably for the Abyssinian expedition. That is a matter of account, and will be repaid from the Imperial Exchequer; therefore it is not of much importance. There is, however, an increase in the army charges, arising from a variety of small additions, which, I am afraid, must be taken as indicating a tendency to an increase rather than a restriction of expenditure under that head; and this is a matter which requires very carefully to be watched. With regard to the net expenditure in England, including stores sent out for the public service of India, there is an increase of £580,000. Of that, about £100,000 is merely nominal—that is, there are certain items which were formerly provided under different heads which have now been included in the payments under this head. Other sums have to be deducted, and the adjustment will be made with the Imperial Government on account of troops serving in India. A sum of £100,000 has been paid by the settlement of old claims, and there is £28,000 on the furlough allowances. There is a considerable sum—£91,000—for passages of officers and troops, £44,000 on account of the overland service, and a further sum on account of the Victoria Hospital at Suez, which are items that have been introduced by the system of overland transport. [Colonel SYKES: What is the amount paid to Lord Clive's representatives?] £23,079. The other head in which there has been an increase is the guaranteed interest on Indian railway capital, which amounts to £660,000—that is, the additional sum paid in interest and the falling off in the traffic receipts have caused the balance of the account to be to that extent against us under that head. That is mainly due to the accident on the Great Indian Peninsula line, which caused a considerable falling off in the traffic, and to the diminution of the cotton trade. There has also been a falling off on the East India line. In one way or another the result of the year has been less favourable to us in that respect, and the amount we have to pay is £660,000 more than was estimated at the time the last Budget was brought forward. Under all these circumstances, there is nothing in the out-turn of 1867-8 that we can look at with any great satisfaction. Undoubtedly the net result looks satisfactory; an Estimate was made that we should have a deficiency of £1,800,000, and we have only a deficiency of £1,100,000. That looks as if matters had improved, but we find a great increase of revenue due to the increase of that most uncertain of all sources of revenue—opium, while the increase in the expenditure is of a character which I fear I must describe as permanent; and, in point of fact, we should have had no improvement at all but for the fact that the sum we expected to spend on public works has not been spent. With regard to that non-expenditure, it is certainly not the duty of the Government of India to force any expenditure. It is better that we should be careful in undertaking projects which, however promising, may, after all, involve the State either in loss, or in the necessity of lying out of its money for some time. It is proper to be cautious in these matters. Money will be quite quickly enough spent if it be well spent. I do not find any fault with the Government of India for not spending the whole money they had estimated to spend. I believe they were very careful in examining the different projects submitted to them, and we now find the benefit of their caution. At the same time, this is not a matter—the non-expenditure of the estimated amount on public works—on which we can look with any pride or pleasure. That, then, is the account of the regular Estimate of the year ending on the 31st of March last. The Committee understand that it is an account made up from actual information for about eight months of the year, and from a close Estimate for the remaining four. I now come to the Budget Estimate for the current year — the year which expires on the 31st of March next. I estimate the revenue and receipts at £48,586,900, and the charges of all sorts at £49,613,394 — leaving a deficiency of £1,026,494. That is the gross amount, allowing all public works extraordinary to fall under the head of charge. Under the head of public works extraordinary there are charges of £3,092,090; and if that were removed from the Budget and charged to capital you might convert your deficiency into a surplus of £2,065,596, just as in the preceding year, if the same thing were done, instead of a deficiency there would be a surplus of £1,600,000. And I think it would be perfectly fair if I were to make such a statement to the Committee, leaving the item of public works extraordinary out of the expenditure, and representing to the Committee that we have a good surplus for the last two years. But I think it wiser to take the course I have adopted, and that, as prudent men, we ought not to run away with the idea that financially we are in a better position than we actually are. And I am bound to say that this distinction between public works ordinary and extraordinary is one which I view with extreme jealousy. I assent to the principle, as it was enforced by my noble Predecessor (the Marquess of Salisbury), and I have adopted it in my Budget Estimate. I entirely agree with the principle that it is a fair and right thing to provide for that class of public works which are of a reproductive character by raising money on loan. I think it may fairly be compared to the conduct of a landed proprietor who keeps his household expenditure properly within his income, but for real improvements on his estate calls in aid his credit and borrows the money which, in the course of time, the improvement itself will repay. That is a perfectly legitimate and fair operation; but he will be open to the great temptation of transferring to this land account a portion of his ordinary expenditure, which ought to be met out of the year's income. He will be inclined to add a new wing to his house, or to put a new conservatory in his garden, and thus he may go on borrowing to a greater extent than he is aware, and yet all the while he may appear to be keeping a pleasant account at his bankers. No doubt, the temptation will be equally strong on the Indian Government to charge to loans public works that are of an ordinary, or, at all events, not of a reproductive character. I observe that, under the old system, before this distinction between public works ordinary and extraordinary was made, large sums were spent on certain classes of works without having recourse to borrowing. But I find that, since this new principle has been adopted, the extraordinary public works have grown to a very considerable extent, while the charges for ordinary public works have shrunk in a corresponding degree. For instance, in the year 1865-6 we spent upwards of £5,000,000 on public works, and charged the amount to the income of the year. But this year there is put down in our statements of public works charged as ordinary no larger sum than £3,800,000, being a difference of £1,200,000. It certainly seems curious that, whereas the system of making a charge for public works extraordinary was adopted with a view to undertaking works of a remunerative character, the charges for other works should be reduced. This year we have for extraordinary works a charge of £1,820,000 for military buildings, barracks, and embankments; £800,000 for irrigation works; and £470,000 for special fund works. With regard to the latter two classes of works, there is no doubt that they are precisely the description of works for which it is legitimate to borrow money. Irrigation works, if properly conducted, will, no doubt, in time recoup you, while the special fund works will do so directly because they are works undertaken by municipalities or other independent bodies to whom money is lent by the Government upon proper security. Therefore, as regards this sum of £1,270,000, it is perfectly legitimate to charge it to extraordinary public works in the Budget. With regard, however, to the items for military buildings, barracks, and embankments, we ought to be very chary of allowing them to be treated in the same manner. No doubt, with regard to these latter works, there is a large exceptional expenditure going on which should be included within certain definite limits, and when the contemplated works are finished that exceptional expenditure ought to come to an end. It may not be unfair that such exceptional expenditure should be provided for by a loan, so as to spread it over a certain number of years. That is a principle which we adopt in this country with regard, for instance, to fortifications. Instead of constructing such works out of revenue, we raise money by terminable annuities, which we expect to pay off within a certain definite period. That is a principle, however, which I myself have never liked, and I should be sorry to see it carried further than is absolutely necessary. But in India the safeguards that exist with respect to that system in this country are not to be found, because the money is not there raised by terminable annuities, but is treated as a certain excess over the income of the year, about which we need not trouble ourselves, and is provided for by either reducing the balances or by borrowing the money necessary without any special provision being made for the reduction of the debt. That is a reason for looking with jealousy upon this kind of expenditure, and another reason for doing so is, that there are items in the revenue of India—especially that of opium—which are so uncertain that it is desirable that we should be careful how we incur anything in the nature of debt. Under all these circumstances, there has been some confusion not only in this country but in India—as to what is the actual condition of our finances, and a question has arisen which has disturbed even the minds of several members of the Governor General's Council—namely, whether we can be fairly said to have a surplus or not in the present year, and the question was raised whether it was or was not necessary to have recourse to further taxation. The whole difference turns on the question what is to be reckoned extraordinary expenditure. Under these circumstances I thought it desirable in the despatch which I have addressed to the Government of India, in reply to their financial despatch, to lay down the rule that in future years irrigation and special fund works ought to be the only works which should appear as public works extraordinary. There may be good reason why, when the expenditure upon public works ordinary is very heavy, it may be necessary to meet it by a loan; but the fact should always be recognized that the deficiency to be so met is a deficiency to be provided for out of revenue. Until we lay down that rule we shall never be safe in borrowing money for public works.

I wish now to make one or two observations on the Budget for the present year as compared with that for last year. Taken as a whole, the Budget for the present year shows an increase of £328,000 in revenue, and an increase of £248,000 in expenditure over that of last year. In point of fact, however, the increase on both sides is merely of a nominal character. There is a substantial increase in the item of Land Revenue, which will be £362,000 better this year that it was last year, and this increase is owing to the improved condition of Orissa, and to some new settlements which have taken place. On the other hand, it has been thought prudent to take a reduced Estimate for the opium revenue, which is estimated at £8,385,000, being £400,000 less than the Estimate of last year under that head. The Estimate under the head of Customs duties is less by about £100,000, on account of the decline in the sugar trade in the Central and North-Western Provinces, and other causes. The total estimated revenue is about £48,500,000, of which upwards of £8,000,000 is estimated to be received from opium. Seeing that opium is estimated to produce more than one-sixth of the whole revenue of India, and seeing that that sum is considerably in excess of the average revenue it has produced during the past ten or twelve years, I think it would be prudent that we should put some limitation upon the amount that we ought to take credit for from this source of revenue, and, therefore, I have suggested to the Government of India that it would be better if, instead of forming each year an estimate of the amount which may be yielded by opium, and taking the full credit for that amount in estimating our revenue for the year, we took a certain sum to place to credit as representing the average revenue we derive from that article, and thus arrived at a fixed and reliable basis upon which to estimate our revenue. In those years in which the revenue from opium exceeds the sum so taken, the excess may go towards strengthening the balances and defraying the charges for the construction of the public works, and should it fall below that sum we might be able to draw upon the balances to meet the deficiency, or we might go into the market for a somewhat larger loan to meet the public works expenditure. I think that by adopting such a course as I have suggested we should be able to get something like consistency and fixity of taxation and of expenditure in India. By making some such arrangement, in combination with an improved system of advances for public works, and by introducing some more careful mode of keeping the accounts of the reproductive fund which we may hope will arise from these public works, we may establish a system of carrying on public works by means of borrowed money upon a solid and secure basis. At present, however, I feel considerable uneasiness with respect to that particular feature in our financial system, because, while I fully recognize as a good one the principle of borrowing for works that are to be reproductive, I am afraid that in carrying it out in detail we may lose sight of the reproductive element, and that we may carry all that comes to us from the public works to the credit of the Land Revenue; and, that so losing sight of it as belonging to a particular fund we may cease to extinguish debt, and may allow it to increase upon us to an extent that may be very undesirable. Under all these circumstances, I think the policy pursued by Mr. Massey and the Government of India on the present occasion is a perfectly sound and right one—I mean with regard to the maintenance of the existing sources of taxation. It was questioned whether, looking at the account in the more favourable aspect in which, I admit it is capable of being regarded, it was necessary to renew the Licence Tax. To have extinguished it was a course so popular that the Government might have been much tempted to adopt it. The amount raised by its means was not a very large one—only £658,000 last year, and undoubtedly there were some features in the tax which gave annoyance and which it was necessary to alter. That alteration reduces somewhat the value of the tax, even as it exists; but I think the Government of India were perfectly right in resolving to maintain this mode of taxation. It is after all but a slight burden on the classes who have to pay it, and it maintains a sort of regard to the principle that those who are the possessors of wealth and those who are exercising profitable occupations should contribute something to the interests of the State. I would call the attention of the Committee to the progress in late years of the different branches of taxation. I have compared the taxation of 1856-7 with the taxation proposed in the present year, taking it under three different heads. In the first place I take the Land Revenue, which can hardly be called a tax, but which is a very important—by far the most important—source of revenue to the State, and the revenue in 1856-7, from this source amounted to something less than £18,000,000, being in fact £17,900,000. In 1868-9 the revenue from this source had risen to £20,400,000, showing an increase under this head of £2,500,000, or about 14 per cent. Then I take the group of taxation which bear upon the consuming population —the Excise, Salt, and Customs. In 1856-7 these three produced £5,700,000, and in 1868-9 they had risen to £10,600,000, showing an increase of very nearly £5,000,000, or about 85 per cent, in this class of taxation. I take thirdly the class of duties which fall upon the mercantile and trading communities and upon the possessors of wealth, such as the Stamps and the Assessed Taxes. In 1856-7 there were, of course, no Assessed Taxes, and the revenue from Stamps only amounted to £612,000. The revenue from these sources in 1868-9 was £2,942,000, showing an increase of £2,330,000, or about 380 per cent. In the former year the Land Revenue yielded 53 per cent of the whole revenue, while now it produces only 42 per cent. I think, under all the circumstances, that it would have been a pity to attempt to get rid of the Licence Tax, and therefore in retaining it and depriving it, as Mr. Massey has done, of its more objectionable features, I think he has exercised a wise discretion. The Government did not think it wise to turn it into an acknowledged income tax. It is, indeed, very little else but an income tax, and I am not sure that it would not have been well to have given it that name, and to have rendered it a little more productive. But that is a matter upon which the Government of India — who ought to be better acquainted with the feelings of those with whom they have to deal than we are—can better judge than the Home Government, and I am ready to accept their opinion on this point.

I have now gone through the principal heads of the Budget of 1868-9. There is one point, however, relating to the Home charges, upon which I should wish to say a few words. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that we have this year made an alteration, or, rather, an addition to the usual accounts which are presented to Parliament. We have added to the Return a new account, giving a comparison of the estimated with the actual receipts and disbursements of the Home Treasury for 1866-7, and another account giving a comparison of the original with the regular Estimate of the receipts and disbursements of the Home Treasury for 1867-8. I think it is very desirable that the Members of the House of Commons should have an opportunity of getting fuller information with regard to these Home accounts than they have hitherto had, and I have introduced a new form of account for the purpose of showing what are the differences between our original Estimate and the amount which is ultimately furnished, with a column giving an explanation of the increase or the decrease, so that, in point of fact, they resemble very nearly the accounts of the army and navy expenditure which are laid upon the table, and which are in the hands of hon. Members when the Estimates are before them. This account shows in what respect the expenditure has or has not exceeded what was estimated. In addition to this, we have adopted this year a new system of referring the accounts to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in the hope that they will examine them and will put any question they may think desirable to the auditor or the officers of the India Office. I am quite satisfied that it is desirable that Parliament should exercise that kind of control and criticism over the whole of the expenses. I am not, however, of opinion that it would be desirable that Parliament should take into its own hands the direction of our expenditure, or that it should endeavour to introduce a system of voting the money that we should spend. I think any system of that sort would prove not only delusive, but positively mischievous, for we all know how few Members of Parliament take a real interest in the subject or have sufficient knowledge to enable them effectively to criticize the details of Indian expense; but frequently a strong pressure would be put upon Parliament by persons having an English interest in the expenditure of Indian money, and this might lead to expenses which are avoided under the present system. I believe that the minute control exercised by a body of men like the Council of India is much more advantageous than any control exercised by this House would be; any acceptance, too, of the responsibility by Parliament which such a control entails would also, in my opinion, tend to introduce laxity into the supervision which that Council exercises in those matters, inasmuch as they would be to a great extent relieved from the responsibility which at present attaches to them.

The statement which I have now laid before the Committee is one, I think, which can excite no great amount of enthusiasm one way or the other. If there is nothing very unsatisfactory in that statement, there is, on the other hand, nothing in it of which we have any great reason to be proud. Our revenue, undoubtedly, keeps up, but it does not increase very largely, and though our expenditure exhibits no large increase, there is a tendency to creep up. We are, undoubtedly, spending a good deal of money on very beneficial undertakings, such as public works and railways; yet, on the other hand, there are many excellent works which we are unable to undertake from want of funds. In the past year I have had to lament that we have been obliged to refrain from carrying out those sanitary and educational measures which we could wish to see adopted, but the consideration of the Government has been turned to these measures, and we are, I believe, making progress. We have established a sanitary Department in our Office, and we are in communication with the Government of India in respect to improved sanitary arrangements. An impulse has been given to the educational movement, but what the result is likely to be we are not in a position to say. What we have to do is to keep our eyes upon the details of the expenditure, and that is by no means an easy thing to do in this country. It must be done mainly in India, but still we believe that much can be done even here. One step of some importance we have taken; we have put a stop to the system of sending home continually by every mail proposals for an increase of salary or expenditure in this or that Department. We have directed, instead, that all those proposals should be reserved and sent home at one time, so that the whole of them may be considered together; and though this is apparently a very simple measure, it is exactly one of those measures which are likely to tend to economy. I hope it may be found possible in the matter of civil, and more particularly of military expenditure, to exercise a more rigorous control over some details than, I think, has been exercised hitherto. At all events, that is the object to which we are now devoting our attention. I have already said, respecting public works, that we are endeavouring to devise a system by which we shall be able to discover what returns we get from the money laid out upon the re-productive principle. Respecting railways, we are now in communication with the Government of India, requesting them to lay before us a complete scheme for the further prosecution of railway works, and to state what railways should be first completed, and at what rate we can safely and properly proceed. There are some lines which must be very speedily taken up by the Government, from political motives, and there are others which it may be desirable to take up with a view to commercial improvement. I have also spoken of the advisability of establishing proper financial relations between the central and local Governments. I very much regret that more progress has not been made in that undertaking since last year, but those who are acquainted with Indian affairs will readily understand that this is a matter which gives rise to much difference of opinion and to considerable discussion between the central Government and the local Governments; and it is not surprising that although Mr. Massey prepared a plan and submitted it to the local Governments, we have not yet received the full Reports which have been sent in. We have before us the nature of the proposition in outline; we have also remarks of certain members of the Council and some influential persons upon it, but we have not yet received the views of the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras upon the subject. That, however, is a matter which will be proceeded with. Altogether I think we may congratulate ourselves upon the financial position of India, that our credit keeps good, and that there is a very fair relation between the revenue and the expenditure. Under these circumstances I will not longer detain the Committee, but I will move the Resolution I have placed in the hands of the Chairman, which differs somewhat in form from that of past years, because while it records the figures as usual, it also contains a reference to the Report of the Committee on Public Accounts for the year, and expresses the assent of this Committee to that Report.

Mr. LAING said, he saw very little to except to in the clear and judicious statement of the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for India. No one could doubt the judiciousness of the conclusion come to by Mr. Massey and the Indian Government, and which had been affirmed by the authorities in this country, that there should be no alteration in the taxation for the current year. Whatever objection there might have been to the policy of the Licence Tax when it was first imposed, it would, in his opinion, have been impolitic, without a much larger surplus, to repeal taxes simply because we had had an exceptionally good opium year. He also generally concurred with the right hon. Baronets's observations as to the danger of allowing items of expenditure on public works to be improperly carried from revenue to capital under the head of extraordinary expenditure. Such a practice resembled the condemned system of keeping railway capital accounts open. But he wished to say a few words on Indian finance generally, because it seemed to him that there still remained a disposition in the Home Indian Government to take a rather too gloomy view of the financial position of India, and that might lead to bad results. About five years ago very important

practical questions were at issue, arising out of the doubt as to whether the restoration of the Indian finances after the Mutiny had been so complete that practically the equilibrium had been established. If the equilibrium had been established it would have been obviously right to incur a more liberal expenditure in useful and reproductive works than would otherwise be possible, and it was also clearly right not to impose an excessive amount of unpopular direct taxation to maintain an unnecessary surplus. On those questions he had taken a different view from that of the Secretary of State of that time. That controversy between Lord Canning's Government and the Home Government should guide them for the future. He most cheerfully bore testimony to the fact that the administration of the Home Indian Government under the right hon. Baronet and the Marquess of Salisbury had been of a much more liberal tone than the policy of earlier times; but he could not help thinking the right hon. Baronet had spoken too gloomily of Indian finance, and he (Mr. Laing) proposed to point out why a more cheerful view of things should be taken. During and after the time of the Mutiny, the financial condition of India was one of extreme distress—there was an accumulated deficit in the four years from 1858 to 1861 of £42,000,000, so that the average deficit for the four years was £10,500,000 per annum; and during 1860 and 1861, two years after the Mutiny, the annual deficit amounted to the formidable figure of £5,250,000. Great efforts were then made towards the establishment of an equilibrium, and since 1861 those efforts had been practically successful. During those six years they had been paying their way. For three years there had been a surplus, and for three years a deficit, but the six years together showed that the debt had slightly diminished; at the commencement it was £113,000,000; in 1867 it was £108,000,000. The interest paid in the year 1862 was £5,160,000, and in 1867 it was £4,829,000. It was true, however, that the cash balance in 1862 had amounted to £17,000,000, and that it stood in 1867 at only £11,000,000; so that to within a few pounds India was in the same position as regarded her public debt, less cash balances, now as she occupied in 1862. This, he thought, proved the soundness of the view entertained by Lord Canning's Government as to the preservation of an equilibrium in the Indian Budget. And he thought it right to observe that the equilibrium of the Indian Budget was very different from the equilibrium of any European Budget, because in the former works were charged to revenue which in the latter would be charged to capital. From 1862 to the present year the cost of the public works undertaken in India was £28,667,000; of which no less than £16,000,000 was for original works and improvements exclusive of the cost of maintaining. Just about one-half of that £16,000,000 was for new civil and military buildings, and might be regarded as adding to the value of the public estate; the other half was for strictly reproductive works; so that £8,000,000 had been charged to revenue, which he ventured to say in the Budget of any other State in the world would have been charged to capital. In India the compensation for land taken for railways was charged to revenue, though it was as strictly a charge against capital as was the cost of constructing the railways themselves. During the last six years £15,000,000, or £2,500,000 a year, had been charged to revenue in India, which, if we took the analogy of any European State or any private railway company, would have been charged to capital. During the same period, though there had been no large war, India had not been completely tranquil and some of the military operations there had been attended with considerable expense. If there had been no increase in the cost of pay and provisions there ought to have been a diminution of £1,500,000 or £2,000,000 as compared with the military establishments of 1861-2; but, instead of a decrease, there had been a small increase. He thought, however, that the expenditure under this head would not have been an increasing one, and he believed that if peace continued, it would be possible to effect a reduction. Here he would observe that his experience led him to believe that if we wanted economy in military matters we must have a civilian primarily responsible for that expenditure—a Minister for War in England and a Governor General in India. In other words, we must not allow a Commander-in-Chief to control his own Estimates. But the Estimates being under the control of a civilian, one man ought to be made responsible for carrying out all the details; and a military man thoroughly acquainted with all the practical details of his profession, was best adapted for this latter duty. He believed that in respect of this matter second thoughts in India had been the worst. In his opinion

the original plan was best, and the amendments made on it by the Treasury were not improvements in regard of economy. A point of difference between him and others who took a sanguine view of Indian finance, on the one side, and those who did not take that view on the other, was in respect of the revenue from opium. He had heard it said that this was a precarious revenue; that it was a reed which some day or other would break in our hand, and that therefore, we did wrong to depend on it. In 1862, he had occasion to look into the matter very closely, and he arrived at quite an opposite conclusion. He came to the conclusion that there was no reason why the revenue from opium should be more precarious than any other revenue depending upon an artificial taste widely diffused among a large population. He at that time ventured to predict that there would be an increase rather than a decrease in the Revenue from opium within the next few years. He did so because having looked back for a few years he found that in China the expenditure for opium had been steadily and rapidly increasing. For the five years ending in 1857 that expenditure had been £8,000,000 per annum. During the next five years, from 1857 to 1862, it was about £11,000,000 per annum. In 1857 the gross revenue from opium in India was in round numbers £5,000,000, and the net £4,000,000. From 1857 to 1861 the average receipts from the same source were £6,080,000. In 1861 they were £6,676,000 gross, or £4,160,000. He might observe that in the case of opium the net revenue was the thing to look to, as the article was one of Government manufacture. Between 1861 and 1867 the gross revenue had risen to £7,380,000 and the net to £5,600,000. In 1867-8 the gross revenue was £8,814,000, and the net £6,951,000. That appeared to him to be as little like a precarious and declining revenue as anything could well be. The enormous population of China preferred opium to any spirit or other stimulant, and, as the experience of the last twenty years proved that, practically, India had a monopoly in the supply of that article to China, the trade in that article would increase as new communications were opened up. He was altogether unable to see why there was anything more objectionable financially in a revenue derived from the sale of opium than in one derived from the sale of spirituous liquors, or, as in Russia, from the monopoly of brandy. He was anxious to call attention to a few facts showing the progress of India; for he believed that while it was important to encourage a reasonable and prudent liberality with regard to public works, it was not less important to exercise a wholesome influence upon public opinion, which was being very rapidly created in India. He should be the last person in the world to indulge in anything like self-laudation or puffery, believing that it always defeated its own object; but, feeling convinced that our government in India was not only the cheapest and best of any oriental nation, but perhaps one of the cheapest civilized governments in the world, he felt it to be only right that the facts should be known generally, and that the Natives should not be led into the mistake of supposing that the British rule was bad, economically, or in any other respect. The first question to be considered was the intrinsic elasticity of the revenue. In 1862 Lord Canning's Government had to decide upon the important question of imposing a Licence Tax, and, accordingly, before this resolution was adopted it became necessary for him to go into very minute calculations with regard to the revenue. Excluding all those additions arising from annexations of territory, to which the right hon. Baronet had referred, and looking merely to the inherent elasticity of the revenue, he found that for the previous ten years an increase at the rate of more than £700,000 a year had been going on, and he ventured to hazard the opinion that the tendency was still further to increase. That was in 1862, and in the last six years the revenue had increased from £42,900,000 to £48,935,000, being an average increase of over £1,000,000 a year. [Colonel SYKES: From opium?] Of course, a portion of the increase was derived from opium, and he had already tried to show that this was as legitimate a source of revenue and as little injurious as any other. But to show that opium was not the only source of increased revenue, he would investigate the progress made during the five years from 1861 till 1866, the date to which the latest complete Returns were available, which seemed to him a period more applicable to the present state of things than some of the examples given by the right hon. Baronet. By comparing the Returns of 1861 with those of 1866 it would be seen that the Land Revenue had increased from £18,500,000 to £20,478,000. Yet during that period there had been no annexations of territory and no increase in the rate of assessment; the whole of that increase, therefore, must be due to the prosperity of the agricultural interests of India, causing additional and waste lands to be brought into cultivation. During the same period the Excise Returns showed an increase from £1,778,000 to £2,612,000; and the yield of the salt tax had risen from £3,805,000 to £5,342,000, the Estimate for next year being even higher. The latter was a very important increase, because the salt tax was perhaps the only one affecting the great mass of the population of Hindustan. There was no man so poor as not to consume salt, and the progress therefore of the revenue from salt in India might be regarded very much in the same way in which the Excise Returns in this country were supposed to throw light on the condition of the great body of the people. Stamps during the same time had risen from £1,182,000 to £1,994,000. These were all items independent of opium, and they exhibited a rapid and satisfactory state of progress. The Government grants for education had increased in five years from £235,000 to £440,000; but, besides this, he found from official Returns that the amount expended upon education from local and private sources, other than grants from the State, had increased from £128,000 to £330,000 —that was to say, had increased nearly three-fold in five years. The average attendance of scholars had risen from 333,000 to 559,000, or 66 per cent. The increase of intelligence was shown in another way; the number of letters and newspapers sent through the Post Office had increased from 47,077,000 in 1861 to 59,931,000 in 1866. In fact, reviewing the career of India for these six years, he knew no other country in the history of the world in which such a great material progress had been made. The increase in the imports and exports was something almost fabulous. The aggregate imports and exports which in 1861 amounted to £68,000,000 in 1866 had risen to £123,000,000—that was to say, had very nearly doubled in five years. The amount of bullion imported into India during the last six years amounted to no less than £115,000,000. The tonnage of shipping entered and cleared rose from 5,101,000 in 1861 to 7,621,000 in 1866, and the railway mileage increased from 1,028 to 3,452 miles. The gross receipts upon these lines stood at £730,000 in the former year, and £4,607,000 in the latter. Contrasting these figures with the financial working of the government of any other country in the world that he was aware of, the results, he believed, must prove most creditable to British government in India. He was the more anxious to dwell upon these points because last year an authority no less eminent than the Marquess of Salisbury expressed, in language which had since become memorable, a doubt whether, as a whole, British rule in India had proved a benefit to the Natives or not. He was very glad that doubt had been expressed, because it had led to what was no doubt a very useful inquiry, and to the production of a body of most valuable Reports, which must convey to the mind of any gentleman who read them attentively the impression that British rule had undoubtedly been of the greatest possible benefit to India. The taxation of India was lighter than that of any other civilized country in the world. There could be no reasonable doubt that the revenue raised from land there was in the nature of a rent, and that if it were not paid to the State it would be paid to private proprietors. The large revenue from opium, moreover, was not really paid by India, but by the consumers in China. If these two items were deducted, the whole amount of revenue raised in India would be only £18,000,000 a year; but even of this limited amount about £1,500,000 accrued from the tribute paid by other native princes, and for services, such as that of the Post Office, for which an equivalent was given. A careful analysis, therefore, of the taxation levied in India for the purposes of the public administrations, civil and military, would show that this did not exceed £15,000,000 a year, which would be about 2*s.* per head on the population of British India, numbering 150,000,000. But, even if the question affecting the nature of the land revenue were waived, and this were treated as an Imperial tax, even then the taxation of the population would be under 5*s.* a head. In no country in the world, making a pretence to civilization, was the taxation upon so low a scale; he did not refer merely to highly taxed countries like England or France, where the taxation was at the rate of over £2 a head, but to such countries as Turkey, Egypt, or Russia, where, with the comparative amount of civilization which they possessed, the taxation was from 15*s.* to 20*s.* a head. Take, again, the Public Debt of India. The annual charge was a shade under £5,000,000 sterling, which was but one-tenth part of the revenue of India; and it had been stationary at this rate since 1861; whereas in other parts of the world, not only was the debt large and rapidly increasing, but the annual payment of interest upon it amounted, perhaps, to one-half, or, as in the case of England, to 33 per cent of the annual revenue. And what had been obtained in return for a portion of the obligation so undertaken? No less an amount than £65,000,000 of British capital had been expended upon the construction of railways in India. In India no less than £65,000,000 of British capital had been expended in making water communications and carrying out other invaluable and important public works. Now, while he quite agreed with the right hon. Baronet as to the importance of economy, and deprecated launching out into extravagance in small matters, yet he had come to the conclusion that, in the present condition of Indian finance we, ought not to starve great, important, and necessary public works. We ought not to mind contracting a national debt in India for purposes of primary importance. Although he was as averse as anybody could be from keeping a small capital account open, yet he could not help seeing that it was a totally different thing from contracting a debt in order to carry out public works of a political and commercial necessity, such as railways and irrigation works. It was obvious, for instance, that a system of railways leading up to Peshawur, on the frontier of the Punjaub, was a primary necessity. The political use of such an undertaking must be evident to everybody. As Russia was extending her dominion in Central Asia it was patent that our policy should be to keep on friendly terms with her, and, while allowing her to do what she liked on the north side of the range of mountains, to put themselves in an efficient state of pefence on the south side. With that object we ought to construct a line of railway to Peshawur, and to complete another up the Indus Valley from Kurrachee. He also thought that the Benares irrigation scheme ought to be proceeded with without delay. On the whole, he was in favour of the Government executing these great works, instead of intrusting them to private companies; and this opinion was, he believed, shared by most of the Indian authorities. At all events, he was anxious that there should be no delay; because, while we were higgling with the company which had possession of the field, we might lose the opportunity of raising the money when the money market was in an easy state. Indeed, he particularly wished to impress on the right hon. Baronet the importance of taking advantage of the present condition of the money market, and of the high credit of India to make ample provision for the wants of that country for a series of years to come. It would be necessary to expend at least £20,000,000 during the next eight years or so. He did not mean to say that a sum of £20,000,000 should be borrowed at once, and then locked up to remain idle. He thought that the right hon. Baronet might very well take a leaf out of the book of some railway companies, which had been making provision for paying off their terminable debentures as they fell due over a series of years. The lenders should be allowed either to pay up in full, or leave a deposit of perhaps 10 per cent. on the remaining calls, so as to insure their being paid. Under such a system the necessity was avoided of disturbing the money market by raising a large sum in any one year, while, on the other hand, there was a certainty of getting the money year by year as it was required. By this method the right hon. Baronet might raise the money he wanted within about 5 per cent or so as cheaply as if he were to take the whole at once, and in the present state of the money market the amount would probably be advanced at a very favourable rate. So far as regarded finance. As to general questions, he should not refer to them at any length, though he must say a few words as to the measures to be adopted for maintaining in India the excellent government which she had enjoyed during the last six years. A question had been raised as to the relative merits of personal government and of Councils. In his judgment the question was one of degree. Everybody must, on the one hand, admit that personal government and personal character was the mainspring of everything in a country like India; but, on the other hand, it stood to reason that all matters could not be intrusted to individual impulse, the more especially as the Secretary of State for India in this country necessarily changed with the Ministry. It was absolutely necessary that he should have the benefit of the advice of experienced Indian officials, and he would suggest that it was of vital importance that men of eminence, like Sir Bartle Frere or Sir Robert Montgomery, should, in returning from India, receive a kind of official retainer to give advice to the Secretary of State for India. In conclusion, he wished to state that he had listened with great satisfaction to the statement of the right hon. Baronet, whose administration had been on the whole a very enlightened, a very economical, and a very successful one.

MR. GRANT DUFF: Sir, I should have been sorry if this conversation had come to an end, without my having had an opportunity of expressing my very great regret that one of those untoward accidents, to which the House is subject, should have prevented the hon. and gallant General, the Member for Frome (Sir Henry Rawlinson) bringing before us a subject, which will, I fear, however favourably matters may turn out, exert a sinister influence on many future Indian budgets. I allude, of course, to the recent advance of Russia on Central Asia. I am as far as possible from being an alarmist on this question. Some who have given much attention to it say that I am too little of an alarmist; but I do think that even in this crowded Session this matter should not have been passed by. There is a difference between panic and wise foresight. A discussion, inaugurated as it would have been by the hon. and gallant General, with whose views some of us do and some of us do not agree, but whose acquaintance with a certain portion of the subject we all admit to be great and almost unique, would have enlightened opinion in Europe, strengthened the hands of the Viceroy in what I consider his wise policy, and above all calmed opinion in India. Far be it from us to wish to see a revival of the anti-Russian feelings of thirty years ago; but let us not deceive ourselves. This is a grave matter. It is for the interest of all of us, and above all for the interest of the Government for the time being that all the best information and all the best thought about Russia, which exists in Western Europe, should be called out for our guidance, and it is known to every one that the most sovereign means of calling out all the best knowledge and all the best thought existing in Western Europe on any political subject is a discussion in the British House of Commons.

COLONEL SYKES said, the right hon. Baronet had brought forward the Indian Budget in a spirit of great fairness. He could not agree with the hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing) that great progress had been made in the trade of India, seeing that the exports and imports showed a great falling off. It appeared from the official Progress Report of India recently printed that the export trade between 1865-6 and 1866-7 had diminished £17,453,698, and that the import trade, including treasure, for the same period had diminished £10,919,196, in all £28,372,894, or 23 per cent on 1865-6, and 19 per cent on 1864-5. The number of sea-going vessels had diminished 917, with a tonnage of 227,547, and the coasting trade 11,555 vessels, with a tonnage of 318,907. This was matter for serious consideration. He would urge the desirability of a more speedy issue of these Returns. He thought that the House should not, at the end of July, 1868, be called upon to discuss the Budget and policy of India only up to the 31st March, 1867. In his opinion, the revenue derived from opium could not be a source of gratification to the moral sense of this country, since it rendered us responsible for the destruction of the *physique* and *morale* of the Chinese, who were the chief consumers. It was satisfactory to find that education was making rapid strides in India. There were 17,117 schools in India in 1864-5, with an attendance of 435,818 scholars, at a cost of £613,000. In 1866 there were 18,562 schools, with an attendance of 559,317 scholars, at a cost of £770,834. The Government Colleges and private institutions had increased; the Colleges from 295 in 1865-6 to 305 in 1866-7, and the institutions from 2,266 to 2,602 in 1866-7, and other schools from 197 to 425—in all from 2,758 to 3,332, and the scholars in these schools from 121,286 to 134,640, and in the private schools from 7,433 to 13,460. The number of Colleges was increasing; but he must point out that the Natives, who received a superior education at these institutions, would expect employment in positions suited to their attainments, and that, unless such employment was provided for them, they would naturally become discontented. They would not be satisfied with small Government clerkships. In illustration, he would take the number of scholars in the University of Madras who had gone up for matriculation examination. In 1857 there were only 41; but in 1866-7 there were 895, and the total number in ten years was 3,161—of these there had graduated in degrees and honours in the different faculties from 1857 to 1867:—Bachelor of Arts, sixty-three; from private tuition, twelve, Bachelor of Civil

Engineering, five; Bachelor of Laws, twenty-three; Fine Arts examination, 168; and from private tuition, ninety-seven. One candidate has taken the degree of M.D., and three others have passed preliminary examinations. The successful scholars of the Calcutta and Bombay Universities are even more numerous. With regard to finance, he agreed with the right hon. Baronet (Sir Stafford Northcote) in thinking that a distinction should be drawn between extraordinary public works, whether remunerative or otherwise, and ordinary annual works. If this were done, instead of throwing extraordinary public works upon revenue the Budget would show an annual available surplus, and this surplus, if devoted to extraordinary public works, would enable us to make considerable progress, particularly with regard to irrigation; for completing extraordinary works recourse should be had to loans. There was a growing feeling of dissatisfaction and discontent with reference to the prospective state of the Indian army. Before the transfer of that army to the Crown regimental bonuses for senior officers on retirement were subscribed to by the officers; but those who have joined the Staff corps have no longer any motive to subscribe, being promoted for length of service alone; the consequence was that the bonus system fell through in all Native regiments, and officers who had expected to retire with a bonus of £5,000, or £6,000, were still kept in the service and deprived of every shilling they had subscribed. Commitees had sat in India upon this subject, but with what result? In a literally trading and huckstering spirit the officers had been asked how much they had received in additional pay at every previous step of promotion in their career, and they were told that so much should be deducted from their bonus—that is to say, from the money they had actually subscribed. This had created great dissatisfaction and resentment, and could not have been intended by the kind liberal spirit in which the despatches of Viscount Cranborne and the right hon. Baronet on this subject was conceived. He was glad to observe that the health of both European and Native troops had been very satisfactory — the death-rate of Europeans which formerly was 10 per cent, including invaliding, being in 1865, 64,405, 2½ per cent for the death-rate. And in 1866, on 59,941, it was no higher than 2 per cent. The invaliding in 1865 was 4·4 per cent, and in 1866 it was 3·4 per cent. The rate of deaths in the Native army in 1866, on 99,036, was only 1·2 per cent, and the invalided were only 1·7 per cent, the happy results, it is to be hoped, of sanitary measures for the European and Native troops. He observed, however, that while the number of troops had diminished by 183,023 officers and men since the Mutiny, the expense had increased by £5,000,000. This opened a wide field for inquiry, and, he hoped, for reduction. While the cost of the Company's army had never been more than £10,300,000 a year from 1851 to 1857, except on two occasions, in 1854 and 1855, when it rose to £11,000,000, the cost of the army in India now was £15,825,791—with an increased number of Europeans it was true, from 42,000 in 1857 to 59,941 in 1868, but with the Native force reduced nearly two-thirds, from 300,000 men to 99,036. Upon the whole the prospects of India, he was glad to think, were not unfavourable. He entreated his right hon. Friend to consider the question of the Native regiments being without officers. In the late Abyssinian expedition some of the regiments had not one of their own old officers. If it were resolved to have only six officers to be named by the Commander-in-Chief with a regiment, surely he would have the common sense to keep the old officers with the men with whom they had served, and between whom and themselves a feeling of sympathy had grown up. To put strange officers with the men was decidedly impolitic and even dangerous.

Mr. BAZLEY said, while thanking the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India for the statement which he had laid before the House as to the Indian finances, he felt it was deeply to be deplored that the interests of 200,000,000 of men should come on for discussion only at the very eve of the prorogation of Parliament; and he trusted that in future the subject of India would be brought before the House at a time when it could be really discussed. Nothing would contribute more to the prosperity of India than attention not only to the rights of labour, but to proper investments in public works. A large amount of money had been expended that would be really unproductive; but he did not know that too much had been laid out upon productive works. They wanted in India supplies of water, not only for irrigation, but also for communication. The Punjaub furnished an example that might be followed with advantage in every part of India. With regard to railways, it was to be observed that, while we in this country had about 14,000 miles of them laid down, in India there were not, probably, 4,000 miles. In the United States of America there were probably 40,000 miles of railway. He submitted that in India, instead of 4,000 there ought to be 40,000 miles of railway communication. He congratulated the right hon. Baronet on the prospects connected with the thirty years' tenure of land. It was very probable that there would every year be an increasing revenue from a continually increasing rent; and he was glad to hear that land, in an uncultivated state, was let at as low a price as 1½*d.* per acre per annum for a certain number of years. At the end of thirty years it would let for 1*s.* an acre. He rejoiced to hear that efforts were being made to increase the quantity and improve the quality of the cotton, and that, according to the gentlemen who had travelled through the cotton cultivating districts, that there was an improvement in the crop. He would be glad to see an agricultural inspection of cotton through the whole of India, and also that there should be a system of agricultural statistics. By that means India would attain a state of prosperity to which she had hitherto been a stranger. One great proof of the progress that had been made was that the price of labour had been considerably increased. He wished very much to see a remission altogether of the duty upon salt, as no greater boon could be conferred upon the inhabitants of India. He trusted that every effort would be made to develop the resources of the country; and in that case he thought that India had a great future before her. In a word, he asked for no favour for our Eastern possessions, he only demanded that justice should be done them. To see palatial structures rising and costly entertainments given at the expense of India was not creditable to us. We should not only give the people of India our language and civilization, but in all our intercourse with them we should be careful to do them justice.

MR. KINNAIRD said, that it was only because he believed that British rule, as had been proved to demonstration by the speech of the hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing) had done good to India, that he rejoiced that we were placed there. He rejoiced also that there was an increasing number of Natives coming to this country, who would learn to value our institutions; and he believed that history would yet do us justice, and show that there never was a nation in the world that had won a country by arms which had so applied itself to promote the interests of the people as we had done. He had been very much gratified to hear from the right hon. Baronet that it was the intention of the Government to increase the amount devoted to education. Such was the appetite the Natives had for education, and such their desire to improve themselves, that it would be found to be a wise economy to increase the grant for education that had been made. By means of grants in aid much had been done in this country, and much, too, had been done in India already. He entirely concurred with the hon. Member for Wick in what had fallen from him on the subject of irrigation, and he hoped the wise advice that hon. Gentleman had given would be followed. He hoped, too, if they were to meet in another Parliament, the right hon. Baronet would grant him the Committee which he had moved for this Session. With regard to opium, he would suggest whether there were not moral considerations which outweighed the financial advantages of the revenue from this article, and upon this subject his right hon. Friend had promised to lay before Parliament some valuable Papers which had not yet reached the Home Government. He thought that with regard to another point alluded to by his right hon. Friend, it was a mistake to suppose that Mr. Massey had defrayed the sanitary expenses and barrack charges out of loans; in justice to Mr. Massey it should be understood that they were really defrayed out of revenue. The only other point to which he need allude had reference to the Council of India, and he believed that, in withdrawing the Bills which he had introduced on this subject, his right hon. Friend would explain that next year, if in Office, he meant to move for a Select Committee to go into the whole question with reference to the Council. The subject was certainly one requiring grave consideration, for the Council as now constituted did not command out-of-doors the confidence which it ought to inspire. There was a general feeling that it did not contain sufficient new blood, and that most of the members had left India so long that they were not acquainted with the existing wants of the country. When the Bills were introduced he had suggested the appointment of a Select Committee, and he hoped that next year this course would be followed.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, that it was a little disheartening to a Minister, who took an interest in the Government of India, to address empty Benches on this subject. [Sir Stafford Northcote: Hear!] The dozen Members present constituted a sorry display of the interest felt in the welfare of 150,000,000 of human souls. He thought that the Indian Government should advertise for tenders whenever they wanted freight or stores. The chain cables and anchors sent out to India should be the subject of public competition. He noticed that estimates had been given at £37 5*s*., but those which had been taken were at £85 and £90. And so with provisions. He had been told that a gentleman recently offered to send out coals to Annesley Bay at 10*s*. a ton cheaper than the Government were being supplied, but that the offer was declined.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, in reply, said, he took the criticisms of the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. Alderman Lusk) in good part. It was very useful for India as well as for England, that a check should be placed upon expenditure by such criticisms; but he believed that the principle upon which the Government went on supplying stores of a naval character to India was to go to the Admiralty contractors and adopt the Admiralty scale of prices, feeling that on this point the Admiralty were better judges than the India Office could be. In the case of the chain cables and anchors alluded to by the hon. Member, he believed that there was a special reason why a patented article was necessary, for serious losses had arisen from the drifting of vessels in a cyclone, and it was thought advisable to have a certain description of anchor which would hold more firmly than the ordinary description. With regard to provisions, he knew nothing, but he remembered a gentleman coming to him and offering to send coals to Annesley Bay at a lower rate than that at which the Government were being supplied. At that time, however, the arrangement had already been made with the Peninsular and Oriental Company, and he believed that the offer made applied only to a very limited quantity of coals—one or two ship-loads, which would have been insufficient for the purpose. He was sorry if he conveyed the impression that Mr. Massey had this year thrown the barrack charges upon loans. What he meant was that Mr. Massey had put down barrack charges in the category of public works extraordinary, and that the principle recognized was that you might provide public works extraordinary by loan. It was not so on the present occasion. It happened that there had been no loan in India this year, for last year a larger loan than was required had been raised in anticipation of public works, and the balance was available for use in the present year. He would not follow the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Colonel Sykes) into all the points he had named, which, no doubt, required attention. With regard to trade Returns, it was rather discreditable that we did not get them of a later date. He was not cognizant of the deficiency until the other day, when, in preparing what he had to say, it occurred to him to make a comparison, and he found that the Returns did not come down later than April, 1867. He thereupon gave instructions that they should be sent within a much more reasonable time; and he did not see why we should not get them quarterly, if not monthly, so that we might know what was going on. The hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Bazley) made a large call upon the Government of India when he asked for the remittance of the salt duty, which produced £6,000,000. A question had been raised as to the propriety of making any addition to the salt duties in Bombay and Madras. in order to bring them up to the Bengal standard; that, however, was prevented by remonstrances that were made, and he was glad that it was. The whole question of the salt duties was being considered with a view to an arrangement. He thanked the hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing) for the kind way in which he had spoken of the financial statement. That of the hon, Member might be taken as a counterpoise to the insufficiently sanguine view which he had taken; but it was better for one in his position not to be too sanguine and not not to encourage expenditure and the increase of debt. He admitted that the hon. Member's picture of the finances of India was, upon the whole, a very fair one; and there was one point he was glad the hon. Member called attention to—namely, the importance of developing the railway system in the direction of the North-West. He already concurred in the importance of that policy. He regretted, as much as his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Grant Duff) did, that the hon. member for Frome (Sir

Henry Rawlinson) had not had an opportunity for bringing forward the whole subject of the foreign policy; but he was quite certain that the true policy was that which had been indicated—that we should abstain from any action which would provoke collision or would produce complications on our frontier, and that we should take all the means in our power to develop our system of communication. This year steps have been taken which would make a considerable stride in the development of communication in the North-West. The Government of India had been called upon to give a general view of the railways with which they thought it best to proceed—keeping separate the commercial system from the political railways, especially on the North-West. In regard to the political railways, the Government had said that, without waiting for anything further, steps ought to be taken for proceeding with, at all events, a portion of them. The Government of India were about to undertake, at Government expense, the construction of a railway from Lahore in the direction of Peshawur, though not further than Rawul Pindee. Commercially it would be a long time before this line would pay, but it was to be constructed for a great political object, and, therefore, it seemed to be an undertaking for Government rather than for a private company. To guarantee a company was a good system when there was a probability of a line paying, but where there was no reasonable probability that it would do so, it seemed desirable to try the experiment of Government making the line. The surveys were being commenced and arrangements made for bridging the rivers and opening up a communication with the salt mines of Rawul Pindee. He attached great importance to the missing link on the Indus Valley system; but it was best to do one thing at a time, and in this case a great deal depended upon the report to be made respecting the harbour of Kurrachee. Sir Seymour Fitzgerald had made a visit to Kurrachee, and sent home a very good report on the state of the works. They had consequently sent out Mr. Parker, an engineer, to see what was the effect upon the bar of the monsoon wave; upon his report it would depend whether Kurrachee was made a first or a second class harbour, and that would determine the direction of the railway. The suggestion to borrow £20,000,000 was not one to be passed over slightingly; but he thought it was a bad principle to borrow money merely because it was cheap, and that it was just as advantageous in the long run to go boldly into the market when money was wanted. There would be no indisposition on the part of the Council of India to raise money for useful works, whether of irrigation or communication.

Resolved, That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1867 was £42,122,433; the total of the direct claims and demands upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium, was £7,637,527; the charges in India, including Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £29,848,640; the value of Stores supplied from England, was £873,363; the charges in England were £5,549,345; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £731,049, making a total charge for the same year of £44,639,924; and there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £2,517,491.

House *resumed*.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL—[BILL 91.]

(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir James Fergusson.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, in moving that the Order of the Day to go into Committee on this Bill be discharged, said, he had hoped up to a late period that the Bill might have been more fully discussed. He fully understood that it was to have been put down for Tuesday last, which would have given him an opportunity of carrying it through Committee; but by mistake another Bill was put down before it, and it did not come on at all. He might have found a later day, but he had previously said that Tuesday was the last day he could bring it on; and the noble Lord the Member for Taunton (Lord William Hay) had left town on the understanding that the Order would be discharged. Apart from that, he doubted whether he should be justified in proceeding with the measure, seeing that several points of considerable importance remained to be discussed. He was not sorry, however, that he had brought forward the measure, as an opportunity had been afforded to the House of expressing a decided opinion upon two material points of the Bill with respect to the *status* of the present members of the Council. The House should understand that the Act of 1858 merely enacted that in the event of any change being made the members of Council should not be entitled to compensation until they had completed ten years of service, and therefore when the matter was re-opened next year the only difference in the state of affairs would be that those members of Council who had completed their tenth year of service during the present year would be entitled to compensation. He thought that the best plan would be when the Bills were introduced next year that they should be referred to a Select Committee. Under these circumstances he begged to move that the Order of the Day for going into Committee upon the Bill should be read and discharged.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged.* Bill *withdrawn.*

POOR RELIEF BILL—(*Lords.*)

[BILL 186.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 10 (Minister may, subject to Regulations, visit and instruct Inmates registered as of his Religious Creed).

MR. POWELL said, he rose to move the addition of words providing that any inmate in a workhouse, above the age of twelve years, should have the right to refuse to be instructed by such minister, after having been once visited by him. He thought that paupers ought not to have forced upon them the ministrations of persons to whom they objected. He fixed the age at twelve years, because in two other clauses of the Bill the age was named as equivalent to years of discretion.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 28, to add the words—

"Unless such inmate, being above the age of twelve years, and after having been visited at least once by such minister, shall object to be instructed by him."—(*Mr. Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he would suggest to the hon. Member to insert fourteen instead of twelve in his Amendment, in accordance with the age prescribed in the Industrial Schools Act.

MR. POWELL said, he was willing to insert "of fourteen," absolutely.

Sir Stafford Northcote

Amendment amended, by leaving out "twelve," and inserting "fourteen."—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

Question proposed,

"That the words 'unless such inmate, being above the age of fourteen years, and after having been visited at least once by such minister, shall object to be instructed by him,'

be there added."

MR. C. P. VILLIERS said, he considered it a farce to suppose that a child of twelve or fourteen years of age could form an opinion upon religion, unless it was influenced by some person who had the opportunity of speaking to it on the subject. He thought that some persons competent to examine the child should first say whether it was fit to decide for itself upon the point of religion.

[Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,]

LORD EDWARD HOWARD said, he wished to ask the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell) whether he would have any objection to the children being examined by the Poor Law Inspectors before requiring them to declare what particular religion they professed ?

MR. POWELL said, that while he had no desire to proselytize, he was anxious to prevent any undue interference with the religion of the inmates of the workhouse.

MR. T. CHAMBERS said, he wanted the opinion of the House of Commons on this important question, but he could not hope to obtain it at that period of the Session, when the attendance of forty Members could scarcely be secured. This was not merely a question whether a young child should be the judge of his religion, but whether a person of any age, being an inmate of the workhouse, should be compelled to submit to the religious ministrations of any clergyman who might be forced upon him. The Bill required, in the first place, a Creed Register to be kept of every inmate ; secondly, that such register might be inspected by the ministers of any religious denominations connected with the churches and chapels in the neighbourhood; thirdly, any such clergyman might, in accordance with the regulations of the workhouse, visit and instruct any inmate, whether he were seven or seventy years of age, whose name appeared on the register. And all this was done, forsooth, in the interests of religious liberty ! He contended that it was an outrage upon the principles of religious liberty. And those who opposed such interference with the religion of those poor people were charged with intolerance and a determination to oppress their consciences. The noble Lord the Member for Arundel (Lord Edward Howard) had used many hard words respecting him on a previous occasion, because of the course he had pursued respecting the Bill. But he (Mr. Chambers) had the testimony of a leader among the Roman Catholics of the House that he had not said one unkind word of any of his opponents. Now, he asked the Committee to say frankly, whether the Bill savoured of religious liberty or of religious coercion. He, for one, did not believe that any religious minister had a right to force his religious ministrations upon him, if he had the misfortune to become a pauper and to enter a workhouse. In opposing those provisions he felt that he was the friend of religious liberty. He would not allow any man to coerce even a criminal to submit to ministrations of religion which he did not desire. He believed that the law at present did all that was required, and that the alterations were not for religious liberty, but against it. They were conceived in the spirit of intolerance, and it was attempted to pass them at the fag-end of a Session when forty Members could not be kept together.

MR. SYNAN said, he thought there would be no objection to the Amendment proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell) if it were coupled with the qualification that in the case of every such child the Poor Law Board should direct an inquiry to be made whether the child was competent to form an opinion on religious matters.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, he would object to that qualification in the name of his constituents. They were already too much hindered with the control of the Poor Law Board. They were saddled with enormous taxation, and were left with no power but to carry out the decrees of the Board. It was not a case of opposition to Roman Catholics alone. They objected to the coercion of any class of people, of whatever religion.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he would remind the Committee that the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Villiers) had stigmatized the objections to this Bill as hypocritical. He could assure the right hon. Member that he was lately in conversation with an eminent member of the Bar, not in that House, who would not believe it when he (Mr. Newdegate) told him that the substance of this Bill was that any person in a workhouse must—whether he liked it or not—receive the visits of a minister of religion. It was to-night admitted by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Villiers) that this was the substance of the Bill, and the right hon. Gentleman approved of it.

MR. REARDEN said, he thought it would be decidedly wrong to intrust power to the local vestries, which had proved—as in the case of the St. George's Vestry, of which he was a member—that it was a power capable of being abused in their hands. The powers conferred by the Bill ought to be in the hands of the Poor Law Board.

COLONEL HOGG said, this was not the first time that the hon. Member for Athlone (Mr. Rearden) had had the audacity to make a charge against St. George's Vestry, Hanover Square.

MR. REARDEN rose to Order, and called for the withdrawal of the word "audacity."

COLONEL HOGG said, he would use the word boldness instead.

MR. REARDEN said, that was equally offensive. He must call on the hon. Gentleman to apologize. ["Order!"]

THE CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member for Athlone had objected to a particular expression, which had been withdrawn.

COLONEL HOGG said, that, as far as his personal experience of the Vestry of St. George's, Hanover Square, enabled him to do so, he gave the most unqualified denial to the charges of proselytizing tendencies which had been made against that body. Any Roman Catholic child subject to their authority had ample opportunities of being visited by the minister of their own persuasion, and Roman Catholic adults were not only allowed to go out on Sundays, but also upon what the Roman Catholic Church considered to be holydays as well. He hoped that the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell) would be accepted.

MR. C. P. VILLIERS said, experience had shown, and that in the very case referred to, that it was ludicrous to suppose children of such a tender age could decide authoritatively as to their own religion. Before they were allowed to decide upon so serious a question there ought to be some inquiry into their mental condition, and as to whether anything in the nature of inducements or other influences of an organized system of proselytism had been brought to bear. He hoped the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell) would fix the age at fourteen, and allow somebody to examine the children.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, as amended, to add, at the end thereof, the words—

"And who shall be considered by the Poor Law Board to be competent to exercise a judgment upon the subject."—(*Mr. Villiers.*)

Mr. POWELL said, he would resist any such inquiry if the child's age was to be fixed at fourteen years. At the same time it would be for the Committee first to vote upon the age of fourteen, and after that to say whether or not they would have an inquiry.

Sir HENRY WINSTON-BARRON said, the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell) had given no reason whatever for objecting to an impartial inquiry by the Poor Law Board. *Sic volo, sic jubeo* was his tone. But were the Committee to be bound by it?

Mr. WHALLEY said, the Poor Law Board was not a competent or impartial tribunal. This was a Bill brought forward by the Poor Law Board in opposition to the wishes of every Board of Guardians in the country. Its object was to prevent as far as legislation could do it, the children of the poor from being brought up in what, at any rate, was a loyal religion, and to leave them by accident as it were, to become members of a religion which, as far as the teaching of its priesthood was concerned, was a religion of disloyalty and sedition, opposed to the historical spirit, and to every instinct of this country.

Sir HENRY WINSTON-BARRON: I call that an insult to my religion; and I call upon the hon. Member to apologize.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) has made use of some terms which are not very common in this House, and which are certainly calculated to give offence to a body of Members in this House.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he was always desirous of conforming to the opinion of the great majority of hon. Members, and although he felt that in doing so he was somewhat curtailing the liberty of speech to which private Members were entitled, he was willing to withdraw the statement, retaining, however, the opinion to which he had endeavoured to give expression. This Bill had been brought forward by the Poor Law Board at a time when their views upon religious matters possibly differed in some respects from those which they now entertained. But, whatever the origin of the clause, its operation was plain. In large towns it was invariably found that the children of the working classes had been surreptitiously baptized into the Roman Catholic faith. Through the willing agency of the public Departments, therefore, this Bill would enable the Roman Catholic priesthood to kidnap the children of humble Protestants and enrol them in their own communion. The House of Lords had condemned the Poor Law Board by striking out the clause.

Lord EDWARD HOWARD said, he hoped that children would not be allowed to change their religion without being examined by the Poor Law Board.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the question of religion did not arise on the present clause, but on Clause 12. The present clause merely said that in the case of children who were, say, Baptists or Roman Catholics, the nearest minister of their faith should be allowed to go in and instruct them. If, as suggested by the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell), a child, on being visited by a minister of religion, objected to being instructed by that particular individual, that was not a religious objection, but a personal objection, and it did not seem necessary that a child should have more liberty in choosing any particular person to instruct him in his own creed than in the selection of his schoolmaster.

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, he must repeat that the clause providing for the Creed Register related not merely to children, but to all inmates of workhouses, and a minister of religion, coming in and finding a person seventy years of age registered as belonging to his creed, would have the power of inflicting his visits on the pauper. He quite agreed that a child of immature years should not have the power of saying that he would not have a particular minister and would have another; but he objected in the strongest possible manner to the Poor Law Board arbitrating in such a matter. He remembered the Poor Law Board being very unpopular in this country, and he should see it so again on account, among many other reasons, of the passing of the present Bill.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he had hoped that they might have come to a compromise on this clause by means of the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Cambridge, the age of fourteen being inserted instead of twelve. Perhaps it might meet the objections of the noble Lord the Member for Arundel (Lord Edward Howard) if the age of sixteen were inserted.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he thought the age of twelve quite sufficient. He knew many children of that age who would puzzle some hon. Members in that House on religious subjects. In Scotland a person of fourteen years of age was able to make a will, or appoint a manager of his property. The Marquess of Bute at that age chose a person to manage his vast estates.

Lord EDWARD HOWARD said, he must remind the Committee that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell) applied to children in workhouse schools, and the children in the minority had no chance against the majority, but were jeered at and laughed out of their religion. It appeared from the third Report of the Poor Law Commission that a Guardian in one of the largest parishes of the metropolis stated, in answer to questions put to him, that the Guardians there never recognized any children as Roman Catholics. He really must say it was perverting common sense to assert that poor children of a tender age in workhouses made choice of a religion through conviction. He had great difficulty in assenting to the compromise which had been suggested.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, the noble Lord denied that children under fourteen years of age had any religion of their own. That, to a certain extent, was the doctrine of the law of England.

Lord EDWARD HOWARD begged the hon. Member's pardon. His observation on the subject had reference to children in the disadvantageous position of the children in our workhouses.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he (Mr. Newdegate) was referring to children in that disadvantageous position. The law of this country had been that if a child became destitute it should be educated in the religion of the State. A similar law existed in certain Roman Catholic countries still. He had been told of the case of a child in a public institution who objected to be visited by a priest. The father of the child was a Roman Catholic, and he was referred to, and he did not wish that the priest should continue his visits. The rev. gentleman insisted on doing so, but a lawyer explained to him that he had no right to adopt such a course. What was the remark of the priest? Why, that the father of the child must be a very bad Roman Catholic. From first to last, this Bill was a violation of the law of England. It was a departure from the modification of the original law of England that the Church of England, being tolerant, should be the instructress to all who did not profess a different religion. It would make the machinery of the Poor Law an instrument for enforcing intolerance. The Secretary of the Poor Law Board had gone the length of asking the leave of the noble Lord the Member for Arundel (Lord Edward Howard) to accept the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell). We were rapidly going from the tolerant system of the Law of England to the most intoterant system of religion ever known in the world.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he thought there was a concurrence of opinion that the clause in its present form should not stand part of the Bill. The question was as to the way in which it should be amended. He hoped the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell) would not substitute sixteen for fourteen years of age in the proposed Amendment.

Mr. SYNAN said, that the opinions with which the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) was imbued, were very erroneous one. When listening to the hon. Member he was reminded of a story he had heard of an Irish barrister. The learned gentleman had told an attorney that he must succeed in a certain action. The attorney was defeated, and meeting the barrister some time after, said to him, "I acted on your opinion and was cast." "Where did I give you that opinion?" said the barrister. "In Capel Street," was the reply. "Oh, then," rejoined the barrister, "never believe a Capel Street opinion again." He would recommend the hon. Member for North Warwickshire to remember the moral of that story. As to the proposition of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell), he contended that children of fourteen years old in workhouses were not competent to select their own creed.

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, that the gentlemen who called for an alteration in the existing law were in reality the persons who would give rise to a selection of creeds on the part of children in workhouses.

Mr. M. CHAMBERS said, he was disposed to vote in favour of the retention of the word "twelve." But he must observe that the Amendment to the clause was founded upon a mistake. It was supposed that the clause provided that a minister belonging to the creed of a child who was on the register of the workhouse as connected with that creed might insist upon instructing that child. Now, the clause merely provided that such minister "may, in accordance with the regulations of the Poor Law Board," visit and instruct such persons.

Mr. SYNAN proposed that the clause should be further amended by the addition to it of the words "and who shall be considered by the Poor Law Board to be competent to exercise a judgment on the subject," a proposal which was supported by Mr. Villiers.

Mr. POWELL said, he objected to the addition because the Amendment would then be applicable to the inmates of workhouses, however old they might be.

Mr. M'LAREN said, that if the Poor Law Board were to send down an inspector to make inquiry into each individual case and report thereupon, they might as well take away all rule and control from the local authorities.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he had had considerable experience in this matter, having for about eight years been a member of the Board of Supervision in Scotland. He had always stood up for the right of children to be educated in the religion of their parents, but nevertheless he should deprecate any addition to this clause, as it would, in his opinion, be for the interest of all parties that a fixed rule should be established.

Question put, "That those words be added to the said proposed Amendment, as amended."

The Committee *divided*: — Ayes 18; Noes 66: Majority 48.

Clause, as amended, *added* to the Bill.

Clause 11 (Where no Religious Service provided in the Workhouse, the Inmate may, on Sunday or other Sacred Day, go to his own proper Place of Worship).

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, he should not press the Amendment of which he had given Notice, as he had no objection to the clause as it now stood.

Clause *agreed to.*

Mr. T. Chambers

Clause 12 (No Child in the Workhouse or School visited by a Minister of its own Religion shall be required to attend any other Religious Services, unless, being above Twelve Years of Age, he shall desire to do so).

Mr. POWELL moved in page 6, line 5, before "such minister" to insert "the parent or surviving parent of such child or in the case of orphans or deserted children." His object was to preserve parental authority in the case of children who were inmates of a workhouse.

Lord EDWARD HOWARD said, he thought the parent was not always competent to form an opinion, and might, indeed, be an imbecile.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. WHALLEY said, that in order to make the clause conformable with Clause 10, he would beg to move the omission from the end of the clause of the words "and who shall be considered by the Poor Law Board to be competent to exercise a Judgment upon the Subject." The Board would judge by it sofficers, many of whom were Roman Catholics.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Poor Law Board to appoint Auditors).

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH proposed the insertion in line 35, after the word "do," of the words "and the provisions contained in the Poor Law Board Act, 1847, relative to the salaries of the persons therein mentioned shall apply to the salaries of the persons to be appointed as auditors by the Poor Law Board." Several Committees had reported in favour of that proposal.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the election of the auditors was now in the hands of the Guardians, and it was the accounts of the Guardians which had to be audited. It was obvious that the present state of things in that respect was anomalous, and exactly the same as if a Board of Directors were to appoint the auditors of their own expenditure.

Mr. NEATE said, he thought that the object should be to exclude central patronage while increasing central control. He would suggest that the Guardians should nominate three persons for the office of auditor, and that the Poor Law Board should appoint one of those three.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he would remind the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Candlish), who had given notice to move to leave out from line 30 to line 37 inclusive, that when the Guardians failed to appoint their own officers, the Poor Law Board, though they had no wish for the power, could make the appointments. The Committee of 1864, after going most fully into this matter, reported that the substitution of district auditors for auditors elected by the Guardians had led to greater uniformity of procedure, more vigilance, and more careful expenditure, and recommended that the auditors should be reduced in number and should devote their whole time to the public service. Previous Committees had taken the same view, and he hoped, therefore, that the clause would be agreed to.

MR. HURST said, he was quite satisfied with the explanation of the hon. Baronet (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), and hoped there would be no opposition to the clause.

MR. T. CHAMBERS said, he must contend that the ratepayers, who were those chiefly interested in checking lavish expenditure, should have the appointment of auditors.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 14 to 20, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 21 (Repeal of Penalties on Parish Officers supplying Goods in Unions).

MR. CANDLISH said, this clause proposed to repeal certain Acts which had been passed for the purpose of prohibiting parochial officers from purchasing goods for the relief of the poor from themselves. The overseers of the poor had to a certain extent the dispensation of relief, and therefore they should not have the power of purchasing from themselves the goods they had to dispense. He proposed to omit from the clause the words "and overseers of the poor."

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the proposed Amendment was unnecessary, because though the overseers had certain duties to discharge towards the poor they had nothing whatever to do with the control of the expenditure.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 22 and 23 *agreed to.*

Clause K (Interpretation of 25 & 26 *Vict.* c. 43, and 29 & 30 *Vict.* c. 113. s. 14, as to Child and Consent of Parents).

MR. T. CHAMBERS moved to omit the words "deserted child or." The Amendment would provide in effect that a deserted child should be treated as a child of the State and should be brought up as a Protestant.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that there were in the workhouses 1,000 Roman Catholic children who were brought up as Protestants because there was no one to demand that they should be brought up in their own creed.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA asked whether a child which had had the misfortune to lose its parents should be handed over to the tender mercies of those who wished to kidnap children for their own creed?

MR. C. P. VILLIERS said, that the Amendment would really reverse the policy which had been adopted for the last thirty years in this country. The law was that where a child's parent was notoriously of a certain religion the child should be brought up in that religion. That was Clause 19 in the Poor Law Amendment Act; but, in some cases, the operation of the law had been defeated by preventing the supply of the proper evidence of the parents' religion. In effect the result of the Amendment would be to bring up as Protestants the children of Catholics. [MR. KINNAIRD: Only where the child has been deserted, and the religion of the parent is not known.] But it was much easier to ascertain the religion of the parents of deserted children than any others. The witness by whom this was stated came from Birmingham, and was now employed in Marylebone. It appeared from his evidence that in the latter place deserted and orphan children were brought up in the religion of the parents, and that since this system was adopted better order had been kept in the House, there had been better conduct among the paupers, and the townspeople were satisfied. The Amendment proposed a refinement in intolerance which would carry us back thirty years, and it involved a principle which was quite new, that of punishing parents by choosing a religion for their children, and which might be applied to offences other than desertion.

MR. T. CHAMBERS said, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. C. P. Villiers) had come round to the view he (Mr. T. Chambers) had advanced at first, that the Bill was not necessary if the provisions of the present law were carried out.

Lord EDWARD HOWARD said, the Amendment proposed a different law for the poor from that applied to the rich. A child possessed of property would be brought under the cognizance of the Court of Chancery, which would ascertain the religion of the parents and take care that the child was brought up in it, but because children were helpless and friendless they were to be treated in a different manner. What he asked was that all children, proved to belong to Catholic parents, whether they had been deserted or were orphans should be brought up in their parents' religion.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, that the Amendment only affected "deserted" — not orphan—children, so that the appeal of the noble Lord was not in point. There was no illiberality in the State taking care of these deserted children—children picked out of the gutter—and in the State providing them with education. What was the meaning of "a deserted child?" It was a child not claimed by any one, and for whom there was no one willing to pay. All that was wanted was that it should not be assumed that such deserted children were Roman Catholics.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, it was proposed in the case of deserted children—on the ground that they had no person standing in a recognized relation to them, and that they were to be paid for by the State — that they should, therefore, be brought up in the religion of the State. But that was not the principle of the existing Poor Laws, which were conceived on the principle that children should be brought up in what was supposed to be their own religion — namely, that of their parents, provided it could be ascertained. Now, all that the clause would do in the case of deserted as well as in that of orphan children would be to enable the Poor Law Board not to act on the assumption that the children were of any particular faith, but to accept the evidence which a Creed Register might afford of such faith, and when that was ascertained the religion of the father was to rule the religion of the child.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, the Creed Register would not prove the religion of the parents, but only the opinion on the subject of the person who made the entry. The result would be that these deserted children would be put up to auction, and they all knew who would claim them. He maintained that when the parents were not forthcoming the children should be brought up in the religion of the State.

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS said, he would support the Amendment. This question of the removal of children would give rise to a great deal of squabbling.

Mr. SYNAN said, that in the majority of cases there would be no difficulty in ascertaining the religion of the parents of a deserted child.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he thought hon. Gentlemen were losing sight of the meaning of the clause. The gist of the alteration proposed was that the Poor Law Board, in the absence of a requisition from the parents or god-parents, might exercise the powers vested in them by the Poor Law Act, and, upon reasonable evidence of the religion of the parents, order deserted children to be sent to a denominational registered school where they would be brought up in their parents' religion.

Mr. AYTOUN said, he wanted to know what was the nature of the inquiry to be conducted by the Poor Law Board before taking such a step, and whether the evidence taken by the officials who made the inquiry was to be laid before the Guardians and the public? The opinion throughout the country would be that the religion to which the child would be assigned would depend very much upon the person to whom the inquiry would be committed. The public had very little faith in Boards for such purposes as these.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that the whole debate had shown that all the words of the clause after "these Acts" ought to be struck out, and therefore he should move that they should be struck out. They were asked to give the Poor Law Board the perfectly novel power of sending deserted children out of the workhouse to a denominational school. Upon what evidence was the Poor Law Board to judge of the creed to which the child should be consigned? The fact was that the Guardians had no right to part with the children in favour of any denomination whatever.

Amendment proposed, in line 17, to leave out from the word "Acts" to the end of the Clause."—(*Mr. Newdegate.*)

Mr. T. CHAMBERS said, he would withdraw his Amendment in favour of that of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate).

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, this was an objection against the existence of a Creed Register. There was no difficulty in the matter. It was the duty of the parochial officer to ascertain what was the religion of the parents.

Mr. RAMSAY said, the difficulty he felt was as to how they were to ascertain the religion of the parents when the deserted child was too young to give any information.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 56; Noes 13: Majority 43.

Clause *added* to the Bill.

Mr. CANDLISH moved a clause (Period for re-payment of Loans may be extended from twenty to thirty years). The object of it was to apportion the re-payment fairly between the present and future ratepayers.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he considered the clause unnecessary, as the present system worked perfectly well. Since the passing of the Poor Law Act a sum of £7,000,000 had been borrowed on a uniform plan, which it would not be well to interfere with.

Clause *negatived.*

Mr. READ moved a new clause (Payments for bastard children).

Clause *added* to the Bill.

Mr. CANDLISH said, in the absence of Mr. T. Potter, he would move a clause (Provision for poor deaf and dumb or blind children), empowering Guardians to send deaf and dumb children to uncertified institutions.

Clause *agreed to.*

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS moved the addition of a clause (Lands and buildings acquired and used under the Poor Law Acts exempted from increased assessment).

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that no such provision as that proposed by the hon. Member was called for except by one or two of the metropolitan unions. If it should be generally demanded there would be ample opportunity for considering it hereafter.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, he had given Notice of a clause of similar effect, though not going so far as that proposed by the hon. Member for Marylebone (Mr. Harvey Lewis). No injustice would be done to any locality by the adoption of the clause of which he had given notice. Its principle was that asylums, hospitals, and other buildings, and all land used or occupied therewith for the purposes of the Metropolis Poor Act, 1867, should be assessed for rates upon the annual value of the site, and any buildings on it at the time of the purchase.

Mr. H. E. SURTEES said, that the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill's) argument applied to a clause not before the Committee.

Clause *negatived.*

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR moved a clause (Any ratepayer shall, under proper regulations, have the right to be present at the meetings of Boards of Guardians).

Clause (Any ratepayer shall, under proper regulations, have the right to be present at the meetings of Boards of Guardians,)—(*Mr. Taylor,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he must oppose the clause. Reporters were present at the meetings of all Boards of Guardians of importance, and that ought to be sufficient for the ratepayers.

Question put, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 5; Noes 32: Majority 27.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments, and an amended Title; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

WEST INDIES BILL—[Bill 124.]

(*Mr. Adderley, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, that with the view of protecting a vested interest which, in his opinion, ought to be respected by the Legislature, he would beg to move to leave out—

"As such coadjutor, continue to act in the same manner as at present as Archdeacon of Middlesex," and insert "and exercises episcopal functions therein, continue to receive out of the Consolidated Fund the annual payment of two thousand pounds, which has hitherto been made to him in part by the Bishop of Jamaica out of the stipend of three thousand pounds paid to the said Bishop from the Consolidated Fund, under the before-recited Acts, and in part out of the stipend appropriated to his Archdeaconry of Middlesex out of the Consolidated Fund, under the said Acts; Provided, That during his receipt of such annual payment no payment shall be made to him out of the Consolidated Fund in respect of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex."

If the coadjutor Bishop of Kingston had not technically a vested interest, he had a strong moral claim.

The said Amendment being read a second time; Amendment proposed,

To leave out the words "as such coadjutor, continue to act in the same manner as at present as Archdeacon of Middlesex," in order to insert the words "and exercises episcopal functions therein, continue to receive out of the Consolidated Fund the annual payment of two thousand pounds which has been hitherto made to him in part by the Bishop of Jamaica out of the stipend of three thousand pounds paid to the said Bishop from the Consolidated Fund under the before recited Acts, and in part out of the stipend appropriated to his Archdeaconry of Middlesex out of the Consolidated Fund, under the said Acts: Provided, That during his receipt of such annual payment no payment shall be made to him out of the Consolidated Fund in respect of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex,"—(*Mr. Russell Gurney,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of The Lords' Amendment."

Mr. CARDWELL said, he thought the claim rested neither on a technical nor a moral ground, and that the precedent which his right hon. Friend's Amendment would establish might be productive of great inconvenience hereafter. The proposal was really one for appointing a new Bishop of Jamaica after the next avoidance of the see.

Mr. BOUVERIE said, he would point out that, as a new charge would be imposed on the Consolidated Fund, the matter could not be taken into consideration except under a Resolution of the House.

Mr. ADDERLEY said, the Government would accede to the proposal, on the ground that it was expedient to deal with such a claim in a wide and generous, and not in a niggardly, spirit. The clause was drawn by the late Lord Cranworth. He thought there was a fair moral claim; and that the Bishop of Kingston would be hardly dealt with if the House did not view the matter in a liberal spirit.

Mr. NEATE said, he thought there was much to be said in favour of the proposition of the right hon. and learned Recorder.

Mr. LOWE said, it appeared that a coadjutor Bishop had been appointed to assist the Bishop. The office of the coadjutor was correlative with that of the Bishop, and could not extend beyond it. When the present Bishop died the office of his coadjutor could not continue to exist. The House were asked to give the coadjutor, not in virtue of an office which he held now, but in virtue of an office which he would hold after the death of the Bishop of Jamaica, a sum of £1,600 out of the Consolidated Fund. He held with his right hon. Friend the Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Bouverie) that this could not now be done.

Mr. M'LAREN said, that the Bishop of Kingston had at present a life-interest in the life of the Bishop of Jamaica, and it was now proposed to give him a life-interest in two lives. The difference was just a grant from the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. ADDERLEY said, that no new charge on the Consolidated Fund would be created by the adoption of the proposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: The whole question seems to be whether this is a new charge on the Consolidated Fund, or a reservation from the £20,000 supposed to be given up. The Bill proposes to relieve the Consolidated Fund from the payment of £20,000, while if the Amendment be passed it would only be relieved of £18,000. I think it is a matter which is open to the decision of the House.

Mr. POWELL said, that as the subject appeared to be taking wider range, he would move the adjournment of the debate.

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

PRISONS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of The Earl of Mayo, Bill to make further and better provision for the custody of Prisoners, and to amend the Law relating to Prisons, in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by The Earl of Mayo, and Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 256.]

House adjourned at a quarter before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 28, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Colonial Governors Pensions Act Amendment* (239).

Committee—Inland Revenue* (279); Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (287); Danube Works Loan* (272); Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London.* (278).

Report—Inland Revenue* (279); Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections (287); Danube Works Loan* (272); Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London,* (278).

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Colonial Shipping* (274); Turnpike Acts Continuance* (253); Electric Telegraphs (282); Expiring Laws Continuance* (280); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4)* (273); Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation* (266); Registration (Ireland) (281), and *passed.*

ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.

(*The Lord Privy Seal.*)

(NO. 287.) COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

LORD LYVEDEN said, that the question dealt with by this Bill was one of such importance that, notwithstanding the late period of the Session at which it had come up to their Lordships, he wished to trespass upon their attention for a few minutes while he expressed his opinion upon it. He thought that the transfer of the jurisdiction of the House of Commons in deciding upon election cases to the Judges was a very serious matter, and ought not to have been done without the gravest consideration. If, indeed, he could believe that the transfer would lead to the repression of bribery at elections, he should be inclined to waive his objections; but, he must say, he did not anticipate that such would be the result. The transfer of jurisdiction he regarded as in itself an evil, and it was certainly a great change in our Constitution; for although the Grenville Act and subsequent Acts had transferred the jurisdiction from the whole body of the House to five Members of it, the power had virtually rested, up to the present moment, with the House of Commons. But it was now, for the first time, to be taken away altogether. It seemed to him a grave constitutional question, whether the House of Commons should part with this tribunal. Another evil of the transfer was that there would not be henceforth the same opportunity for that exercise of business habits which made the House of Commons something more than a mere debating society. If both Election Petitions and Private Bill legislation were taken away from them, the functions of Members of the House of Commons would be materially curtailed. This would not have mattered so much, if the House of Commons had retained ultimate decision over these matters; but their whole powers were transferred to the Judges, and nothing kept back. He did not believe the Bill now under discussion would be a remedy for electoral corruption, for the evil, he feared, was too deep-seated to be removed by this measure. He was sorry, too, to find that a great deficiency of the present system had not been supplied—he referred to the want of motive power. Only electors would be able to initiate proceedings, and the consequence would be that in the very boroughs where there had been the greatest corruption, and where both parties had been engaged in and had profited by it, no Petitions would be presented. It was notorious that the worst cases were those in which, both parties being afraid of the consequences, no Petitions were presented. Now what was wanted was that any persons, whether electors or not, should be competent to bring forward cases, or else that a public prosecutor should be appointed. The matter ought not to be left to the electors, because the most flagrant cases would then be hushed up. The consequence would be that the Bill would altogether fail to put an end to bribery and corruption. Another point deserving of consideration was that legislation was of little use, unless it was supported by public opinion, which was not the fact in the present case. What instance was there of a man engaged in bribery having been on that account discredited in society, or having any moral stigma attached to him? So far from this, he had known cases of men who had been guilty of bribery becoming Cabinet Ministers, and filling the highest offices in the State. Without a healthy public opinion the provisions of this Bill would be of little effect. He believed, indeed, that election agents throughout the country were putting their heads together, and were already coming to the conclusion that corrupt practices would go on much as before, notwithstanding the coming down of a Judge to institute an inquiry on the spot. He was sorry that some provisions which would have been very beneficial had been rejected by the House of Commons.

One of these was that election expenses, or at least a moiety of them, should be charged on the rates. That was an excellent proposition, and he regretted that after having been inserted in the Bill it was ultimately struck out. He would say nothing of what passed in the other House on the subject, as he wished to avoid anything offensive, but he much regretted the absence of that clause. He also regretted that an end had not been put to canvassing agents, and, indeed, to canvassing altogether, for if bribery was to be put down some strong step of this kind must be taken. He approved the clause disqualifying any person who had been guilty of bribery from sitting in Parliament for seven years. He was not so sure, however, that the disqualification should be extended to disqualification for the magistracy, and unless there was to be an Address to the Crown to remove persons guilty of bribery from the commission of the peace he did not see how this provision was to operate. A proposal had been brought forward that Members should make a declaration that they had not been guilty of corrupt practices; but under the circumstances he was glad that it had been rejected. Its operation would probably have been just as nugatory as the property qualification used to be, for it was notorious that Members possessed of some pretended qualification did not scruple to go up to the table of the House of Commons and make the declaration. The declaration against bribery might in the same way have become a mere farce, and he was therefore glad that it had been rejected; but the way in which it was generally recoiled from was a proof that no public opinion existed which would back legislation, and so put an end to bribery. Another question was that of travelling expenses. There was no more frequent form of bribery than the paying voters a larger sum than they had actually disbursed; yet the Bill contained nothing to check this. The municipal Elections were another source of bribery. When the Municipal Reform Act was passed apprehensions were expressed on this point, and it was notorious that bribery prevailed at these elections. This, he feared, would continue to be the case; and indeed bribery might be practised at municipal Elections with a view to influencing Parliamentary Elections. He regretted, therefore, that the Bill did not attempt to deal with the former. There was one remedy for bribery, the ballot; but that was so objectionable in other respects that he, for one, could not support it. At the same time he believed it to be the only effectual check. Again, in this Bill there was a want of definitions. In the 1st clause, indeed, there was a definition of "corrupt practices;" and what were they? They were bribery, treating, and undue influence. In an after-part of the Bill they were told that a Commission was to be issued to inquire into corrupt practices. But was a Commission to be issued to inquire into treating, and, if so, what was the amount of treating to be inquired into? Again, what was undue influence? Would anyone give him a definition of it? He could not conceive anything more difficult. Then there was bribery by custom, as, for instance, if a candidate employed tradesmen in a town—if he employed the butcher, the shoemaker, and the grocer; but, in that case, how could the Bill reach him? And yet bribery in that shape was quite as foul as in any other. He felt that bribery could only be put an end to by creating a public opinion against it; but it might be very much checked in the way he had indicated. He believed that candidates were more in fault than any other persons, and that if they chose really to set their faces against bribery they might do much to put an end to it. He was perfectly willing to admit that it did Her Majesty's Government great credit to have made this attempt to put down bribery, and he had not the slightest intention of opposing the Bill. But he thought that some measure was wanting to bring this offence before the Judges otherwise than through the electors, who were persons very much interested, and who would be under the apprehension of being disfranchised themselves or getting their borough disfranchised. The consequence would be that many cases of bribery most gross and lamentable would never come under the cognizance of the Judges; and in this way the Act would become inoperative.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY thought that the conclusion which would naturally be drawn from the noble Lord's speech was that he would vote against the Bill, because he considered that no legislation whatever would be of any use—he seemed to consider that the vices of human nature were so inherent and impossible to correct that all attempts to legislate on the subject would be thrown away. That might be the case; but at all events Her Majesty's Government had thought it their duty to try a new course of legislation with regard to bribery when all other courses had failed. As to the privileges of the House of Commons, there could be no doubt that House had fully considered the matter during the period—some months—while the matter was before them. The noble Lord had said that he had no hope from the proposed tribunal, the highest in this or perhaps in any other country, the most respectable, and the most incorruptible. He differed entirely from the noble Lord. Let their Lordships only consider what was the state of opinion out-of-doors about the Committees of the House of Commons in trying Election Petitions. What was the first question asked when a man had got a Committee to try his Petition? It was this — "How is the Committee formed? Is it a good one or a bad one?" Questions of that kind were debated in the most open manner; and what did all that show? Not that the Members of the House of Commons were not capable of giving the best decision in the case, but that public opinion did not respect the tribunal and used to speak of the Committees in the offensive manner he had described. Assuredly, then, it was time to send Election Petitions to be tried before a tribunal which could not possibly be suspected. The noble Lord had said that more ought to be done with a view to encourage the presentation of Petitions. Now he very much doubted the necessity of such a course. By the new Reform Bill the number of electors would be very much multiplied; and almost every man in a borough — at all events almost every man of respectability—and every householder would be an elector, and everyone would have it in his power, on certain conditions, to challenge the election. He thought it very likely that the beaten party would have among its members plenty of persons with zeal enough to challenge the election when needful without the intervention of a public prosecutor. Then the noble Lord had said something about the ballot—that, though he would not vote for it himself, it would be a security against corruption. He differed altogether from the noble Lord. Their Lordships must have heard how the ballot was managed in other countries, how agents were engaged, how they organized bodies of voters, and told them that if Mr. So-and-So came in they would have so much to be divided among them—the candidate would make a conditional promise to the agent and the agent to the voter. This was only a temporary measure; it was only to be passed practically for four years; their Lordships would have an opportunity of seeing how it would work, and of judging of the results.

House in Committee accordingly.

Clauses 1 to 23, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 24 (Shorthand Writer to attend Trial of Election Petitions).

LORD ROMILLY said, this clause required that the proceedings of these election trials should be taken down by the Shorthand Writers of the House of Commons. He thought that it had better be left to the shorthand writers who usually attended the Courts; but he would not press the Amendments of which he had given notice.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he thought his noble and learned Friend had exercised a wise discretion in withdrawing his Amendment. Admitting the respectability and talent of many of the shorthand writers who had signed the petition, he thought that, even if this were a permanent and not merely a temporary measure, there would be several things to be considered before the House would accede to the prayer of their petition. For instance, on the ground of economy alone, it was certainly a very grave question whether it would be wise to do anything which might have the effect of crippling the existing staff of shorthand writers, under the management of the Messrs. Gurney, who were found to perform the duties satisfactorily. But whether wise or unwise in that point of view—and he (the Lord Chancellor) thought it would be unwise—there could be no doubt that any alteration of this clause would come with a very bad grace from their Lordships. The House of Commons was, by this Bill, giving up its jurisdiction over the trial of Election Petitions—a jurisdiction which it had hitherto clung to with great jealousy—and in doing so it had expressed the wish that the record of the proceedings of the new tribunals should be taken down in shorthand by certain officers, of whose efficient discharge of similar duties it had had experience, and in whom it placed entire confidence. This was, he was sure, not a matter in which their Lordships would for a moment think of interfering with the Bill as it had passed the other House.

Clause *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; Amendments made; and Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

ELECTRIC TELEGRAPHS BILL.

(The Duke of Montrose.)

(NO. 282.) THIRD READING.

THE DUKE OF MONTROSE, in moving that the Bill be now read the third time, said, that in reference to what had been said on a previous occasion with respect to the expediency of giving powers to make use of the railway wires in certain cases, he desired to explain that the Bill contained a clause empowering the Postmaster General to require the railways to carry on through their wires any business which might be necessary for the convenience of the public. The railway companies wished to have independent wires for their own purposes, but they were willing to act for the Post Office in cases where there might not happen to be a convenient telegraph office or local post office.

Bill read 3ª.

LORD REDESDALE said, he had an Amendment to move in that part of the Bill which provided for the distribution of money by the directors of the telegraph companies in recognition of special services. This clause put into the hands of directors and officers the power of voting money to themselves without much control, and he thought it would be only reasonable that the arbitrator named in the Bill should determine whether the sum was reasonable or not. He, therefore, moved to insert the words, "any sums so voted having been approved of as fair by the arbitrator hereinafter named."

THE DUKE OF MONTROSE said, he could not agree to the Amendment, because, if it were adopted, the Bill must go back to the Commons, and delay would thus be occasioned. The fact was that in the case for which the noble Lord wished to provide the shareholders must take care of themselves; and he should hope that, after the notice taken of the subject by the noble Lord, shareholders would be sufficiently alive to prevent any job of that sort. The arbitrator was really not the proper person to settle such a point as this; he was merely to fix the sum to be paid by the Government to these companies, and was not to decide between the directors and the shareholders.

Amendment *negatived.*

Bill *passed.*

BABY FARMING.—QUESTION.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, he desired to ask the Lord President of the Council a Question on a subject which had obtained much notoriety, in a great measure through the efforts of *The British Medical Journal*, the conductors of which had incurred considerable trouble and expense in searching into this abominable system. The system might be divided into two parts. One, and a comparatively legitimate part, was the baby nursing where infants were placed out to nurse by persons who really looked after them to some extent; the other part was the baby farming, where infants were put out for the sole purpose of being got rid of altogether, or of never being heard of again by the parents. To the class of persons who made this a trade belonged Mrs. Winsor, who escaped from punishment by a strange technicality in the law; and there was every reason to believe that these Mrs. Winsors were numerous, and were carrying on a large trade in many parts of the kingdom. Such a state of things had excited, very naturally, much terror. What, it was asked, could be the state of our laws when they were found so ineffectual as to be totally unable to put down such practices? On the other hand there were persons who relied on the known inefficiency of the law to enter on a career of crime, and the knowledge that this crime existed and was not suppressed produced the worst effect, for it familiarized the public in the most frightful manner with the perpetration of crime, and taught them that it was not to be reached by the law. Under these circumstances he begged to ask the Lord President of the Council, Whether the attention of the Government has been directed to the System of Baby Farming; and, if so, whether they intend to institute any Inquiry into the subject?

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, that owing to the Notice of this Question which had been given by his noble Friend, he had caused some inquiries to be made into the subject. Unfortunately it was too true that a system of what was called baby farming existed, under which the grossest crimes might be committed. His noble Friend had asked whether the Government intended to institute any inquiry into the subject? but probably the object which his noble Friend had in view might be somewhat defeated if the Government were to institute such an inquiry. He believed that the facts were not such as to demand inquiry. The system was well known. Persons who had an unnatural desire to get rid of their children put them out to nurse in the charge of those who, by neglect or other methods with which they were familiar, probably brought about the deaths of these poor infants. It was intolerable that such acts as these should be committed in a civilized country, and yet escape without punishment by the law. But the matter was rather one of police than of sanitary investigation. Measures might be adopted for putting an end to so inhuman a practice, either by registering the houses of persons taking these children to nurse, or by a system of licensing combined with periodical inspection by properly qualified officers. He was glad the noble Earl had asked the Question, because this was a subject of great importance. Government would turn their attention to it during the Recess, and he hoped they would be able to discover means which, embodied in a Bill, would obviate the dangerous abuses to which attention had been directed.

REGISTRATION (IRELAND) BILL.

(The Lord Privy Seal.)

(NO. 281.) THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

LORD STRATHNAIRN: With a considerable experience of Ireland, my Lords, and as commanding the troops in that country, I cannot refrain from expressing my great regret that the Registration Bill should have come up without the salutary measure of the increase of polling-places. The distance and scarcity of polling-places not only facilitate, but invite attack on voters, and render necessary the employment of troops at elections. The bad effects of troops being thus employed are so universally recognized and have been so often brought before your Lordships that I shall not dilate on the matter. The distance and scarcity of polling-places cause great concentration of voters and the consequent concentration of rioters, and necessitate those long journeys by road through a highly-excited country which are so dangerous to voters. The increase and proper distribution, my Lords, of polling-places obviate these disadvantages, enable electors to vote in comparative security, and render unnecessary the general employment of troops at elections. If the increase of polling-places in Ireland was at all times called for, they are doubly so since, as was seen at the Tipperary and Waterford elections, the elements of disorder and intimidation have been organized by men who have learnt tactics in the American war. For example, barricades, strongly constructed with trunks of trees and large stones, are drawn across the road in ground which enables assailants, under cover, to attack the escorts on both flanks with a cross-fire of stones. At one place in Waterford one of these barricades was drawn across a sunken road; on the almost precipitous banks looking into it were stationed men ready to roll down rocks and stones on the voters as they passed. Luckily, the voters took another road. If they had not, your Lordships can judge how many good farmers and good soldiers would have been killed or cruelly maimed. At another place four-cross-roads was selected as the place of attack, as favouring the concentration of rioters from different quarters. They arrived at the rendezvous with a punctuality which would have done credit to the Quarter Master General's Department. They were placed in two lines—one attacking, one in reserve; both under cover. All the gaps leading from the roads into the fields had been solidly built up to prevent cavalry clearing rioters out of the fields; and piles of large angular stones called "smashers" had been carefully stored up in rows on each side of the roads. A man performing the duties of Staff officer rode continually during the collision which ensued with orders from the first to the second line. The results of these organized attacks on voters and their escorts were in the Waterford election thirty-six casualties among the military. Some of them were serious. One, a corporal of the Carbineers, a very good man, hovered between life and death from concussion of the brain by a "smasher." Another, a captain of the 75th, had his eye cut out by a stone. Under these circumstances, and as recent political events, into which I will not enter, render it more than probable that the coming elections will be unusually stormy, I venture to ask my noble Friend who has charge of the Bill whether it would not be possible, even now at the eleventh hour, to improve the old law in a way which would afford some protection to voters, and obviate the unsparing employment of troops at elections. For I am sure, my Lords, that you will agree with me that the present condition of elections in Ireland is very unsatisfactory, and discreditable to humanity, good and civilized government, and the freedom and independence of election. I beg to say, my Lords, that I have made these observations, not under the influence of any party feeling whatever, but solely from a sense of professional feeling.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: Certainly, no authority on this subject can be higher than that of the noble and gallant Lord. I regret extremely it is now too late to do what he wishes to do—namely, to increase the number of polling-places in Ireland by an Act of Parliament. I must inform my noble Friend that the Government had taken measures for increasing their number in the counties, and that clauses with that object were prepared and inserted in the Registration Bill for Ireland when it was presented to the House of Commons. I regret still more to say that they met with so factious, so unbending, so determined, and what, looking to the consequences that may follow, I may call so wicked an opposition, that the Government were obliged to withdraw them; that opposition coming from those who two years ago were advocates for an increased number of polling-places. It is a disagreeable thing to attribute motives to anybody at any time; but, looking at the palpable advantage on the score of convenience of increasing the number of polling-places in a country where, in some cases, they are thirty and thirty-five miles apart, and seeing the palpable advantage to humanity and peace, and the general good of society in those districts, of increasing the number of polling-places, it is almost impossible not to impute motives as actuating the violent manner in which the Government were opposed on this particular point, There can be no doubt that an increase of polling-places in Ireland would not only contribute to the peace and tranquillity of the elections, but would render it unnecessary to employ a great number of the troops that are employed to maintain order. That of itself would be of a great advantage. Putting on one side the question of fairness and justice with respect to the elections in the counties, the very fact that one-half the number of troops would be required at the elections ought to have been the strongest inducement to any Irishman to do as much as possible to increase the number of polling-places. It is now too late to consider the question. The Government having been baffled in the manner I have described, I have only to say I trust the good sense of the people of Ireland and the courage of the electors themselves will contribute to maintain peace and order, and, although I sincerely trust that nothing of the sort will be necessary, Her Majesty's Government will feel it to be their duty to maintain order if it is broken, and I think the maintenance of that order cannot be in better hands than that of my noble and gallant Friend.

LORD DENMAN thought it was due to Ireland that something of a conciliatory nature should be said before the close of the Session, and that every facility should be given for electors to register their votes, and it was to be lamented that the efforts of the Government had not proved successful in this respect. One of his first reasons for joining the party of the noble Earl late at the head of the Government, as he stated to him by letter, before his seeming likely to be again in Office (in January, 1858), was his knowledge of the forbearing and generous conduct at the time of the potato famine towards his tenants in Ireland by remitting their rents when they had not the means of paying them, and by forgiving them the severance of crops, and by paying their passage to a country where they might better their condition. He could not imagine how bitterness amongst such emigrants could be entertained. He had the honour of holding a name which of itself promised justice to Ireland; and acting on the conviction that Fenianism was not general, and that antipathy to England was not founded on the question of religion, he had called the attention of Her Majesty's Government to an old historical document, which showed that in 1641 there was an unreasonable desire, that—

> "Such of the English as could not prescribe a settlement in this Kingdom (Ireland) for 200 years are to be cut off, notwithstanding they be of the Romish Sect; and, what exceeds all, not an English beast, nor any of that breed, must be left in the Kingdom."—[*Somer's Tracts*, vol. 5, p. 578.]

This unreasonable prejudice, then as now, had no foundation; and as the prerogative of mercy had been extended at the last moment, he could not but hope that his intercession in May of last year had helped to turn the balance in favour of the convicts whose case just before had seemed hopeless; and, as regarded the passing of abstract Resolutions with reference to the Irish Church they were likely to prove as abortive as the Appropriation Clause of 1835, and would do no more to advance a settlement in Ireland than any vague declamation in Hyde Park could have advanced the cause of Reform.

Bill read 3ª; Amendments made; Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
before Four o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 28, 1868.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee* — District Church Tithes Act Amendment [246].
Report—District Church Tithes Act Amendment [246].
Considered as amended — Poor Relief [186]; District Church Tithes Act Amendment [246].
Third Reading — Poor Relief [186]; District Church Tithes Act Amendment [246], and *passed*.

The House met at Two of the clock.

UNITED STATES—LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF PHILADELPHIA.—QUESTION.

MR. BENTINCK said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he will lay upon the Table the Correspondence relative to the recent restoration of certain State Papers to the British Government by the Library Committee of Philadelphia, in the United States of America, and whether any and what steps have been taken by Her Majesty's Government to mark their sense of the liberality of the Library Committee?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, he would be very happy to lay upon the table the Correspondence to which the hon. Member had alluded. A set, as far as published, of the Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the Calendars of State Papers, with fac-similes in photozincography of the Domesday Book and other national manuscripts, being in all 156 volumes, uniformly bound, was sent to the Philadelphia Library Committee by the Lords of the Treasury in grateful acknowledgment of the honourable and disinterested feelings which prompted their gift. The Directors have returned thanks to Her Majesty's Government for this munificent donation.

MR. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, If he will lay upon the Table any official acknowledgment of "the discernment and judicious course of action" whereby, as stated by the Master of the Rolls, five valuable volumes of original State Papers, *tempore* James I., were recovered by Mr. Hepworth Dixon for the benefit of the nation?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he had inquired into the subject, but could not find that there had been any Correspondence or communication between Mr. Hepworth Dixon and the Lords of the Treasury with reference to this matter. The remark of the hon. Member was correct that the Master of the Rolls in his published Report had stated that it was entirely owing to the zealous activity of Mr. Hepworth Dixon that these valuable muniments had been restored to the British nation.

ARMY—WIMBLEDON MEETING.

QUESTION.

MR. BAZLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether Corporal Peake, who won the Prize at Wimbledon, but of which he is reported to have been deprived, will be otherwise rewarded; and in the event of a non-regulation wad having been used and contributed to his success, whether that wad will be introduced into the Service?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, he was unable to answer the Question of the hon. Member. The shooting for the prizes at Wimbledon was carried on under the management of the National Rifle Association, which was a private society, and not in any way connected with the War Office, and therefore he had no official knowledge of what had occurred on the occasion referred to by the hon. Member.

ARMY—MARCH OF TROOPS FROM ALDERSHOT TO SANDHURST.

OBSERVATIONS.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he must request permission to answer a Question which had been put to him yesterday by the hon. Member for Nottingham (Mr. Osborne), which he was then unable to answer from want of information on the subject. The hon. Member asked him whether it was true that during the march of a flying squadron from Aldershot nine men had been attacked by sunstroke, and upwards of eighty-seven men sent to the hospital in consequence of sickness caused by the intensity of the heat? He had informed the hon. Member yesterday that he had at that time received no information upon the subject, but that he would make it his duty to ascertain what the real facts of the case were. He had that morning received a letter from Sir James Yorke Scarlett, Commander-in-Chief at Aldershot, in which that gallant officer stated his great regret that such exaggerated statements should have found their way into the public newspapers. He held in his hand a telegram which had been received from Aldershot yesterday evening, and sent by Sir James Yorke Scarlett, which stated that during the three days that the flying squadron was on the march only three men were sent into the hospital, that no cases of sunstroke had occurred, and that there was only one slight surgical case. It would be recollected that the heat on the first day of the march was very great, but he was happy to say that all the cases of sickness were of a most trifling character.

Mr. NEATE said, he wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman had received information that on a late occasion, when the Household Brigade was inspected at Wormwood Scrubs, six men had to be carried off the ground and eight others were sent to the hospital?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had received no information upon the subject of the hon. Member's Question. He would make inquiry into the matter, and he trusted that the statement would prove equally unfounded with that to which he had just referred.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILL—[Bill 135.]

(*Mr. Walpole, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy.*)

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Mr. WALPOLE said, the Amendments introduced in the House of Lords into this Bill were four in number. By the first of those Amendments the time allowed to the Governing Bodies of the Public Schools as constituted by the Bill for exercising their power of proposing new Governing Bodies was extended from the 1st of January, 1869, to the 1st of May in that year, provision being made for a month's further extension by an Order in Council. To this Amendment he had no objection to offer. The second Amendment empowered the Governing Bodies to found exhibitions to be endowed out of the property of the Schools. To this also he had no objection to offer. The third Amendment, of which he also approved, referred to Westminster School. The House would remember that originally a sum of not less than £3,500, and not more than £4,000, was to be given by the Chapter for the purposes of the School, and certain buildings were to be assigned for its benefit. The Lords had, with the full concurrence of the Chapter and the governing body of the School, altered that provision, in order to make it more effectual. The School might now receive a sum of not less than £4,000, and the difference between the £3,500 and the £4,000 would be capitalized for the benefit of the school during the life-interest of certain persons who have houses to be assigned to the School. The fourth and last of the Amendments altered the number of the Special Commissioners from seven to nine, by adding to the names already agreed upon those of Canon Blakesley and Sir Roundell Palmer. There could be no difference of opinion with respect to the eminent fitness of these two gentlemen for the office; but he might express his conviction that nine was too large a working number; and that, by the addition, the balance of the Commission, both political and professional, would be very materially disturbed. He should move, therefore, that the Lords' Amendments be agreed to, with this exception; and that the fourth Amendment be disagreed to.

Mr. AYRTON said, he hoped the Government would adhere to the Bill, as far as regarded the number of the Special Commissioners, as it was sent up by them to the House of Lords. He thought that course would be more likely to give general satisfaction.

Amendments *agreed to,* as far as the Amendment in page 9, line 4.

Page 9, line 10, the next Amendment, read a second time.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE admitted that if it had been desirable to increase the number of the Special Commissioners the names added by the House of Lords would deserve very respectful consideration. But it was from the first thought desirable to limit the Commission to seven Members; and that proposition, after being carefully considered by the Government, had been accepted by the House, and he thought it would be undesirable to disturb it, even by adding to the Commission two such distinguished names as those which had been proposed. He therefore thought they had better adhere to the arrangement made by the Select Committee, and in that view his Colleagues agreed. He moved that the House should disagree with the Lords' Amendment, which proposed to add to the Commission.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

MR. BOUVERIE said, he did not agree with the right hon. Baronet (Sir Stafford Northcote). It must have been a strong sentiment which had influenced the other House in the matter. He could not believe that the two additional Members added to the Commission by the House of Lords would render the number of Commissioners excessive; and the two names which had been chosen were those of men of distinguished eminence. Probably among the whole of the graduates of Cambridge University there was not one more thoroughly qualified to deal with questions of the nature referred to the Commission than Canon Blakesley, or who by his attainments occupied a more conspicuous position in the world of science. It would, he believed, be a serious loss to the public service, and a great disadvantage to the Public Schools themselves, if they had not upon the Commission the benefit of Canon Blakesley's services. The reason why his name, which had been originally on the list, was struck off, was because St. Paul's School, of which he was an almoner, having been exempted from the operation of the Commission, it was supposed that his name, as representing the School, ought no longer to be retained. That, however, was a great mistake, for it was not in any such representative capacity that he had been originally chosen; and the House of Lords, by a great majority, restored the name, in conjunction with that of the hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer). Having himself been first to a Public School and afterwards to Cambridge, he was in a position to speak confidently as to the reputation of Canon Blakesley, and the esteem in which his attainments were held. He (Mr. Bouverie) should divide the House upon the Motion.

MR. POWELL, as a Member of the Select Committee, denied that Canon Blakesley's name had been omitted because St. Paul's School had first been removed from the list. There were other considerations, by no means disrespectful to Canon Blakesley, but arising from the desire to have a well-balanced Commission, which should fairly represent the different views entertained with reference to education, without giving a preponderance to any. He was quite certain that, as at present constituted, advanced views would have great power in the Commission.

MR. NEWDEGATE, as an Oxford man, thought that the addition of the name of the hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) to the Commission would give increased confidence in the operation of that body to those who were connected with the University of Oxford and to many Members of this House. He therefore trusted that Her Majesty's Government would not persevere in their opposition to the Amendment. That opposition had the appearance of a party opposition, and there was no reason whatever for differing from the House of Lords in the matter. He (Mr. Newdegate) remembered the distinguished part which the hon. and learned Member for Richmond took in the discussions on the Oxford University Bill, and the great majority of Oxford men felt very grateful to him for the part he took upon that discussion. They found in the hon. and learned Member a person imbued with the spirit of industry, and in every way competent by attainments and ability to deal with the subject of the regulation of the University to which he belonged. As a man who had been to these Public Schools, and as connected with the Governing Body of one of them, he (Mr. Newdegate) most emphatically asserted that there would be greater confidence placed in the constitution of the Commission, and that its operations would carry greater weight if the name of the hon. and learned Member for Richmond was, according to the recommendation of the House of Lords, retained on the Commission. Although the Commission was, of course, nominated by the Government, it was to be a Parliamentary Commission with enormous powers conferred upon it by Parliament. Now, Parliament consisted of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords, and he believed that if the House of Lords exercised their undoubted privilege of suggesting two additional men to whom individually no possible objection could be taken, it would be a graceless act for this House to object to that addition. The hon. and learned Member for Richmond was eminently qualified for the work, and he stood as high among Members of this House as he stood in the profession to which he was so distinguished an ornament.

Mr. DENMAN said, he thought it only reasonable that in this particular instance the House of Lords should have a voice. They had treated with the greatest tenderness the recommendations of the House of Commons; they had not displaced a single one of the seven names which were inserted, but had added the names of two other extremely eminent men, which they felt would add weight to the Commission. A Commission of nine members would only differ from a Commission of seven in the greater knowledge, experience, and inquiring power which it would possess. It would be a most ungracious act to press for the omission of these names. Canon Blakesley, whom he had known for a great many years, was one of the most able and universally well-informed of all the tutors at Trinity College, Cambridge, and so scrupulous was he in his desire to act impartially as a Commissioner that during the two years in which he had now been designated as a Commissioner, he had purposely abstained from taking an active part in the discussion of educational subjects in public, which he would otherwise have been anxious to do. The hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) was also admirably qualified for being placed upon the Commission.

Mr. NEATE also thought the addition of the name of the hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) would be very desirable, as his legal authority would add great weight to the Commission, while his long experience as Attorney General would enable him to moderate between the extreme elements upon the Commission.

Colonel SYKES said, that if the Commission was now a well-balanced one it would not be advisable to interfere with it by the addition of names, however distinguished, if the effect of so doing would be to destroy the balance of opinion. He should vote with the Secretary of State for India.

Mr. Newdegate

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 28; Noes 18: Majority 10.

Other Amendments *disagreed to.*

Subsequent Amendments *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:"—Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Walpole, Lord Robert Montagu, The Judge Advocate, Mr. Noel, and Mr. Whitmore: — To withdraw immediately; Three to be the quorum.

POOR RELIEF BILL.—(*Lords.*)—[Bill 186.]

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Mr. NEATE moved the insertion of a new clause, (Greater uniformity in treatment of casual poor). The hon. and learned Member observed that there was a competition of cruelty on the part of the different unions. They were constantly inquiring what was the maximum of labour, and what was the minimum of accommodation for the casual poor. The result was, the treatment of that class of paupers sank in some cases below the level of humanity. He believed the Poor Law Board intended to issue a Circular to the various unions with the view of having a uniform system. He was in favour of uniformity as among the unions; but he thought the principle of uniformity, as to the treatment of all persons coming under the denomination of "casual poor" had been carried too far already. It was true that very many of those persons adopted a vagrant life voluntarily; but there was a large minority of the casual poor who were in that wretched condition from no fault of their own. Magistrates, in many cases, told prisoners who were brought before them as vagrants that "if they would take themselves off to some other districts they might be discharged at once." But this was altogether foreign to the purpose for which they were appointed, and it would be attended with good results if the Home Secretary were now and then to remind magistrates so acting that they sat not as protectors of the rates, but as administrators of the law. A distinction ought to be drawn between mere vagrants and persons temporarily destitute. Mere vagrants ought never to be sent to the workhouse, for they knew perfectly well that the only courses of living which they followed were beggary or robbery, with now and then a mixture of the two. It would be very desirable if some statement were given to the House of the intention of the Poor Law Board with reference to this subject, which deserved, if time allowed it, a much fuller discussion.

Clause (Greater uniformity in treatment of casual poor,)—(*Mr. Neate,*) — *brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH expressed regret that his hon. and learned Friend, in accordance with the Notice which had been given, had not brought forward this subject at an earlier period of the Session, when it might have received that careful consideration which its importance demanded. The first portion of the clause related to the issuing of orders prescribing the time and conditions of the admission of casual poor into the workhouse; and the second enacted that vagrants should be detained in the workhouse a certain specified time after their admission. He doubted the wisdom of the latter provision because it would naturally occur that vagrants would avoid the workhouse, seeing they were liable to be detained. The visiting of the casual poor by one or more Guardians was a thing which he considered would be impossible to carry out. So much for the clause. Then came the question as to what were the intentions of Her Majesty's Government with reference to the order proposed to be issued? In reply, he had to say that the Poor Law Board were fully conscious of the need of uniformity in dealing with this matter. It was obvious that no system which endeavoured to separate the really deserving poor from the vagrants would be successful unless uniformity were had recourse to. Vagrancy had increased very considerably all over the country within the last two years, owing, doubtless, to the financial crisis and the consequent absence of employment. But in the metropolis, where a novel system of dealing with vagrants had been adopted, it was found that the proportion of vagrants in London in January, 1868, had only increased by 11½ per cent over the number in January, 1866, whereas throughout the rest of the country the increase of vagrants was no less than 50 per cent. That clearly proved that the practice in London was better than the practice in the rest of the country, and accordingly the Poor Law Board had it in contemplation by a General Order to extend the system which had already been found so beneficial in practice. It would be required, for instance, that Guardians should take the responsibility of a sound and vigilant discrimination between deserving travellers in search of work and professional vagrants not really destitute, by the appointment of officers capable of exercising such discrimination; and that where practicable the police should be appointed assistant relieving officers. Another provision would be that a proper search should be instituted, to secure that persons applying for relief should have no means of obtaining lodging or food in any other way. A book of descriptions would also be kept, in which the persons of the vagrants, together with their line of travel, would be described. Again, it was very desirable that uniformity should be secured, at least between neighbouring unions, in the diet and lodging of vagrants, and also in the task of work which they would have to do in return for their lodging and food; and some provision might well be made under this head for increasing their task of work in the case of continued applications for relief by habitual tramps. With regard to the accommodation of tramps, it would be very desirable that baths should be provided in all cases, and that each person should have a separate or divided bed place. The forthcoming Order would likewise suggest in cases where it might be practicable that the accommodation for deserving travellers should be different from that given to professional vagrants. He trusted that the provisions of the Order, as he had sketched them out, would be satisfactory to the House, and would be productive of beneficial effects in checking vagrancy; at all events, the attempt was well worth making. In another respect also it might be found possible to assimilate the practice in rural districts to that which obtained in the metropolis. In the country the expense of maintaining vagrants was sustained by the unions separately, while in London it was thrown on the common fund. And there was a reason for putting this charge upon the common fund which did not hold good in other cases, that with regard to vagrants that knowledge of local circumstances, which was the safeguard of local administration, did not apply. Vagrants were generally the poor of the country, and not of any particular union, and, looking at the matter in that light, it might be a subject for future consideration whether, by analogy to the common fund in the metropolis, the charges for vagrants might not be thrown upon the county rates. It might also be matter for consideration on some future occcasion whether the care and custody of vagrants might not be put entirely into the hands of the police. However, nothing of this kind was proposed to be done by the Order which was shortly to be issued, and he merely mentioned these points for the information of hon. Members. There was one thing which would do even more to check vagrancy than any improvement, however meritorious, in local administration, and that was, if some means could be devised of checking the mistaken bestowal of alms by the charitable public. When the public came to understand that persons really in want of relief could obtain it either from the poor or from the county rates, they would be less disposed, he hoped, to bestow mistaken charity than they were at present. But as long as the indiscriminate bestowal of alms to anybody who asked for them continued—and it was always easier to give than to refuse—vagrancy must continue to flourish in this country.

MR. HENLEY considered the subject dealt with by the clause before the House one of the gravest importance. He was very glad that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford (Mr. Neate) was not going to press his Motion, because he did not think it went to the root of the question. This matter of vagrancy would, in his opinion, never be ameliorated unless they treated casual poor as they treated all other classes of poor. The present system was really nothing more than a system of shifts and contrivances in order to throw the burden of maintaining vagrants off the shoulders of one parish upon another, Instead of meeting the evil, or attempting to face it, we strove to shift these vagrants from one place to another at the least possible expense and inconvenience. Thus we had some 50,000 people constantly circulating all round the country, and proving just as great a burden to the ratepayers as they would be if settled in one place, and had the means afforded them of living decently, instead of being, as they were, a curse to the whole body politic. Unless the question were looked upon in this large view, they would never be successful in abating this great pest to society. The present system reminded him of hunting crows from one field in order to let them settle down upon another. The evil would never be abated unless they grappled with it boldly and in a large comprehensive manner.

Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill read the third time.

MR. NEWDEGATE*: Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not think me unreasonable if I move at this stage of the Bill that Clause 3 be struck out. I shall also have to object to clauses from 6 to 12 inclusive, which are connected with Clause 3 in substance; but the clause to which I now object is the 3rd. By that clause the Poor Law Board is enabled, after giving notice to the Guardians, to appoint what officers it may think fit in any or each union of this country, and to direct what salaries shall be paid to these officers out of the rates, thereby acquiring a power totally to supersede every Board of Guardians in the country with reference to the appointment of officers and the payment of these officers out of the rates, which each Board of Guardians is bound to collect. This, Sir, is a very decided step towards the establishment of a centralized power; and I further find that it is understood in the House that this step is taken with the immediate view of appointing chaplains of other denominations than the Church of England, and among these Roman Catholic priests as chaplains. We have had some discussion upon this clause, and a division. This clause is mixed up with miscellaneous clauses in this Bill, but taken in connection with the clauses from 6 to 12, inclusive, it constitutes a separate portion of the Bill; this is understood and acknowledged. I wish, then, to show the House the sort of sense in which these provisions, when taken together, are understood by the conductors of some of the Roman Catholic papers. Last Saturday there appeared an article on the subject of these clauses in *The Weekly Register*, a well-known Ultramontane Roman Catholic paper, and I will take the liberty of reading the concluding portion of that article to the House, in order to warn the House and to warn the country of the sort of operations that the conductors of this newspaper expect the clauses, to which I have alluded, will have, when the power they confer is enforced by the Poor Law

Board. This is the conclusion of the article—

> "As the Bill has already passed the House of Lords, it will be law in a day or two, and the Marylebone, Pancras, and Chelsea Boards of Guardians will have lost their proselytizing power, and be compelled to carry the Poor Law into effect, in accordance with the enlightened and generous views of the Whig and Tory Governments, and of the two great parties in Parliament. We promise these low-bred, discomfited bigots that they may calculate upon a rigid surveillance of their future conduct, and upon the adoption of energetic measures to force them to do their duty, however sorely it may go against their grain."

Now, Sir, no one can read this paragraph, which is strictly in accordance with the tenour of the whole article, without seeing that the conductors of this newspaper—which is a very influential Roman Catholic organ, advocating Ultramontane principles—consider that these clauses in the Bill are virtually penal upon the Guardians of the unions to which they allude—nay, more, virtually penal upon the Guardians of the unions throughout the whole country. It is obvious, Sir, that a law is not less a law because it passes this House, when there are not above 100 Members remaining in town to attend our Sittings than if it had passed in a House of 500 Members; and my conviction is that these clauses would not have passed unless the House had been in the feeble condition in which it is usually found during the dog days. These clauses will, nevertheless, have the force of law. There were but two Amendments made on these clauses. Both of them were made last night. The first Amendment was to this effect—whereas, the 10th clause stood so that every adult pauper, every adult inmate of a union-house, would be compelled, whether he or she liked it, or whether they disliked it, to receive the visitation of a minister of the particular denomination, to which such pauper inmate was entered on the Creed Register, as belonging. The House was last night merciful enough to decide, that, if after once receiving the visitation of such minister or priest, any pauper objected to a renewal of the visitation, he should not be compelled again to submit to it. We had a division upon that point, in which those Members, who have been the most active promoters of these clauses voted against this Amendment; for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. C. P. Villiers) proposed an Amendment upon that Amendment—whereby he would have again interposed the authority of the Poor Law Board, that of the central authority—to control the freedom, the discretion given in this Amendment, to the unhappy pauper as to whether he would continue to receive or would decline the ministration of the priest or minister of the denomination to which he is under the Bill to be registered as belonging. This Amendment was rejected, but the Amendment which the House has adopted goes only to this—There is no power in the man to alter the description of the religion to which he is held to belong in the Register, the entry being made in the first instance when he comes into the union-house; but he may object to receive the ministrations of the individual minister or priest after he has been once visited by him. Now, I say that this exception which we introduced last night in favour of the religious freedom of the individual, small as it is, unmistakeably proves the stringent character of the whole measure. But there was another Amendment made last night, and it is still more remarkable. When the title of the Bill was read the learned Lord Advocate—and the Lord Advocate is always held to be the Minister for Scotland in this House — moved, that the title of the Bill should be altered so as to mark clearly that the operation of the Bill is limited to England and Wales. As a good Scotchman, the Lord Advocate has taken care to exclude his own country from the operation of the measure. Sir, it is a well-known fact that the policy of the Ultramontane party, in this and every country, where the State is not Roman Catholic, is to secularize the State; to divorce the State from all connection with any religion as its own. The operation of these clauses will be to constitute the Poor Law Board, which is a secular Board, but which, as has been over and over again stated in the course of the debates on this Bill, is at present subject to, and acting under, Ultramontane influences—["No, no!"] — I say that has been over and over again stated, and that no one has denied it in debate. The operation of these clauses is, I repeat, to constitute that secular Board the supreme judge of the religion of the inmates of those workhouses; the supreme judge of the religion in which the children in those workhouses shall be brought up; the sole arbiter as to which of the various religious denominations in this country the religious teaching of deserted children shall be committed. Take then this Bill, as exemplified by these clauses, and it is clear that the central power of the Poor Law Board is to over-ride the Guardians of every union in the country with respect to the appointment of officers and the allotment of salaries to those officers. A Creed Register is for the first time established as a public document; not as a document in the manner it has hitherto existed, for the information of the Guardians only, and for their guidance, but as a public document open to the ministers of every denomination in order that they may claim the inmates of those workhouses according to the description of their religion in the Creed Register as their peculiar property. I have described the Amendment by which there is to be a partial mitigation of this system in the case of individual adults; but as the Bill now stands, under the operation of these clauses, when once a man, or a child, whether a boy or a girl, is entered upon the Register, as belonging to a particular denomination, he is the property, the religious property of the minister of that denomination who may undertake to visit the workhouse; the minister of whose chapel is nearest the workhouse having the preference in claiming or asserting this property in the pauper inmates or children of his denomination. Now, Sir, these provisions have been proposed in two Parliaments and in several Sessions; but never until this House was in its present debilitated condition have those provisions received the assent of the House. They are of a most stringent character, and I wish to take this opportunity of making known to the whole body of Guardians throughout the country the nature and extent of the power which these clauses give to the central authority, the Poor Law Board, over them. I wish to inform them that in the opinion of the Ultramontane journal, which I have quoted, this power is to be exercised in the sense of being a penal power. I wish to inform them of the kind of regulation and coercion to which these clauses will subject them. And I wish to do so particularly before this present Parliament is dissolved. For if the Ultramontane organ, to which I have referred is correct in its assertions, there is a coalition between the Leaders of the two great parties in this House for the purpose of thus crippling, incapacitating, and coercing the local administrations of this country in all matters connected with the religious teaching, not only of the adults, but of the children in every union workhouse or union-house throughout this country. Sir, it is my belief that the allegation of proselytism, which this Ultramontane newspaper adduces against the Guardians, is if not altogether unfounded, to say the least grossly exaggerated; and, let it be remembered, that this allegation comes from an Ultramontane newspaper, the organ of the men, who are themselves the most unscrupulous of proselytizers. This allegation is, I believe, a mere attempt to conceal or to excuse the extension of this central power of the Poor Law Board over the administration of the Poor Law in matters, which enter more deeply into the social condition of the people than any others. No Parliament has hitherto permitted this central authority to reach to such an extent. Sir, we are told that we are in the midst of a crisis. So we are. It is said to be a crisis for the Irish Church. So it may be. But the crisis that we are passing through is, in my opinion, a constitutional crisis. The attempt is to secularize the State, whilst its central power, as secular, is increased over matters connected with religion. All this tends to the establishment of a far less free and a much more coercive system of government than that under which we have hitherto lived. Seeing, therefore, that the bearings of the clauses are of the most important description, that they touch the constitutional system of this country, that they invade the great principle of religious freedom, and the system of local self-government and local administration, I have thought that it would be inconsistent with my duty, as there has been no general discussion on the main provisions and purport of this Bill, and as these clauses form the most operative and characteristic portion of the measure; for these reasons I think it inconsistent with my duty, to those I represent, and to the Guardians of the poor generally, not to take this opportunity of informing them of the stringency of this measure, and of the opinion of its future operation which is entertained by those who have been and are the chief promoters of this Bill.

Amendment *negatived.*

Bill *passed,* with Amendments.

DISTRICT CHURCH TITHES ACT AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 246.]

[*Lords.*] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee (according to Order).

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Sect. 9 of 28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 42 repealed).

Mr. WALPOLE said, the effect of the Bill would be to divide the clergy of the Church of England into two classes — rectors and vicars. Under the Church Building Acts a great variety of designations had been bestowed upon different bodies of the clergy, who were styled incumbents, perpetual curates, and so forth. This was found to be a great inconvenience, which the present Bill was intended to remove. There was, however, already in operation a clause of an Act of Parliament under which if a portion of the tithes were given to an incumbent he could, with the consent of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, be declared a rector or a vicar as the case might be. The 2nd clause of the present measure fully provided for the division of the clergy into the two classes of rectors and vicars, and he should therefore move the omission of the 1st clause.

Mr. MONK regarded this as a most extraordinary attempt at legislation. His right hon. Friend who had moved the omission of the 1st clause seemed particularly anxious to undo all that had been done by the House of Lords. When the Bill was introduced into that House it consisted of a single clause, which was the second in the Bill as it now stood. The fact was that a compromise was come to. His right hon. Friend had not at all clearly explained the object of the 1st clause. Under the 9th section of the Act of 28 & 29 *Vict.* a clergyman who purchased even an infinitesimal amount of tithes might, with the assistance of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, become a rector. Indeed, he was credibly informed that a case had arisen in which the Commissioners were required to convert into a rector a perpetual curate who had purchased tithes which returned him an annual income of something under 2*d.*

Mr. POWELL said, he thought the duty of the House clearly was to consider the Bill on its merits with regard to what had been said in "another place." He should, this being so, support the Motion for the omission of the clause.

Motion *negatived.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered;* read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

WEST INDIES BILL—[Bill 124.]

(*Mr. Adderley, Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

LORDS' AMENDMENT. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [27th July] proposed to be made to the Amendment made by The Lords to the West Indies Bill; and which Amendment was,

To leave out the words "as such coadjutor, continue to act in the same manner as at present as Archdeacon of Middlesex," in order to insert the words "and exercises episcopal functions therein, continue to receive out of the Consolidated Fund the annual payment of two thousand pounds which has been hitherto made to him in part by the Bishop of Jamaica out of the stipend of three thousand pounds paid to the said Bishop from the Consolidated Fund under the before recited Acts, and in part out of the stipend appropriated to his Archdeaconry of Middlesex out of the Consolidated Fund, under the said Acts: Provided, That during his receipt of such annual payment no payment shall be made to him out of the Consolidated Fund in respect of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex,"—(*Mr. Russell Gurney,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of The Lords' Amendment."

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. AYRTON said, he hoped the Secretary of the Treasury would support him in objecting to a proposal which, if adopted, would form a very bad precedent. The House was asked to make a new grant out of the Consolidated Fund by way of Amendment to an Amendment of the other House without any Resolution having been come to on the subject by the House in Committee. The clause, if amended as proposed, would give to the Bishop of Kingston £800 as his own salary and £1,200 from the Consolidated Fund as agent of the Bishop of Jamaica, so that the proposal actually suggested the appropriation of £1,200 out of the Consolidated Fund. The Act under which the payments were to be made was the 5 & 6 *Vict.*, which empowered Her Majesty to devote such sums from the Consolidated Fund as she deemed necessary to carry out any arrangement which might be come to for the spiritual welfare of the people of Jamaica. It appeared to be a new charge upon the Consolidated Fund for the benefit of a particular individual, and such a charge ought not to be created except in Committee. The proposition ought not, he believed, now to be made, and he trusted, therefore, that the Lords' Amendment, which was a very harmless one, would be agreed to. It was harmless because it could never come into operation, and he hoped, therefore, that the House, out of compliment to the other branch of the Legislature, would agree to the Amendment as sent down.

Mr. GILPIN said, he hoped the time would soon come, and he should see it, when the question of Bishops' salaries would occupy as little time in that House as the payment of salaries to Dissenting ministers and of funds for the erection of chapels. With regard to the question now before the House, he should vote against the proposed alteration of the Lords' Amendment, for the reason that if it did not actually create a new charge upon the Consolidated Fund, it would create a charge for an additional life.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that by the patent under which his appointment was made the Bishop of Kingston was not merely appointed coadjutor to the Bishop of Jamaica. For his duties as coadjutor to the Bishop of Jamaica he received £1,200 a year out of the salary of the Bishop of Jamaica, in addition to the sum of £400, formerly £800, which he received as the Archdeacon of Middlesex. But he was also empowered on the death of the Bishop of Jamaica to perform the episcopal duties of that See until a successor had been appointed, consecrated, and had arrived in the diocese. The whole object of the Amendment now proposed was that the Bishop of Kingston should, in such an event, receive the same emoluments as were now given to the Archdeacon of Middlesex. He could see no objection to this proposal, and should therefore support it.

Mr. M'LAREN said, that the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Russell Gurney) proposed to strike out part of the Lords' Amendment by which a pecuniary saving would be effected. The right hon. and learned Gentleman purposed to strike out that part of the Amendment which conveyed the intention of the other House, and to put in something entirely different in its nature, and not in any way connected with the subject of the Lords' Amendment; and he desired to know, whether it was in accordance with the rules of the House to take advantage of the technical fact that an Amendment had been made by the other House to insert a fresh provision which could by no possibility have any connection with that Amendment?

Mr. AYTOUN submitted that they had no power to do what was proposed by the Amendment. Power was given to grant a salary out of the Consolidated Fund to some person holding a particular office and provided for under the Act of Parliament; but was it competent to them to transfer the salary to some totally different office?

Mr. SPEAKER: A Question was put to me on this point last night, and I made answer to it that it appears to me, so far as the privileges of the House are concerned, the question turns upon whether there is any new charge upon the Consolidated Fund, and while the Bill proposes to relieve the Consolidated Fund of £20,000 this Amendment would relieve it of £18,000 only. The question of the merits of the Bill is a matter for the consideration of the House. The hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) has asked me whether in point of form this Amendment can be put? The question is whether it is relevant, and it appears to me that it is relevant to the Amendment of the Lords. I do not mean to say it is not a somewhat complicated question. I adhere to the substance of the opinion I gave last night that, as there is no new charge upon the Consolidated Fund, therefore I think it is a matter more to be decided by the House on its merits than by any opinion from the Chair.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 30; Noes 29: Majority 1.

Lords' Amendment *agreed to*.

House adjourned at half after
Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, July 29, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Third Reading*—Inland Revenue* (279); Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections* (287); Danube Works Loan* (272); Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London,* (278); Colonial Governors Pensions Act Amendment* (239), and *passed.*

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 29, 1868.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Withdrawn*—Mines Assessment* [221]; Church Rates Regulation* [22]; Church Rates Commutation* [10].

The House met at a quarter before Four of the clock.

ARMY—ORDNANCE SURVEY MAPS.
QUESTION.

MR. HARVEY LEWIS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Why the Public cannot be supplied with the Maps of the Ordnance Survey, as at this time no complete copies of all the Maps can be procured in London; and, why arrangements are not made by which complete sets and portions of the Ordnance Survey publications can be obtained by the Public and the Trade through the Stationery Office, under whose direction the Maps and publications of the Geological Ordnance Survey are satisfactorily issued?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that, on account of the bulky nature of the maps, there might be some difficulty in obtaining them, though he had never himself experienced the slightest difficulty. He believed there was no place in England where any portion of the Ordnance Survey might not at once be obtained. It was now under consideration whether it would be convenient to supply them through the Stationery Office, but he was not aware that any practical inconvenience arose from the present arrangement.

THE POST OFFICE AND CIRCULAR DELIVERY COMPANIES.—QUESTION.

MR. M'LAREN said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Treasury have yet decided in favour of allowing the Post Office to carry printed matter, not exceeding one ounce in weight, for one halfpenny; and, whether the Treasury will give orders not to take any further legal proceedings to impede the action of Circular Delivery Companies until after the meeting of the new Parliament?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that the subject of the first part of the hon. Member's Question was now under consideration, but no decision had been come to upon it at present in consequence of the Post Office officials having had their time so greatly taken up by the Electric Telegraphs Bill. He trusted, however, that very shortly some decision upon the point would be arrived at. With regard to the latter part of the hon. Member's Question, he could only say that a case had been stated for the opinion of a Court of Law with respect to the legality of the operation of the Circular Delivery Company, and therefore it would be unadvisable to express any opinion upon the subject at present.

ARMY—COLONELS IN THE ROYAL ARTILLERY.—QUESTION.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is intended to allow any of the full Colonels of the Royal Artillery who have sent in their names for retirement, to have immediate benefit by the sum voted for them on Thursday July 16th?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that the matter was under consideration, and he hoped to be able in a few days to inform the gallant officers interested in it of the decision which had been come to.

ARMY—SENIOR STAFF OFFICERS OF PENSIONERS.—QUESTION.

MR. WYLD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If any consideration has been given to the grievances of the Senior Staff Officers of Pensioners, to which his attention was called during the last Session of Parliament—namely, that the Memorandum, dated

War Office 15th March 1842, promised that their situations should be considered as "Full Pay" appointments; but some time after they accepted these situations on the faith of this promise a regulation was made that the holders of them should have the inadequate step of Brevet Major, with the addition only of two shillings per day to their pay, and that this limitation of advancement and the limitation of their retiring allowances inflicts a serious injury upon the Senior Staff Officers of Pensioners, many of whom left their regiments, and some of them paid back the regulated difference between half and full pay to hold these appointments; and whether he is disposed to consider the "Full Pay" appointment of the Senior Staff Officer of Pensioners as entitling them to a gradual increase of rank, pay, and retiring allowance?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that he could not think the Senior Staff Officers of Pensioners had any cause of complaint, seeing that considerable advantages in the way of promotion had been extended to them. The best answer he could give to the hon. Member was to state that almost every day he was receiving applications for appointments on the Pensioners' Staff, which were greatly coveted by military men. On the other hand, however, in consequence of the arrangements now in progress with respect to the Army of Reserve, their labours had greatly increased, and he would take into consideration how far those additional labours entitled them to extra pay.

ARMY—PREACHING IN THE ARMY.

QUESTION.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been called to a Military General Order, said to have been issued by the General Commanding-in-Chief in Canada, forbidding Officers to preach to or to teach the men of their Regiments, and in consequence of which two Officers of the Rifle Brigade had sent in papers resigning their Commissions; and, whether he had any objection to lay a Copy of such General Order on the Table of the House?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he regretted that the hon. Member had been unable to give him longer Notice of his Question, to the subject of which his attention was called for the first time by the hon. Member's Notice yesterday; but

even had he received a longer notice, it would have been impossible for him to give any definite answer with respect to a General Order said to have been issued by the Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's Forces in Canada. He found upon inquiry that in May last a Letter was received by the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief in this country from Sir Charles Windham, the Commander-in-Chief in Canada, bringing under his attention the fact that certain officers in the Rifle Brigade were in the habit of preaching in the public churches, and that complaints had been made to the Commander-in-Chief with respect to that practice, which in some instances had led to what he was going to call scandals and to considerable excitement. The Commander-in-Chief in Canada had ordered the officers in question to return to their regimental quarters at Ottawa, and they were prohibited from continuing the practice of preaching in the churches. The practice appeared, however, to have revived, and complaints were again made to the Commander-in-Chief in Canada, which were likewise sent home by Sir Charles Windham, with a request that he should be informed as to the course he should take. By the direction of the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief a Letter of a most temperate and moderate character was written by the Adjutant General in answer to those complaints, which stated that he had no wish to discourage officers from preaching to their men, but strongly discouraging the practice of officers attempting to go beyond the fair limits of their vocation by preaching in churches. He was only aware of the retirement of the two officers referred to from the Notice of the hon. Member. Not long ago similar prohibitions were issued at Winchester and Portsmouth, where complaints had been made of practices of the same kind.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. THOMAS HUGHES, who had given Notice to call attention to the inaccurate state of the Standard of Weight and Measure, and to the present system of enforcing the law, whereby half the penalties are paid to the informer, said, he was sorry to have to call the attention of the House to so important a question as that of the standards of weights and measures at this period of the Session, as of course he could not expect that the House would go into the matter thoroughly. But those who were interested in the question as he was—for the county of Surrey was unfortunately the first in the Returns of penalties for the use of inaccurate weights and measures—had hoped that the Government would have been able to bring in a measure this Session, and had therefore put off calling attention to this subject earlier. He believed that the Government were waiting for the Report of the Standards Commission; but as they would, he supposed, have the whole question under their consideration in the Recess, there were several points which he wished to call their attention to. First, as to the present custom of giving half the penalties to the informer. Nothing could be worse than such a system, as would be clear to the House by the case of his own borough. In Lambeth there were two Inspectors of weights and measures, one of whom was lately a common police-constable, and the other in an equally humble condition in life. These officers were paid a fixed salary of £250 each with half the penalties in addition; and these penalties amounted in the past year to upwards of £1,200, so that the salaries of these officers had been more than doubled by the penalties. It was well to pay such officers a proper salary, but not well to make their salary depend upon the amount of fines inflicted. Then there was the question of tribunals. The present one was eminently unsatisfactory. In Surrey, for instance, no register of convictions was kept by the magistrates, so that there could be no really satisfactory evidence as to the degree of guilt of any person who was summoned. In illustration of the way in which this branch of the law was administered, he might state that in one day at Islington upwards of 120 cases were got through in four hours and a half. On inquiry it was found that in nearly every case the same fine of 5*s*. had been inflicted, and in no less than twenty-six of the cases the defendants had been fined, for having weights which were actually heavier than the standards. Then as to the standards themselves. Before the Act of 1866 the Board of Trade standards had not been verified for forty years. By the present law they must be verified once in ten years; but this was much too seldom. He thought it should be done at least every six years. The secondary standards, which were in constant use, were to be verified once in five years. But if he was rightly informed, the wear and tear of the standards would make a difference of a drachm a year. Surely, therefore, the standards in ordinary use should be verified every year. The method of setting the standards right, too, seemed to be very objectionable. He had seen only yesterday a standard weight in which the adjustment had been made by soldering a piece of lead roughly on to the bottom of the weight. Then, again, the Act of 1866 empowered Her Majesty in Council to settle what amount of variation might be tolerated between the standards at the Board of Trade and the secondary standards. He did not know whether any scale of variation had been fixed by Order in Council, but if it had, it ought to be extended to the variation between the secondary standards and those of tradesmen. If the Vice President of the Board of Trade could give some information as to the amount of variation which was tolerated at present, it would be interesting, he thought, to the House, and certainly to himself, representing as he did an important trading constituency in the south of London. The same amount of variation which was at present tolerated between the Board of Trade standard and the secondary standards ought clearly to be sanctioned between the secondary standard and the weights and measures used by dealers throughout the country. He would also suggest that the Government should enforce the publication of the names of persons convicted, with the particulars of their offence. In almost all cases no publication was made either of the names of the persons convicted or of the circumstances of the conviction. There was no knowing whether weights were a drachm or an ounce too light, or whether, as in some cases, they were too heavy. It would certainly benefit the honest trader if, in every instance, it were obligatory on the tribunal imposing the penalty to publish the circumstances of the case; and some system might also be devised under which a mark should be fixed on the shops of all deliberate offenders. If these points were attended to he thought the Government might easily frame a measure which would protect the public and the honest tradesman. At present the only persons who profited by the law and the way it was carried out were the dishonest tradesmen. He hoped the Government would consider the question in the Recess.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Thomas Hughes.*)

MR. STEPHEN CAVE apologized for not being prepared to answer the question fully. Having been very unwell for the last two days, he had not been able to attend the House, and had in fact seen the Notice for the first time, only a few minutes before. Part of the question, moreover, properly belonged to the Home Office. The law, with regard to penalties, had been altered in many respects; but it had been found by experience that it often slumbered, in consequence of there being no inducement to anybody to enforce it. What was everybody's business was nobody's business, and the evil had been felt in regard to overcrowding themselves, of which so many complaints had been heard. Those, however, who complained of the operation of the law had the remedy in their own hands, because if they used genuine weights and measures they would not be exposed to its operation at all. It always struck him as a very remarkable circumstance that the poor, who were chiefly fleeced by the rascality of the small tradesmen, were yet the very persons to stand up for these offenders against the law which would protect them from their misdoing. As long as such a state of feeling existed, it was hopeless to attempt to enforce the law. It would be a great thing, of course, if the magistrates kept a register, and if the names of the offenders, and the number of their convictions were published; but in the very neighbourhood where these people lived, and where their offences must be well known, the fact did not deter poor persons from dealing with them. The reason, no doubt, in many cases, was that these poor persons were almost always in debt to the shopkeeper, and were therefore under his hand, and a very hard hand it often proved to be. He was not quite able to follow what had been stated by his hon. Friend about shopkeepers being convicted whose weights were too heavy, and could only suppose that the fine in such cases was imposed because the weights were not properly marked with the Government stamp, but had been bought unstamped from some private makers. The variations in the standards to which his hon. Friend had referred was one which it was perfectly impossible to express in terms, and was merely an allowance for the effect of the atmosphere upon the different kinds of metal of which these weights were made. Re-verification from time to time was undoubtedly advantageous, but complaints had been already made both from counties and boroughs of the cost of this proceeding, and more frequent re-verification would, of course, necessitate an increase of staff. No doubt, in centres of great trade, like the metropolis, such adjustment would be more often required than in other places. He was not sufficiently acquainted with the practice to know exactly what was usual with regard to soldering, but in the event of a slight addition being required to a weight soldering would probably be the cheapest way of making it. He entirely concurred with his hon. Friend in the desire which had been expressed for some sign to be placed over the shops of defaulters. In France this was constantly done. When a man was convicted of using false weights he was not only fined for it, but in addition was obliged to have constructed at his own expense a kind of tablet giving the fact of the conviction, the reason for it, and how much he was fined; and this he was required to expose in his shop for a certain number of days, weeks, or months, and a policeman called every day to see that it was fixed in some conspicuous place. This might be a proceeding too strong for this country, but if something of a similar kind existed here, in practice it would no doubt prove very beneficial. The different points mentioned by his hon. Friend should be carefully inquired into at the next meeting of the Standards Commission.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, that his hon. Friend the Member for Lambeth (Mr. T. Hughes), considering the borough which he represented, had stated the case very fairly. But if 1,200 persons had been convicted it was quite plain that there were 12,000 who deserved conviction. The law as it stood now was much too lenient towards rogues. He was a director of a large company, which suffered every day from the rascality of the public. Hitherto they had been in the habit of posting up the names of the persons by whom they were so defrauded; but it had recently been laid down that in doing so railway companies would be guilty of a libel. As the use of false weights was really a dreadful offence he thought it would be better, instead of marking the shop, from which the tradesman might remove, to brand the man himself. A practice existed of giving short weight to the poor, which was exceedingly difficult to detect—namely, that of putting a piece of lead, or something heavy, in the scales, and taking it out again after the article was served. For his part he should wish such rogues to be branded with the letter "R" in their forehead.

COLONEL SYKES said, he hoped that the time was not far distant when the Continental system would be introduced into this contry.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

PATENT OFFICE INQUIRY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. BENTINCK said, he rose to move for a Copy of the Proceedings taken in the case of Mr. Leonard Edmunds. He would remind the House that some few years ago the country was startled by the statement that certain irregularities of a serious nature had occurred in the Patent Office, with which Mr. Edmunds was connected. A Commission of Inquiry was appointed by Lord Westbury, who was at that time Lord Chancellor, The result was that two Reports were published, the last of them dated January, 1865. These Reports disclosed some extraordinary matters—matters which excited great attention in both Houses of Parliament, and throughout the country. The gravest charges, such as peculation, embezzlement, gross dishonesty, wilful falsification of accounts, and many other acts of a like nature were brought against Mr. Edmunds, and in connection with the Suitors' Fund, with which he was said to have meddled, he was branded as a defaulter. Not only was he driven from his office, but he was also deprived of a pension which a Commission of the House of Lords had assigned to him on account of his resignation of his appointment as reading clerk in that House, and, thus broken down, he was thrown upon society with a tarnished reputation. But the case did not stop there. The Government which was at that time in power, and no doubt rightly enough, believed that such offences in a public servant as those which Mr. Edmunds was alleged to have committed could not be overlooked, and, though his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer) stated that it was not thought advisable to take criminal proceedings against him, civil proceedings were instituted, and very properly so, to recover the balance in which he was alleged to have been deficient. In the first instance, proceedings were taken in the Court of Exchequer, which was supposed to be the proper tribunal, but subsequently they were shifted to the Court of Chancery, and the proceedings in the Court of Exchequer were abandoned. The information in the Court of Chancery was not filed until eighteen months after the Report had been made by the Commissioners, and the answer of Mr. Edmunds, which was not excepted to, and which, in reality, constituted the evidence in the case, was filed in the month of December, 1866. It was not, however, till three years after the last Report of the Commissioners had been made that the proceedings in the case were brought to maturity. During all this time Mr. Edmunds had been deprived of his pension, and, though he (Mr. Bentinck) did not find fault with the Law Officers of the Crown for what had been done, he could not help thinking that a great hardship had been inflicted upon Mr. Edmunds by the removal of the proceedings from the Court of Exchequer to the Court of Chancery, and by his being subjected, as he had been, to an expense of no less than £2,000. When the information was heard every effort was made by the Government to secure a hearing of their case. His hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General appeared by virtue of his office to lead the case, and with him was his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Richmond, the leader of the Chancery Bar, and one of the ablest advocates that ever practised in the Court of Chancery. Indeed, in this case it might be said that the Crown had everything, and Mr. Edmunds next to nothing. The case was heard by Vice Chancellor Giffard—and an abler lawyer or a Judge more endowed with good sound common sense never adorned the Bench in this country. He would trouble the House with a portion of the judgment delivered by Vice Chancellor Giffard. The Vice Chancellor said—

> "In one respect I am happy to say that the arguments and the evidence adduced on behalf of Mr. Edmunds have been successful—that is to say, they have been successful in clearing his character from all imputation. They have satisfied me that his liability, whatever it may be, is a liability from mistake—mistake under circumstances of very considerable difficulty, brought about in some respects because he could not obtain the audits which he asked for, I think, in

1834, and subsequently in 1852 or 1853, and brought about also by what is a most unfortunate Act of Parliament, which was passed with reference to a given state of circumstances, when, in point of fact, these circumstances changed very materially afterwards."

Then the learned Vice Chancellor concluded his judgment as follows:—

"Having made that preface, I may add that it is not without regret that I have come to this conclusion that in other respects the arguments which have been adduced on behalf of the defendant are not successful. I think there is jurisdiction in this Court. I think that the direction asked with reference to stamps must be given in the form which I will presently state. I must also declare that he is not entitled to make any deduction whatever for or in respect of the parchment used in the preparation or engrossment of any document issued by him as Clerk of the Patents, or from the office of Clerk of the Patents, or any other deduction whatsoever, in respect of the preparation and engrossment of any such document. It is with regret that I find myself compelled by the terms of the Act of Parliament to make that last declaration. I repeat, as I said at the outset, that I think the defendant's evidence has removed any imputation that can be justly or fairly cast upon his character, and, having regard to all the circumstamces, the very difficult position in which he was placed and the fact of the audits being refused, I certainly shall not make him pay any costs."

A more complete refutation of the charges made against Mr. Edmunds he could not conceive. He now desired to know, therefore, what course the Government proposed to take in this matter. It was quite clear that after what had occurred the case of Mr. Edmunds could not stop in the position it now was, and if he had the honour of a seat in the next Parliament he should certainly move the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry into the whole of the circumstances. In any case he trusted that, having regard to the accusations which were brought against Mr. Edmunds and the decision of the Vice Chancellor, his hon. and learned Friend would exercise what he (Mr. Bentinck) believed would prove a wise discretion, and advise the Government to stop all Chancery proceedings hereafter, and not subject Mr. Edmunds to any of those vexatious proceedings from which he had already suffered so much. There was a point in connection with the decree of the Vice Chancellor which affected Mr. Edmunds very materially. The decree referred to points connected with charges of 12*s.* 10*d.* for engrossments. The matter he believed might now be fairly referred to arbitration. Indeed, this course was suggested by the late Attorney General, Sir John Rolt, in a letter dated the 23rd of January, 1867, in which he proposed to refer the case to a legal arbitrator, for—

"A full and complete investigation of the accounts, and also Mr. Edmunds' claims against the Crown arising upon the accounts;

stating further that—

"The Crown would not put Mr. Edmunds to the expense and delay of instituting a cross proceeding for enforcing his claims, but would consent to the arbitrator disposing of the whole question without any such proceeding."

Mr. Edmunds was perfectly willing that that course should be taken. It might perhaps be objected that the offer of arbitration having been once made and refused the matter was now closed. But it should be remembered that the offer was refused at the time when Mr. Edmunds' character had not been cleared, and that if he had then accepted it he could not have obtained that full and complete vindication of his conduct which he had since done. He should now leave the matter in the hands of the Government, simply observing that he had endeavoured in dealing with the subject to avoid all matters of a personal nature.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That there be laid before this House, a Copy of all the Proceedings and Evidence in the Information in Chancery, Attorney General v. Edmunds; together with the Papers relating to the Patent Office Inquiry."—(*Mr. Bentinck.*)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. Member who has brought forward this Motion having more than once referred to me, perhaps it may be convenient that I should say a few words on the part of the case in connection with which that reference has been made. My hon. Friend has correctly read, as far as my recollection goes, the passages of the judgment of the Vice Chancellor, which he was anxious to bring under the notice of the House; but my hon. Friend has asked for Papers which I think it would be altogether out of the ordinary course to print at the public expense. I may, however, observe that in those Papers no charge of defalcation or fraud was made against Mr. Edmunds. He was charged simply with being a debtor to the Crown; and the information asked that an account might be taken. It was a mere statement that Mr. Edmunds had held an appointment under the Crown, and that, while holding that appointment, he became a debtor to the Crown. On that information a decree was subsequently granted. I do not mean to say anything about the other part of the proceedings taken on the advice of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer); but I believe there were ample reasons why this information should have been, as it was, filed in the Court of Chancery instead of the Court of Exchequer. In the Court of Chancery there is a better machinery for the investigation of complicated accounts. The information stated two items—one a deduction made by Mr. Edmunds for discount upon stamps, and the other a deduction of 12*s.* 10*d.* from the fees on patents, this latter deduction being made for each skin of parchment. The issue was whether Mr. Edmunds was right in making those deductions before paying the money over to the Crown. The Vice Chancellor held that he was not. I am glad my hon. Friend has read to the House that passage in the judgment of his Honour which states that Mr. Edmunds had a duty to discharge under an Act of Parliament which it was difficult to construe, and that he erred, not through fraud, but through a mistake. Now, as far as I understand my hon. Friend, he asks this question—"What advice does the Attorney General intend to give to the Government in reference to the Papers which Mr. Edmunds has laid before the Government." I admit that those Papers have been laid before me for my advice. The hon. Member, speaking irresponsibly, or simply upon his responsibility as a Member of this House, has been good enough to tell me what advice I ought to give to the Government; but for myself I can only say that the Papers are now under my consideration, and that my advice will be given in a few days. The House must see that it would be highly inconvenient if I were now to state to the House what advice I shall give—whether I shall advise the Government in favour of arbitration, or for having the account taken through the medium of the Court of Chancery. I have taken the matter into consideration without any prejudice, and I hope I shall, with fairness, advise the Government as to the best course to adopt, having regard to the public interests, and, I will add, having regard also to the interests of Mr. Edmunds.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

House adjourned at a quarter after Five o'clock till Friday.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 30, 1868.

THE NEW PALACE OF JUSTICE.

QUESTION.

Lord DENMAN, in pursuance of Notice, asked of Her Majesty's Government, If the Commissioners under the Courts of Justice Building Act had recommended any definite plan in regard to the New Palace of Justice? The noble Lord said, no task could be more ungracious than seeming to under-rate the exertions of a Royal Commission, especially of the noble Lord (Lord Cranworth), and to oppose the opinion of eminent jurists who anticipate the greatest advantage from the concentration of the Courts of Justice; but having since 1864 differed from them all, and observing that but £36,000 was left for the building of a palace, whilst their Lordships' House had carried a clause that all plans and estimates should be laid before Parliament before the beginning of the work (which was given up on condition of a certificate as to the expense of the site not exceeding £750,000, and the expense of the building not exceeding another £750,000), he could not but remark that if the present plan were carried out more than seven acres would be required; whilst to accommodate jurors, suitors, witnesses, and the public as they could now be accommodated at Westminster Hall and Guildhall, no single building could be sufficient. The approaches also to Westminster had been improved, and in a very short time a railway station would be opened at the very place at which Mr. Canning's statue formerly stood. Shortly, instead of merely thinking they were represented, he hoped that the people would feel that they were so, and he trusted that no contract would be entered into without its previously being submitted to the new Parliament. He wished that the present unsightly buildings could be dispensed with; they had been condemned by his noble Relative as soon as they were built; but it had been settled that on £200,000 being paid for them they should be given up to the Commissioners, and it had been suggested that they might become Committee-rooms of the House of Commons. As to the increase of fees for fifty years, his noble Relative (who had done everything in his power to diminish the cost of litigation, counting the loss to his family and himself beforehand), could not have approved of such a method of paying for buildings, though it had the authority of an Act of Parliament passed last year. He must conclude joining in opinion with two of Her Majesty's counsel on the Home Circuit that an abandonment of Westminster Hall and Guildhall was unnecessary, and that the evils attending concentration had not been duly considered. He knew that his noble Relative did not approve of the Courts sitting at Westminster Hall and Guildhall at the same time, but that could be avoided. He really believed, in the present state of the labour market, that if these Courts were begun they might remain unfinished for years, like the tower of Cologne Cathedral, and he hoped that the Government would wait until the next Session and not adopt any plan with undue haste.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he would endeavour to answer the Question of the noble Lord without attempting to enter into the wide subject introduced by him. The Commissioners under the Courts of Justice Building Act had not as yet actually recommended any definite plan, and therefore of course the Lords of the Treasury could not have adopted any recommendation. At the same time he was bound to add that the members of the Commission—of which he was one—held a meeting a few days ago, at which they agreed to a draft letter to be accompanied by sketches of certain floor plans, to be approved of. That letter and those plans had not, however, as yet been dispatched, but they were about being so. That was the state of the matter between the Government and the Commissioners.

LORD DENMAN said, that it was made clear that Parliament would have to exceed greatly the original estimates.

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter before
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 31, 1868.

MINUTES]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Royal Assent*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 85]; Sir Robert Napier's Annuity [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 91]; Liquidation [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 68]; Land Writs Registration (Scotland [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 64]; University Elections (Voting Papers) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 65]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 66]; Metropolitan Police Funds [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 67]; Fairs (Metropolis) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 106]; Libel (Ireland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 69]; Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 70]; Promissory Oaths [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 72]; County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 71]; Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 73]; Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 74]; Petit Juries (Ireland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 75]; Admiralty Suits [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 78]; Railway Companies [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 79]; Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Court [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 77]; Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 80]; Army Chaplains [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 83]; Assignees of Marine Policies [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 86]; County General Assessment (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 82]; Entail Amendment (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 84]; Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 130]; Court of Justiciary (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 95]; Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 96]; Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 97]; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 94]; Vaccination (Ireland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 87]; Courts of Chancery and Exchequer (Ireland) Fee Funds [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 88]; Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 89]; Public Departments Payments [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 90]; New Zealand Assembly's Powers [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 92]; New Zealand Company [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 93]; Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 98]; Militia Pay [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 76]; Hudson's Bay Company [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 105]; Indorsing of Warrants [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 107]; Bankruptcy Act Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 104]; Burials (Ireland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 103]; Compulsory Church Rates Abolition [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 109]; Court of Session (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 100]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 102]; Municipal Elections (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 108]; Marriages Validity (Blakedown) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 113]; West Indies [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 120]; Ecclesiastical Commissioners [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 114]; Larceny and Embezzlement [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 116]; Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 115]; Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 101]; Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 121]; Regulation of Railways [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 119]; Expiring Laws Continuance [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 111]; Electric Telegraphs [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 110]; Public Schools [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 118]; District Church Tithes Act Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 117]; Poor Relief [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 122]; Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 123]; Inland Revenue [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 124]; Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 125]; Danube Works Loan [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 126]; Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 127]; Colonial Governors Pensions Act Amendment [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 128]; Colonial Shipping [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 129]; Registration (Ireland) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 112]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 199]; Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 81]; Lee River Conservancy [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 154]; Tain Provisional Order Confirmation [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 155]; Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 150]; Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 156]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 151]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 157]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 158]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 152]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 6) [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 153].

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT. SPEECH OF THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The PARLIAMENT was this day prorogued by Commission.

The Lords Commissioners — namely, The Lord Chancellor; Lord Privy Seal (The Earl of Malmesbury); The Duke of Beaufort (Master of the Horse); The Duke of Buckingham (Secretary of State for the Colonies); and The Earl of Devon (President of the Poor Law Board)—being in their robes, and seated on a Form between the Throne and the Woolsack; and the Commons being come, with their Speaker, the Royal Assent was given to several Bills.

Then The LORD CHANCELLOR *delivered* the Speech of the Lords Commissioners as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"I am happy to be enabled to release you from your Labours, and to offer you My Acknowledgments for the Diligence with which you have applied yourselves to your Parliamentary Duties.

"My Relations with Foreign Powers remain friendly and satisfactory. I have no Reason to apprehend that *Europe* will be exposed to the Calamity of War, and My Policy will continue to be directed to secure the Blessings of Peace.

"I announced to you at the Beginning of this Session that I had directed an Expedition to be sent to *Abyssinia* to liberate My Envoy, and others of My Subjects, detained by the Ruler of that Country in an unjust Captivity.

"I feel sure that you will share in My Satisfaction at the complete Success which has attended that Expedition. After a March of 400 Miles, through a difficult and unexplored Country, My Troops took the strong Place of *Magdala,* freed the Captives, and vindicated the Honour of My Crown; and by their immediate Return, without One Act of Oppression or needless Violence, proved that the Expedition had been undertaken only in obedience to the Claims of Humanity, and in fulfilment of the highest Duties of My Sovereignty.

"The Cessation of the long-continued Efforts to promote Rebellion in *Ireland* has for some Time rendered unnecessary the Exercise by the Executive of exceptional Powers. I rejoice to learn that no Person is now detained under the Provisions of the Act for the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus, and that no Prisoner awaits Trial in *Ireland* for an Offence connected with the Fenian Conspiracy.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"I have to thank you for the liberal Supplies which you have voted for the Public Service.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"I have had much Satisfaction in giving My Assent to a Series of Measures completing the great Work of the Amendment of the Representation of the People in Parliament, which has engaged your Attention for Two Sessions.

"I HAVE seen with Satisfaction that the Time necessarily occupied by this comprehensive Subject has not prevented you dealing with other Questions of great public Interest, and I have gladly given My Sanction to Bills for the better Government of Public Schools, the Regulation of Railways, the Amendment of the Law relating to *British* Sea Fisheries, and for the Acquisition and Maintenance of Electric Telegraphs by the Postmaster-General; and to several important Measures having for their Object the Improvement of the Law, and of the Civil and Criminal Procedures in *Scotland.*

"BY the Appointment of a Comptroller-in-Chief in the War Office a considerable Reform in Army Administration has been commenced, which, by combining at home and abroad the various Departments of Military Supply under One Authority, will conduce to greater Economy and Efficiency both in Peace and War.

"IT is My Intention to dissolve the present Parliament at the earliest Day that will enable My People to reap the Benefit of the extended System of Representation which the Wisdom of Parliament has provided for them. I look with entire Confidence to their proving themselves worthy of the high Privilege with which they have thus been invested; and I trust that, under the Blessing of Divine Providence, the Expression of their Opinion on those great Questions of public Policy which have occupied the Attention of Parliament and remain undecided, may tend to maintain unimpaired that Civil and Religious Freedom which has been secured to all My Subjects by the Institutions and Settlement of My Realm."

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Thursday* the Eighth Day of *October* next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Thursday* the Eighth Day of *October* next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 31, 1868.

The House met at half after One of the clock.

FRANCE, BELGIUM, AND HOLLAND.

QUESTION.

MR. OTWAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he has received any information as to a projected offensive and defensive alliance between France, Belgium, and Holland, or of any combination of those powers, for purposes hostile to Prussia and Germany?

LORD STANLEY said, in reply, that he had yesterday seen the Belgian Minister upon the subject to which the Question related; and he, Baron Dujardin, was authorized by his Government to state, that so far as Belgium is concerned, there is no foundation whatever for the report to which the Question of the hon. Member referred. He understood no proposition of the kind comprised in the Question had been made by France or Belgium, either officially or unofficially. He had received from the Hague a similar statement—namely, that the report was unfounded—but couched in more general terms.

METROPOLIS—THE PARKS.

QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether, for the convenience of Foreigners and other Visitors to London, he will cause at each of the park gates the name of the gate to be written legibly and conspicuously?

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, in reply, that he was not aware that any inconvenience had arisen to foreigners from the names of the gates not being painted up; but there would be no objection, when the notice boards required re-painting, to place the names of the different parks at their head.

POOR LAW ASSESSMENT.—QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Whether he will take into his consideration the advisability of introducing a measure, in the next Session of Parliament, to compel the single parishes in the Metropolis to re-assess, in the same manner as the parishes in unions have been compelled to re-assess under the Union Assessment Act, in order that the contributions to the common fund may be levied throughout the Metropolis on a fair and equal basis?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, in reply, that it had been his intention to introduce a measure for the uniform valuation of the metropolis; but the same reasons that had prevented the progress of important measures which the Government desired to see passed had interfered to prevent him from doing so. He hoped to introduce such a measure next Session.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS.

QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, with the sanction of the Treasury, have abandoned the scheme of forming a new wide street immediately opposite the Horse Guards, from Whitehall, through Whitehall Yard to the Thames Embankment, as planned by Mr. Pennethorne, in his Report of the 24th April 1868, and stated by him to form a handsome approach to the Embankment from Buckingham Palace, the Park, and the Horse Guards, with the Public Offices South thereof, and to furnish fine sites available for the erection of public buildings, or for private houses and offices, and that the said street passes wholly through Crown property, the leases of which have all terminated; whether the Commissioners of Woods and Forests have so determined in consequence of the Metropolitan Board of Works having decided not to make the street opposite the Horse Guards at the expense of the Metropolis, but to make a thoroughfare to the Embankment through Whitehall Place; and, whether the Treasury is not of opinion that if the new street be formed through Whitehall Yard, as designed by Mr. Pennethorne, it would nearly double the present value of the Crown property through which it passes?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, that his hon. Friend (Mr. Sclater-Booth) had left town, and that he was not able to answer the Question for him.

THE CIRCUITS.—QUESTION.

VISCOUNT MILTON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it is true that the Government do not intend to take into consideration the necessity of holding Assizes at some convenient place within the South-Western Division of Yorkshire?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he had answered two days ago a somewhat similar Question put to him by the noble Lord. A Commission was now taking into consideration all the circumstances connected with the discharge of judicial business, and, pending the inquiry by that Commission, he did not think it would be convenient to establish any new Assize town.

VISCOUNT MILTON said, he wanted to know whether the right hon. Gentleman would consider the question?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he would defer the consideration of the matter pending the inquiry by the Commission.

LORD NAPIER'S PENSION.

QUESTION.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the

Treasury, Whether it would not be a desirable and appropriate completion of the provision made by Parliament for the support of the title conferred on Lord Napier of Magdala, if a pension equivalent to that already granted by Parliament was made to extend to Lady Napier, in case of any unforeseen contingency?

Mr. DISRAELI said, in reply, that the provision that had been made by Parliament on the recommendation of Her Majesty for Lord Napier of Magdala, in consideration of his eminent services, had been well considered by Her Majesty's Government with reference to all the circumstances; and therefore he could not hold out any hope that the matter would again be open to consideration.

CASE OF MR. GEORGE F. TRAIN.

QUESTION.

Mr. REARDEN said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the attention of the Irish Government has been called to a statement by Mr. George Francis Train's solicitor, that he applied to the Chief Clerk of the Court of Judge Miller, of Dublin, for leave to file an affidavit of Mr. Clark Bell, the solicitor, who paid Mr. Henry the Ebbw Vale Company's claim, being the debt for which Mr. Train is now detained in prison, in order that Mr. Train might be in time to make application on the 29th instant to Judge Miller for his discharge, being the last day on which Judge Miller would sit before the end of the long vacation in November next, and which application would be grounded on the affidavit then presented to him; but that the Chief Clerk in the most peremptory manner refused to receive the affidavit on the files of the Court, on the pretext that the same was not in proper form, and not written on paper prescribed by the rules of the Court; that the affidavit of Mr. Clark Bell was sworn to at Venice, Italy, by Mr. Train, before the British Consul; and whether, if such statement be correct, the Irish Government will recommend that the case of Mr. Train be referred to the Master of the Court of Exchequer in Ireland, in order that the facts and circumstances connected with Mr. Train's continued imprisonment may be inquired into, with a view to his discharge, should it appear that such imprisonment is unjust?

The Earl of MAYO said, in reply, that neither his attention nor that of the Irish Government had been called to this case. The hon. Member must be aware that the Executive Government had no power to interfere in the proceedings of Courts of Justice, and therefore it would be highly improper were the Government to institute any inquiry into the matter. He might, however, state that the hon. Gentleman must be labouring under some mistake, as he found that the case was set down for hearing for that day.

TAXATION OF MORTGAGES.

QUESTION.

Mr. Alderman SALOMONS said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, with regard to Benefit Societies, the sum at which mortgages would be taxable under the Inland Revenue Act would be £200 or £500?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, in reply, that the effect of the Inland Revenue Act would take away the exemptions from taxation of loans by Benefit Societies to strangers, but the exemption would be continued in favour of advances not exceeding £500 made by those Societies to their own members.

ARMY—HOUSEHOLD BRIGADE.

QUESTION.

Mr. NEATE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has made any inquiry into the circumstances to which he had drawn his attention the other day, of the Household Brigade being kept out in the heat on Wormwood Scrubs from eight in the morning until half past two o'clock in the afternoon, the result being that seven men had to be carried off the ground in vans, and seven or eight others had to be sent to the Hospital?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that he had made inquiries, and that he had been unable to obtain any confirmation of the rumour.

In answer to Mr. Otway,

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that the story of a number of the household cavalry having had to be sent home in cabs, and taken into the hospital after the field-day at Wormwood Scrubs on Tuesday week, was, so far as he could ascertain, without foundation.

Mr. OTWAY: Well, I can assure you that it is true.

Mr. NEATE: Will the right hon. Gentleman state of whom he made his inquiries?

ARMY—INSUBORDINATION AT THE WINDSOR REVIEW.—QUESTION.

Lord ELCHO said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in the first place, Whether he can state to the House what has been the result of the inquiry instituted for the purpose of ascertaining whether any insubordination had been shown by any of the Volunteers on their return from the Windsor Review; and whether, in the event of its being proved that any insubordination had occurred, any steps have been taken to strike out of the Army the companies or company which had been guilty of such insubordination; and, secondly, whether it is the intention of the right hon. Gentleman during the Recess to take steps to ascertain whether the opinion held by some that the Volunteer Force could not be kept up to their present strength upon the present Parliamentary Capitation Grant is or is not well founded?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: Sir, in answer to the first part of the Question of the noble Lord, I have to state that in consequence of information I received in regard to the alleged insubordinate conduct of the Second Company of the First Administrative Battalion of the Hertfordshire Volunteers on the occasion in question, I called on the Commanding Officer for an explanation of the circumstance. I am sorry to say that the explanation I received was by no means satisfactory, and that it became my painful duty to advise that the Second Company of the First Hertfordshire should be removed from the Army List. A similar charge of insubordination on the same day has been made against the Ninth Essex Corps; but, as the inquiry has not yet been completed, it is not in my power to state the course which I shall pursue. With regard to the latter part of the Question, I am not prepared to institute a formal inquiry into the matter; but I shall always be open to any fresh facts which may be placed before me.

DEATHS IN COLDBATH FIELDS PRISON.

QUESTION.

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to several cases of persons dying in Coldbath Fields Prison during the period of their incarceration, and that the verdicts of the Coroner's Inquests were such as to warrant further inquiry; and, if not, whether he will institute an inquiry into the subject?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that he had made inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining the truth of a statement that several prisoners had died in Coldbath Fields Prison under circumstances that had induced the Coroner's Juries to return verdicts which called for further inquiry. He was informed that one adverse verdict had been given, and he intended to make further inquiry into the matter.

UNITED STATES — ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. Speaker acquainted the House, That, in pursuance of a Resolution of the Congress of the United States of America, a Volume containing the expressions of condolence and sympathy communicated to the United States Government on the subject of the Assassination of Abraham Lincoln, late President of the United States of America, and the attempted Assassination of William H. Seward, Secretary of State, and Frederick W. Seward, Assistant Secretary, on the evening of the 14th of April 1865, has been transmitted to the House of Commons as a testimonial of the grateful appreciation by the People of the generous expressions of condolence and sympathy in the late national bereavement communicated by the House of Commons to the Department of State of the United States.

Lord STANLEY said, he rose to move a Resolution of Thanks from the House to the Congress of the United States of America for the gift of a volume in reference to the late President Lincoln, and that the Resolution be forwarded to Mr. Secretary Seward for presentation to Congress.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolved, That this House accepts, with much gratification, the Volume transmitted to them in pursuance of the Resolution of the Congress of the United States, and hereby directs that the said Volume be placed in the Library of the House; and that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to Mr. Secretary Seward with a request that he will communicate the same to the Congress of the United States.—(*Lord Stanley.*)

ITALY—CONSULAR CHAPLAIN AT NAPLES.—QUESTION.

MR. HARDCASTLE said, in the absence of his hon. Friend (Mr. Hubbard), he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the stipend of the Rev. Pelham T. Maitland, Consular Chaplain at Naples, has been withdrawn; and, if so, then upon what grounds, and especially whether the reasons for such withdrawal affect in any degree the high character Mr. Maitland has always maintained at Naples as a Clergyman of the Church of England?

LORD STANLEY: Sir, what has happened at Naples is this. Very acrimonious disputes having arisen amongst the English congregation, and the parties concerned having refused to abide by the decision of the Ecclesiastical authorities, I thought it was not seemly that Her Majesty's Government should be mixed up with the affair, and I therefore felt it my duty to withdraw the grant which had been made under the Consular Act. I am glad, however, to have it in my power to state that what has occurred does not in the slightest degree affect the personal character of Mr. Maitland, whom I have always heard spoken of in the highest terms.

CHINA—TREATY OF TIEN-TSIN.

QUESTION.

COLONEL SYKES said, he was desirous of learning, Whether the noble Lord the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has had any communication from the Envoy of China with regard to the Treaty of Tien-tsin?

LORD STANLEY said, he had received no such communication. He was not aware when the gentleman referred to was expected in this country.

REPEAL OF THE UNION WITH IRELAND.—LEAVE.

MR. REARDEN moved for leave to bring in a Bill for the amendment of the Act of Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, the establishment of a Federal Parliament and independent Legislature in Ireland, the separation of the National Debts and Revenues of the two countries, and the responsibility of each Country for its own debt and its reduction.

No hon. Member seconding the Motion, it was not put from the Chair.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The House went: and the ROYAL ASSENT was given to several Bills.

And afterwards a Speech of The LORDS COMMISSIONERS was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by The LORD CHANCELLOR.

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Thursday* the Eighth Day of *October* next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Thursday* the Eighth Day of *October* next.

[TABLE OF STATUTES.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1867-8.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons, dated 9 July 1868 ;—*for*,

A RETURN "of the Number of DAYS on which THE HOUSE SAT in the Session of 1867-8, stating, for each Day, the Date of the Month, and the Day of the Week, the Hour of Meeting, and the Hour of Adjournment ; and the Total Number of Hours occupied in the Sittings of The House, and the Average Time ; and showing the Number of Hours on which The House Sat each Day, and the Number of Hours after Midnight ; and the Number of Entries in each Day's Votes and Proceedings (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.146, of Session 1867)."

(*Mr. Charles Forster.*)

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
1867									
Nov. 19	Tu	1½	7	45	6	15	-	-	23
,, 20	W	12	1	30	1	30	-	-	8
,, 21	Th	4	6	15	2	15	-	-	29
,, 22	F	4	5	30	1	30	-	-	13
,, 25	M	4	5	45	0	45	-	-	23
,, 26	Tu	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	24
,, 27	W	12	1	15	1	15	-	-	14
,, 28	Th	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	31
,, 29	F	4	10	30	6	30	-	-	39
,, 30	S	12	12	30	0	30	-	-	8
Total...	10	- -	-	-	38	15	1	45	212
Dec. 2	M	4	5	30	1	30	-	-	41
,, 3	Tu	4	7	15	3	15	-	-	32
,, 5	Th	4	7	0	3	0	-	-	33
,, 6	F	4	7	0	3	0	-	-	38
,, 7	S	12	1	45	1	45	-	-	14
	Adjourned till Thursday, 13th February.								
Total...	5	- -	-	-	12	30	-	-	158
1868									
Feb. 13	Th	4	7	30	3	30	-	-	68
,, 14	F	4	9	45	5	45	-	-	195
,, 17	M	4	9	15	5	15	-	-	184
,, 18	Tu	4	11	0	7	0	-	-	68
,, 19	W	12	4	0	4	0	-	-	25
,, 20	Th	4	5	45	1	45	-	-	64
,, 21	F	4	8	0	4	0	-	-	29
,, 24	M	4	6	30	2	30	-	-	180
,, 25	Tu	4	4	45	0	45	-	-	55
	Adjourned till Friday, 28th February.								
,, 28	F	4	4	45	0	45	-	-	52
Total...	10	- -	-	-	35	15	-	-	920
Mar. 5	Th	4	8	0	4	0	-	-	86
,, 6	F	4	8	45	4	45	-	-	46
,, 9	M	4	11	30	7	30	-	-	69
,, 10	Tu	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	55
,, 11	W	12	5	15	5	15	-	-	44
,, 12	Th	4	12	0	8	0	-	-	53
,, 13	F	4	12	0	8	0	-	-	59
,, 16	M	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	65
,, 17	Tu	4	8	0	4	0	-	-	60
,, 18	W	12	5	30	5	30	-	-	59
,, 19	Th	4	11	45	7	45	-	-	73
,, 20	F	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	63
cont.									
Mar. 23	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	75
,, 24	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	82
,, 25	W	12	5	45	5	45	-	-	47
,, 26	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	78
,, 27	F	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	58
,, 30	M	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	84
,, 31	Tu	4	12	0	8	0	-	-	62
Total...	19	- -	-	-	142	45	10	15	1,221
Apr. 1	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	40
,, 2	Th	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	85
,, 3	F	4	3	15	11	15	3	15	90
	Adjourned till Monday, 20th April.								
,, 20	M	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	86
,, 21	Tu	4	11	30	7	30	-	-	71
,, 22	W	12	5	15	5	15	-	-	50
,, 23	Th	4	11	15	7	15	-	-	98
,, 24	F	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	70
,, 27	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	111
,, 28	Tu	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	73
,, 29	W	12	5	45	5	45	-	-	42
,, 30	Th	4	3	0	11	0	3	0	86
Total...	12	- -	-	-	97	20	9	45	902
May 4	M	4	11	30	7	30	-	-	119
,, 5	Tu	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	85
,, 6	W	12	3	45	3	45	-	-	41
,, 7	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	81
,, 8	F	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	81
,, 11	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	95
,, 12	Tu	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	81
,, 13	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	54
,, 14	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	89
,, 15	F	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	66
,, 18	M	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	103
,, 19	Tu	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	91
,, 20	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	43
,, 21	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	88
,, 22	F	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	78
,, 25	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	106
,, 26	Tu	4							
	Adjourned till Thursday, 28th May.								
,, 28	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	116
,, 29	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	70
	Adjourned till Thursday, 4th June.								
Total...	19	- -	-	-	151	5	16	0	1,487

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1867-8.

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned. H.	M.	Hours of Sitting. H.	M.	Hours after Midnight. H.	M.	Entries in Votes.
1868									
June 4	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	77
„ 5	F	4	9	45	5	45	-	-	56
„ 8	M	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	98
„ 9	Tu	12	8	15	8	15	-	-	48
„ 10	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	56
„ 11	Th	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	70
„ 12	F	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	64
„ 15	M	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	87
„ 16	Tu	2	1	15	11	15	1	15	50
„ 17	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	55
„ 18	Th	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	76
„ 19	F	4	4	15	0	15	-	-	17
„ 22	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	75
„ 23	Tu	2	1	45	11	45	1	45	60
„ 24	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	41
„ 25	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	89
„ 26	F	2	12	30	10	30	0	30	73
„ 29	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	109
„ 30	Tu	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	72
Total...	19	- -	-	-	162	10	20	15	1,273
1868									
July 1	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	54
„ 2	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	72
„ 3	F	2	1	45	11	45	1	45	65
„ 6	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	89
„ 7	Tu	2	1	30	11	30	1	30	68
„ 8	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	53
„ 9	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	69
„ 10	F	2	2	30	12	30	2	30	72
„ 13	M	4	2	30	15	30	2	30	91
„ 14	Tu	2	2	0	10	0	2	0	63
„ 15	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	45
„ 16	Th	12	3	0	16	0	3	0	68
„ 17	F	2	2	30	12	30	2	30	60
„ 18	S	12	5	0	5	0	-	-	36
„ 20	M	4	3	15	11	15	3	15	55
„ 21	Tu	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	43
„ 22	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	37
„ 23	Th	2	9	15	7	15	-	-	25
„ 24	F	2	3	30	13	30	3	30	82
„ 25	S	12	2	45	2	45	-	-	30
„ 27	M	4	2	45	10	45	2	45	74
„ 28	Tu	2	5	30	3	30	-	-	38
„ 29	W	3¾	5	15	1	30	-	-	46
„ 31	F	1½	Prorogation.				-	-	30
Total...	24	- -	-	-	203	0	32	15	1,365

SUMMARY.

Month.	Days of Sitting.	Hours of Sitting. H.	M.	Hours after Midnight. H.	M.	Entries in Votes.
1867						
November ...	10	38	15	1	45	212
December ...	5	12	30	-	-	158
1868						
February......	10	35	15	-	-	920
March.........	19	142	45	10	15	1,221
April	12	97	20	9	45	902
May	19	151	5	16	0	1,487
June...........	19	162	10	16	15	1,273
July	24	203	0	32	15	1,365
Total......	118	842	20	90	15	7,538

Average Time of Sitting, 7 Hours, $8\frac{36}{118}$ Minutes.

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1867-8.

(PARL. PAPER 0·145.)

SUMMARY.

Number of Divisions on Public Business before Midnight	134
Ditto „ „ „ after Midnight	30
Ditto—Private Business	4
Total Number of Divisions in Session 1867-8	168

A

TABLE OF ALL THE STATUTES

PASSED IN THE THIRD SESSION OF

THE NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

31° & 32° *VICT.*

PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS.

I. AN Act to apply the Sum of Two million Pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year ending the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight.

II. An Act to grant to Her Majesty additional Rates of Income Tax.

III. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (*Ireland*) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

IV. An Act to amend the Law relating to Sales of Reversions.

V. An Act for the Amendment of "The Metropolitan Streets Act, 1867."

VI. An Act to forbid the Issue of Writs for Members to serve in this present Parliament for the Boroughs of *Totnes*, *Reigate*, *Great Yarmouth*, and *Lancaster*.

VII. An Act to further continue the Act of the Twenty-ninth Year of the Reign of Her present Majesty, Chapter One, intituled *An Act to empower the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of* Ireland *to apprehend, and detain for a limited Time, such Persons as he or they shall suspect of conspiring against Her Majesty's Person and Government.*

VIII. An Act to provide for the Acquisition of a Site for a Museum in the East of *London*.

IX. An Act to regulate the Disposal of extra Receipts of Public Departments.

X. An Act to apply the Sum of Three hundred and sixty-two thousand three hundred and ninety-eight Pounds Nineteen Shillings and Ninepence out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Years ending the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven and the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight.

XI. An Act to amend an Act to make further Provision for the Despatch of Business in the Court of Appeal in Chancery.

XII. An Act to facilitate the Alteration of Days upon which, and of Places at which, Fairs are now held in *Ireland*.

XIII. An Act to apply the Sum of Six million Pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year ending on the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine.

XIV. An Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better Payment of the Army and their Quarters.

XV. An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on shore.

XVI. An Act to apply the Sum of Seventeen million Pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year ending on the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine.

XVII. An Act to further continue and appropriate the *London* Coal and Wine Duties.

XVIII. An Act to give further Time for making certain Railways.

XIX. An Act for declaring valid certain Orders of Her Majesty in Council relating to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for *England* and to the Deans and Chapters of certain Churches.

XX. An Act to enable Persons in *Ireland* to establish Legitimacy and the Validity of Marriages, and the Right to be deemed Natural-born Subjects.

XXI. An Act to provide Compensation to Officers of certain discontinued Prisons.

XXII. An Act to amend the Law relating to Places for holding Petty Sessions and to Lock-up Houses for the temporary Confinement of Persons taken into Custody and not yet committed for Trial.

XXIII. An Act to render valid Marriages heretofore solemnized in the Chapel of Ease of *Frampton Mansel* in the Parish of *Sapperton* in the County of *Gloucester.*

XXIV. An Act to provide for carrying out of Capital Punishment within Prisons.

XXV. An Act to extend the Industrial Schools Act to *Ireland.*

XXVI. An Act to enable certain guaranteed *Indian* Railway Companies to raise Money on Debenture Stock.

XXVII. An Act for raising the Sum of One million six hundred thousand Pounds by Exchequer Bonds for the Service of the Year ending on the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine.

XXVIII. An Act to grant certain Duties of Customs and Income Tax.

XXIX. An Act to amend the Law relating to Medical Practitioners in the Colonies.

XXX. An Act to amend the Act of the Seventh and Eighth Years of the Reign of *Victoria,* Chapter Forty-four, relating to the Formation of *quoad sacra* Parishes in *Scotland,* and to repeal the Act of the Twenty-ninth and Thirtieth Years of the Reign of *Victoria,* Chapter Seventy-seven.

XXXI. An Act to amend the Act passed in the Session of Parliament held in *Ireland* in the Thirty-ninth Year of the Reign of His Majesty King *George* the Third, intituled *An Act for the better Regulation of Stockbrokers.*

XXXII. An Act for annexing Conditions to the Appointment of Persons to Offices in certain Schools.

XXXIII. An Act for the Collection and Publication of Cotton Statistics.

XXXIV. An Act to alter some Provisions in the existing Acts as to Registration of Writs in certain Registers in *Scotland.*

XXXV. An Act to extend the Provision in "The Duchy of *Cornwall* Management Act, 1863," relating to permanent Improvements.

XXXVI. An Act to make perpetual the Alkali Act, 1863.

XXXVII. An Act to amend the Law relating to Documentary Evidence in certain Cases.

XXXVIII. An Act for the Appropriation of certain unclaimed Shares of Prize Money acquired by Soldiers and Seamen in *India.*

XXXIX. An Act to give Relief to Jurors who may refuse or be unwilling from alleged conscientious Motives to be sworn in Civil or Criminal Proceedings in *Scotland.*

XL. An Act to amend the Law relating to Partition.

XLI. An Act to make Provision in the Case of Boroughs ceasing to return Members to serve in Parliament respecting Rights of Election which have been vested in Persons entitled to vote for such Members.

XLII. An Act to amend the Act of the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Years of the Reign of Her Majesty, Chapter Fifty, by abolishing the Rate imposed by the said Act on all Occupiers of Premises within the extended Municipal Boundaries of the City of *Edinburgh.*

XLIII. An Act for extending the Provisions of The *Thames* Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) Act, 1864, and for amending the Powers of the Metropolitan Board of Works in relation to Loans under that Act.

XLIV. An Act for facilitating the Acquisition and Enjoyment of Sites for Buildings for Religious, Educational, Literary, Scientific, and other Charitable Purposes.

XLV. An Act to carry into effect a Convention between Her Majesty and the Emperor of the *French* concerning the Fisheries in the Seas adjoining the *British* Islands and *France,* and to amend the Laws relating to *British* Sea Fisheries.

XLVI. An Act to settle and describe the Limits of certain Boroughs and the Divisions of certain Counties in *England* and *Wales,* in so far as respects the Election of Members to serve in Parliament.

XLVII. An Act to amend "The Consecration of Churchyards Act, 1867."

XLVIII. An Act for the Amendment of the Representation of the People in *Scotland.*

XLIX. An Act to amend the Representation of the People in *Ireland.*

L. An Act to amend the Acts for the Administration of Prisons in *Scotland* in so far as regards the County of *Lanark;* and for other Purposes.

LI. An Act to amend the Law relating to Fairs in *England* and *Wales.*

LII. An Act to amend the Act for punishing idle and disorderly Persons, and Rogues and Vagabonds, so far as relates to the Use of Instruments of Gaming.

LIII. An Act to continue in force an Act of the Second Year of King *George* the Second, Chapter Nineteen, for the better Regulation of the Oyster Fishery in the River *Medway.*

LIV. An Act to render Judgments or Decreets obtained in certain Courts in *England, Scotland,* and *Ireland* respectively effectual in any other Part of the United Kingdom.

LV. An Act to provide for the Collection by means of Stamps of Fees payable in the Supreme and Inferior Courts of Law in *Scotland,* and in the Offices belonging thereto; and for other Purposes relative thereto.

LVI. An Act to amend the Act Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth *Victoria,* Chapter Sixty-six, for the safe keeping of Petroleum.

LVII. An Act to make Provision for the Appointment of Members of the Legislative Council of *New Zealand,* and to remove Doubts in respect of past Appointments.

LVIII. An Act to amend the Law of Registration so far as relates to the Year One thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight, and for other Purposes relating thereto.

LIX. An Act to amend the Law relating to Reformatory Schools in *Ireland.*

practical questions were at issue, arising out of the doubt as to whether the restoration of the Indian finances after the Mutiny had been so complete that practically the equilibrium had been established. If the equilibrium had been established it would have been obviously right to incur a more liberal expenditure in useful and reproductive works than would otherwise be possible, and it was also clearly right not to impose an excessive amount of unpopular direct taxation to maintain an unnecessary surplus. On those questions he had taken a different view from that of the Secretary of State of that time. That controversy between Lord Canning's Government and the Home Government should guide them for the future. He most cheerfully bore testimony to the fact that the administration of the Home Indian Government under the right hon. Baronet and the Marquess of Salisbury had been of a much more liberal tone than the policy of earlier times; but he could not help thinking the right hon. Baronet had spoken too gloomily of Indian finance, and he (Mr. Laing) proposed to point out why a more cheerful view of things should be taken. During and after the time of the Mutiny, the financial condition of India was one of extreme distress—there was an accumulated deficit in the four years from 1858 to 1861 of £42,000,000, so that the average deficit for the four years was £10,500,000 per annum; and during 1860 and 1861, two years after the Mutiny, the annual deficit amounted to the formidable figure of £5,250,000. Great efforts were then made towards the establishment of an equilibrium, and since 1861 those efforts had been practically successful. During those six years they had been paying their way. For three years there had been a surplus, and for three years a deficit, but the six years together showed that the debt had slightly diminished; at the commencement it was £113,000,000; in 1867 it was £108,000,000. The interest paid in the year 1862 was £5,160,000, and in 1867 it was £4,829,000. It was true, however, that the cash balance in 1862 had amounted to £17,000,000, and that it stood in 1867 at only £11,000,000; so that to within a few pounds India was in the same position as regarded her public debt, less cash balances, now as she occupied in 1862. This, he thought, proved the soundness of the view entertained by Lord Canning's Government as to the preservation of an equilibrium in the Indian Budget. And he thought it right to observe that the equilibrium of the Indian Budget was very different from the equilibrium of any European Budget, because in the former works were charged to revenue which in the latter would be charged to capital. From 1862 to the present year the cost of the public works undertaken in India was £28,667,000; of which no less than £16,000,000 was for original works and improvements exclusive of the cost of maintaining. Just about one-half of that £16,000,000 was for new civil and military buildings, and might be regarded as adding to the value of the public estate; the other half was for strictly reproductive works; so that £8,000,000 had been charged to revenue, which he ventured to say in the Budget of any other State in the world would have been charged to capital. In India the compensation for land taken for railways was charged to revenue, though it was as strictly a charge against capital as was the cost of constructing the railways themselves. During the last six years £15,000,000, or £2,500,000 a year, had been charged to revenue in India, which, if we took the analogy of any European State or any private railway company, would have been charged to capital. During the same period, though there had been no large war, India had not been completely tranquil and some of the military operations there had been attended with considerable expense. If there had been no increase in the cost of pay and provisions there ought to have been a diminution of £1,500,000 or £2,000,000 as compared with the military establishments of 1861-2; but, instead of a decrease, there had been a small increase. He thought, however, that the expenditure under this head would not have been an increasing one, and he believed that if peace continued, it would be possible to effect a reduction. Here he would observe that his experience led him to believe that if we wanted economy in military matters we must have a civilian primarily responsible for that expenditure—a Minister for War in England and a Governor General in India. In other words, we must not allow a Commander-in-Chief to control his own Estimates. But the Estimates being under the control of a civilian, one man ought to be made responsible for carrying out all the details; and a military man thoroughly acquainted with all the practical details of his profession, was best adapted for this latter duty. He believed that in respect of this matter second thoughts in India had been the worst. In his opinion

Clerks of the Crown in certain Boroughs in *Ireland*.

XCIX. An Act to continue certain Turnpike Acts in *Great Britain*, to repeal certain other Turnpike Acts, and to make further Provision concerning Turnpike Roads.

C. An Act to amend the Procedure in the Court of Session and the Judicial Arrangements in the Superior Courts of *Scotland*, and to make certain Changes in the other Courts thereof.

CI. An Act to consolidate the Statutes relating to the Constitution and Completion of Tithes to Heritable Property in *Scotland*, and to make certain Changes in the Law of *Scotland* relating to Heritable Rights.

CII. An Act to alter the Qualifications of the Electors in Places in *Scotland* under the "General Police and Improvement (*Scotland*) Act, 1862," or under the Act Thirteen and Fourteen *Victoria*, Chapter Thirty-three, and to amend the said Acts in certain other respects.

CIII. An Act to amend the Law which regulates the Burials of Persons in *Ireland* not belonging to the Established Church.

CIV. An Act to amend the Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

CV. An Act for enabling Her Majesty to accept a Surrender upon Terms of the Lands, Privileges, and Rights of "The Governor and Company of Adventurers of *England* trading into *Hudson's Bay*," and for admitting the same into the Dominion of *Canada*.

CVI. An Act for the Prevention of the holding of unlawful Fairs within the Limits of the Metropolitan Police District.

CVII. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Indorsing of Warrants in *Scotland*, *Ireland*, and the *Channel Islands*.

CVIII. An Act to amend the Laws for the Election of the Magistrates and Councils of Royal and Parliamentary Burghs in *Scotland*.

CIX. An Act for the Abolition of compulsory Church Rates.

CX. An Act to enable Her Majesty's Postmaster General to acquire, work, and maintain Electric Telegraphs.

CXI. An Act to continue various expiring Laws.

CXII. An Act to amend the Law of Registration in *Ireland*.

CXIII. An Act to render valid Marriages heretofore solemnized in the Chapel of Ease called *Saint James-the-Greater* Chapel, *Blakedown* in the Parish of *Hagley* in the County of *Worcester*.

CXIV. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for *England*.

CXV. An Act to amend "The Sanitary Act, 1866."

CXVI. An Act to amend the Law relating to Larceny and Embezzlement.

CXVII. An Act to amend the District Church Tithes Act, 1865, and to secure Uniformity of Designation amongst Incumbents in certain Cases.

CXVIII. An Act to make further Provision for the good Government and Extension of certain Public Schools in *England*.

CXIX. An Act to amend the Law relating to Railways.

CXX. An Act to relieve the Consolidated Fund from the Charge of the Salaries of future Bishops, Archdeacons, Ministers, and other Persons in the *West Indies*.

CXXI. An Act to regulate the Sale of Poisons, and alter and amend the Pharmacy Act, 1852.

CXXII. An Act to make further Amendments in the Laws for the Relief of the Poor in *England* and *Wales*.

CXXIII. An Act to amend the Law relating to Salmon Fisheries in *Scotland*.

CXXIV. An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Inland Revenue.

CXXV. An Act for amending the Laws relating to Election Petitions, and providing more effectually for the Prevention of corrupt Practices at Parliamentary Elections.

CXXVI. An Act to enable Her Majesty the Queen to carry into effect a Convention made between Her Majesty and other Powers relative to a Loan for the Completion of Works for the Improvement of the Navigation of the *Danube*.

CXXVII. An Act to prevent the Removal of the Tower of the Church of *Saint Mary Somerset* in the City of *London*, and for vesting the said Tower and the Site thereof, and a Portion of the Burial Ground attached to the said Church, in the Corporation of the said City.

CXXVIII. An Act to extend the Provisions of the Act Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth *Victoria*, Chapter One hundred and thirteen, to Persons who have held the Office of Lord High Commissioner of the *Ionian Islands*.

CXXIX. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Registration of Ships in *British* Possessions.

CXXX. An Act to provide better Dwellings for Artizans and Labourers.

LOCAL AND PERSONAL ACTS.

The Titles to which the Letter **P.** *is prefixed are Public Acts of a Local Character.*

i. AN Act for granting further Powers to the *Burry Port and Gwendreath Valley* Railway Company.

ii. An Act to authorize a Diversion of the Line and Alteration of the Levels of the *Devon Valley* Railway; and for other Purposes.

iii. An Act to make further Provision for lighting with Gas the Town and Parish of *Loughborough* in the County of *Leicester;* to incorporate the *Loughborough* Gas and Coke Company; and for other Purposes.

iv. An Act to confer certain additional Powers upon the *North London* Railway Company.

v. An Act to empower the *Grand Junction* Waterworks Company to raise further Money; to acquire additional Land; and for other Purposes.

vi. An Act for authorizing a Deviation of the *Newquay and Cornwall Junction* Railway, and for extending the Time for the Completion of that Railway; and for conferring further Powers on the *Newquay and Cornwall Junction* Railway Company, and on *Treffry's* Trustees, with reference to the *Newquay* Railway; and for other Purposes.

vii. An Act to enable the Metropolitan Board of Works to make Improvements in the Parish of *Saint Marylebone* in the County of *Middlesex* by forming a new Street in lieu of *Stingo Lane* from the *Marylebone Road* to *Upper York Street.*

viii. An Act to authorize the Construction of a Subway under the *Thames* from *Tower Hill* to the opposite Side of the River.

P. ix. An Act to confirm certain Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Act, 1866, relating to the Rivers *Blackwater* (*Essex*) and *Hamble.*

P. x. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Workington, Walton-on-the-Hill, West Derby, Eton, Llanelly, Oxenhope* and *Stanbury,* and *Keighley,* and for other Purposes relative to certain Districts under the said Act.

P. xi. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The General Police and Improvement (*Scotland*) Act, 1862," relating to the Burghs of *Perth* and *Brechin.*

P. xii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under the "General Police and Improvement (*Scotland*) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of *Broughty Ferry.*

xiii. An Act to authorize the Company of Proprietors of the *Lewes* Waterworks to raise more Money; and for other Purposes.

xiv. An Act to extend the Time for the compulsory Purchase of Lands, and for the Completion of the *Buckfastleigh, Totnes, and South Devon* Railway.

xv. An Act to provide for the finding and maintaining of One Chaplain in lieu of Two in the Parish of *Saint Saviour, Southwark;* and for other Purposes.

xvi. An Act for enabling the Local Board of Health for the District of *Loughborough* in the County of *Leicester* to construct and maintain Waterworks and supply Water within the District; to hold and regulate Fairs and Markets; and for other Purposes.

xvii. An Act for the altering, widening, and rebuilding a Bridge across the River *Severn* at *Stourport* in the County of *Worcester,* and for making further Provisions with respect to the said Bridge.

xviii. An Act for facilitating Arrangements with respect to the new Parish of *Saint Luke, King's Cross,* and other new Parishes and Districts, with a view to better Provision for the Cure of Souls within the original Limits of the Parish of *Saint Pancras* in the County of *Middlesex;* and for other Purposes.

xix. An Act to enable the *Dingwall and Skye* Railway Company to make Deviations of their authorized Line of Railway; and for other Purposes.

xx. An Act to authorize the *Brompton, Chatham, Gillingham, and Rochester* Waterworks Company to raise further Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxi. An Act to confer further Powers upon the *Carnarvon and Llanberis* Railway Company, and upon the *London and North-western* Railway Company, with respect to the *Carnarvon and Llanberis* Railway.

xxii. An Act for authorizing the Purchase by the Corporation of *Lincoln* of certain Common Rights, and the Diversion of a Road in *Canwick Common,* and the Sale of Portions of the said Common; and for other Purposes.

xxiii. An Act for incorporating the *Hythe and Sandgate* Gas and Coke Company (Limited), and defining the Limits of Supply of Gas by them, and regulating their Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxiv. An Act for empowering the Corporation of the Borough of *Leicester* to execute Works for Prevention of Floods on the River *Soar* and other Waters within the Borough, and additional Sewerage and Drainage Works, to make new Streets and Improvements, to establish a Vegetable Market, and to make Arrangements with the Visitors of the *Leicestershire and Rutland* Lunatic Asylum, and for establishing sanitary and other Regulations for the Borough; and for other Purposes.

xxv. An Act for enabling the Company of Proprietors of the Undertaking for recovering and preserving the Navigation of the River *Dee* to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

xxvi. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands for the Construction of the *Chester and West Cheshire Junction* Railway.

xxvii. An Act to enable the Local Board of Health for the District of *Leamington Priors* in the County of *Warwick* to purchase the Property of the *Leamington* Royal Pump Room Company (Limited) at *Leamington Priors*, and to maintain a Pump Room and Baths and Public Gardens and Pleasure Grounds in *Leamington Priors* for the Use and Enjoyment of the Inhabitants thereof; and for other Purposes.

xxviii. An Act for supplying with Water the Parishes, Townships, and Places of *Slough*, *Upton-cum-Chalvey*, *Stoke Poges*, *Langley*, *Datchet*, and *Farnham Royal*, in the County of *Buckingham;* and for other Purposes.

xxix. An Act to authorize the Borough of *Portsmouth* Waterworks Company to make and maintain Works in connexion with their present Waterworks, and to raise more Money; and for other Purposes.

xxx. An Act to authorize "the City of *Dublin* Steam Packet Company" to make further Arrangements for the Investment of their Contingency Fund; and for other Purposes.

P. xxxi. An Act to authorize the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for *England* and *Wales*.

xxxii. An Act to dissolve and re-incorporate the *Cork* Gas Consumers Company, Limited, and to provide for lighting the City of *Cork* with Gas; and for other Purposes.

xxxiii. An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Cork* to make a Diversion in the Line of the *Cork, Blackrock, and Passage* Railway; to authorize Agreements with the Harbour Commissioners; to define and extend the Powers of the Corporation in reference to Water Supply and Matters of local Government; to raise further Monies; to alter and amend the existing Acts relating to the Borough; and for other Purposes.

xxxiv. An Act for improving the Supply of Water to the Borough of *Haverfordwest*, for facilitating the Recovery of Market and other Tolls and Dues leviable in the Borough, for improving the Recreation Ground of the Borough; and for other Purposes.

xxxv. An Act to authorize the *Farnworth and Kearsley* Gas Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxxvi. An Act to extend the Limits of the Act for appointing a Stipendiary Justice of the Peace for the Parish of *Merthyr Tidvil* and adjoining Places; and for other Purposes.

xxxvii. An Act to enable the *Knighton*, the *Central Wales*, and the *Central Wales Extension* Railway Companies to take a Lease of the *Vale of Towy* Railway jointly with the *Llanelly* Railway and Dock Company; and for other Purposes.

xxxviii. An Act for vesting the several Undertakings of the *Knighton*, the *Central Wales*, and the *Central Wales Extension* Railway Companies in the *London and North-western* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

xxxix. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands for and for the Completion of certain of the Railways of the *Glasgow and South-western* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

xl. An Act for enabling the *Brentford* Gas Company to raise additional Capital; to construct new Works; to vary and extend the Limits of Supply; and for other Purposes.

xli. An Act to authorize the *Burslem and Tunstall* Gas Company to raise further Capital; and for other Purposes.

xlii. An Act to incorporate the *Clevedon* Gas Company, and to make further Provision for lighting with Gas the Parish of *Clevedon*, and certain Parishes and Places in the Neighbourhood thereof, in the County of *Somerset*.

xliii. An Act for conferring additional Powers on the *Midland* Railway Company for the raising of further Capital and the Construction of new Works; and for other Purposes.

xliv. An Act for making and maintaining a Market in the Parish of *St. Mary, Lambeth*, in the County of *Surrey*.

xlv. An Act for authorizing the *Leeds* New Gas Company to raise further Money, and acquire additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

P. xlvi. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to *Brightlingsea*, *Clevedon*, *Morecambe*, *Mousehole*, *Instow*, *Saltburn-by-the-Sea*, and *Southport;* and for amending the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861.

P. xlvii. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to *Carlingford Lough*, *Elgin* and *Lossiemouth*, *Greenock*, *Hunstanton*, *Tenby*, and *Torquay*.

xlviii. An Act for dissolving and re-incorporating the Proprietors of the *Yeadon and Guiseley* Gaslight and Coke Company; and for other Purposes.

xlix. An Act to confer further Powers on the *Midland* and *London and North-western* Railway Companies for the Construction of Works in connexion with their *Ashby and Nuneaton* Railway; and for other Purposes.

l. An Act for authorizing the *North and South Western Junction* Railway Company to make a Deviation or Alteration in their Main Line of Railway; to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

li. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands, and for the Completion of the *Uxbridge and Rickmansworth* Railway.

lii. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands, and for the Completion of the *Acton and Brentford* Railway.

liii. An Act to authorize the Construction by the *Great Northern* Railway Company of a new Road in the Town of *Leeds;* and for other Purposes.

liv. An Act to confirm the Issue of Stocks and Shares of the *Great Western* Railway Company in Payment of Dividends to the Holders of Stocks or Shares in the Company.

lv. An Act to repeal "The *West Riding and Grimsby* Railway (Extension) Act, 1865."

lvi. An Act to incorporate the *Ystrad* Gas and Water Company, Limited, and to make Provisions for the Supply of Gas and Water in the Parish of *Ystradyfodwg* in the County of *Glamorgan;* and for other Purposes.

lvii. An Act for amending the Provisions of "The *Alexandra* (*Newport*) Dock Act, 1865," with respect to the borrowing Powers of the *Alexandra* (*Newport*) Dock Company; and for other Purposes.

lviii. An Act to incorporate the *Humber* Conservancy Commissioners, and to make Provision for a Lease to them of Foreshores of the *Humber* and the Estuary thereof between the Confluence into the same of the Rivers *Ouse* and *Trent* and the Sea, and to amend the Enactments relating to the Commissioners; and for other Purposes.

lix. An Act for the Establishment of a united Constabulary Force in and for the University and City of *Oxford.*

lx. An Act to empower the Corporation of *Reading* to alter and improve or rebuild *Caversham Bridge* in the Counties of *Berks* and *Oxford;* and for other Purposes.

lxi. An Act to amend and enlarge the Provisions of "The *Reading* Waterworks Act, 1851;" to make further and better Provision for supplying the Town of *Reading* and the adjoining Districts with Water; and for other Purposes.

lxii. An Act to extend the Time for constructing the *Wexford* Branch and the *Kingstown Connecting* Branch of the *Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford* Railway Company; to make Arrangements as to the Capital of the Company; and for other Purposes.

lxiii. An Act to authorize the Abandonment of certain Portions of the Railways authorized by "The *North British* and *Edinburgh and Glasgow* (*Bridge of Forth*) Railways Act, 1865;" also an Extension of Time for the compulsory Purchase of Lands and the Completion of other Portions of the said Railways; and for other Purposes.

lxiv. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands for and the Construction of the Railways authorized by the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway (*Ripponden* and *Stainland* Branches, &c.) Act, 1865; to empower the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Company to subscribe to the *Hull* Docks; and for other Purposes.

lxv. An Act for further regulating the Capital of the *Bristol and Exeter* Railway Company, and for authorizing the Abandonment of the *Tiverton and North Devon* Railway; for extending the Time for making the *Brean* Railway; and for other Purposes.

lxvi. An Act for incorporating and granting certain Powers to the *Peterborough* Gas Company.

lxvii. An Act to authorize the Corporation of *Chichester* to remove the present Cattle Market, and to provide a new Cattle Market; and for other Purposes.

lxviii. An Act to amend the *Downpatrick, Dundrum, and Newcastle* Railway Act, 1866.

lxix. An Act to extend the Time for completing certain of the authorized Works of the *London and South-western* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

lxx. An Act for altering and amending "The *Maryport* Improvement and Harbour Act, 1866;" for authorizing new Works and extending the Powers of the Trustees; and for other Purposes.

lxxi. An Act for the Abandonment of the Undertaking of the *Ilfracombe* Railway Company, and for the Dissolution of that Company; and for other Purposes.

lxxii. An Act for enabling the *Sunderland and South Shields* Water Company to extend their Works and their Supply of Water, and to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

lxxiii. An Act to enable the *Potteries and Shrewsbury and North Wales* Railway Company to make a substituted Line of Railway, and to abandon a Portion of their authorized Railway; and for other Purposes.

lxxiv. An Act for dissolving the *Calverley* Gas Company (Limited) and the *Horsforth* Gas Company, and incorporating a Company for supplying with Gas certain Parts of the Parishes of *Calverley, Guiseley,* and *Addle,* in the West Riding of the County of *York.*

lxxv. An Act for empowering the Local Board for the District of *Wolborough* in the County of *Devon* to acquire Market and Fair Rights and Tolls, and to establish and hold Markets and Fairs; and for other Purposes.

lxxvi. An Act for better supplying with Gas the City of *Chichester* and adjoining Places; and for other Purposes.

lxxvii. An Act to incorporate the *Merthyr Tydfil* Gas Company, and to confer upon them Powers and make Provisions for more effectually supplying with Gas the Town of *Merthyr Tydfil* and its Neighbourhood; and for other Purposes.

lxxviii. An Act for better supplying with Water the Parishes of *Topsham, Clyst Saint George, Woodbury,* and *Lympstone,* in the County of *Devon.*

lxxix. An Act to amend and enlarge the Provisions of "The *Warrington* Waterworks Act, 1855;" to extend the Limits of the Company for the Supply of Water; to make further and better Provision for supplying *Warrington* and the adjoining Districts with Water; and for other Purposes.

P. lxxx. An Act to make Provision respecting the Use of Subways constructed by the Metropolitan Board of Works in the Metropolis.

lxxxi. An Act to enable the Local Board of Health in and for the District of the Borough of *Reading* to acquire the Undertaking of the *Reading* Waterworks Company; and for other Purposes.

P. lxxxii. An Act to authorize the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Special Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for *England* and *Wales.*

P. lxxxiii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage Act, 1861."

P. lxxxiv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Southampton, Bradford, Whitchurch* and *Dodington, Royton, Kendal,* and *Sunderland.*

P. lxxxv. An Act to confirm a certain Provisional Order under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the District of *Tormoham* (*Devonshire*).

P. lxxxvi. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Malvern, Cowpen, Bristol, Sheffield, Margate, Bognor,* and *Otley;* and for other Purposes relative to certain Districts under the said Act.

lxxxvii. An Act for authorizing the *Morley* Gas Company to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

lxxxviii. An Act to enable the *Waterford and Limerick* Railway Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

lxxxix. An Act for enlarging and improving the Court-houses and Public Buildings of the City of *Glasgow* and County of *Lanark*, and erecting additional Court-houses, Halls, and Buildings; and for other Purposes.

xc. An Act to amend "The *Itchen* Floating Bridge Act, 1863;" and for other Purposes.

xci. An Act to extend the Powers of the *Stourbridge* Railway Company with respect to the Branch Railway to *Stourbridge*.

xcii. An Act for incorporating and granting other Powers to the *Worthing* Gaslight and Coke Company.

xciiii. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands and for the Construction of the Works authorized by "The *Clonmel, Lismore, and Dungarvan* Railway Act, 1865."

xciv. An Act to authorize and incorporate Commissioners to supply with Gas the Town of *Dundee* and Districts and Places adjacent, and to transfer to them the Gasworks of the *Dundee* Gaslight Company and the *Dundee* New Gaslight Company; and for other Purposes.

xcv. An Act for supplying with Water *Ruthin* and Places adjacent in the County of *Denbigh*.

xcvi. An Act to authorize "The Commissioners for improving the Port and Harbour of *Waterford*" to construct a Dry Dock and Road, and other Works connected therewith respectively; and for other Purposes.

xcvii. An Act for the Extension of Time for the Purchase of Lands and Completion of Works authorized by "The *Barry* Railway Act, 1865," and "The *Barry* Railway (Alteration) Act, 1866;" and for other Purposes.

xcviii. An Act for making a Tramway from the *Somerset and Dorset* Railway at *Glastonbury* to *Street* in the County of *Somerset;* and for other Purposes.

xcix. An Act for authorizing the *Teign Valley* Railway Company to make and maintain a Deviation of their authorized Railway; and for other Purposes.

c. An Act for making a Railway from the *Wycombe* Branch of the *Great Western* Railway to *Great Marlow* in the County of *Buckingham;* and for other Purposes.

ci. An Act for authorizing the *Tottenham and Hampstead Junction* Railway Company to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cii. An Act to extend the Time for the compulsory Purchase of Lands for and for the Completion of the *Abergavenny and Monmouth* Railway.

ciii. An Act for granting Powers to the Proprietors of the *Windsor and Eton* Waterworks.

civ. An Act for authorizing the Corporation of the Borough of *Barrow-in-Furness* to supply with Gas and Water the Borough and adjacent Districts; to purchase the Undertaking of the *Furness* Gas and Water Company; for defining and extending the Powers of the Corporation in relation to the Improvement of the Borough, and to Police, and other Matters of Local Government; and for other Purposes.

cv. An Act for enabling the *Caledonian* Railway Company to abandon certain authorized Branches; for extending the Periods limited for the Acquisition of Lands and Construction of Works as respects their *Muirkirk* Branch; for raising additional Money; and for other Purposes.

cvi. An Act for consolidating the Acts relating to the Gaslight and Coke Company, for regulating their Capital, and for authorizing them to erect new Gasworks, and to construct other Works in connexion therewith, and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cvii. An Act to enable the *Kington and Eardisley* Railway Company to make Deviations of their authorized Railways; to abandon Portions of their Railways; to revive and extend the Powers of compulsory Purchase of Lands; and to use a Portion of the *Leominster and Kington* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cviii. An Act to grant further Powers to the *Metropolitan District* Railway Company.

cix. An Act for enabling the *Metropolitan* Railway Company to make a Junction Line in the Parish of *Saint Sepulchre* in the City of *London;* for giving Effect to Arrangements with other Companies; for extending the Time limited for the Purchase of certain Lands; for amending the Acts relating to the Company; and for other Purposes.

cx. An Act for the Improvement of the Township and District of *New Kilmainham* in the Barony of *Upper Cross* and County of *Dublin*.

cxi. An Act for altering the Streets in communication with the Embankment on the North Side of the *Thames;* for giving Effect to an Arrangement with the *South-eastern* Railway Company with respect to the Pier at *Hungerford*, and to an Arrangement with the *Metropolitan District* Railway Company; and for amending some of the Provisions of the Acts relating to the Embankment on the South Side of the *Thames;* and for other Purposes.

cxii. An Act to authorize the Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of the Royal Burgh of *Dundee* to construct a Sea Wall so as to enclose a Portion of the Alveus of the Frith of *Tay* opposite to the Burgh, and to form an Esplanade and a Road or Street on and within such Sea Wall; and for other Purposes.

cxiii. An Act for repealing the Gun Barrel Proof Act, 1855, and for making other Provisions in lieu thereof; and for altering the Constitution of the Guardians of the *Birmingham* Proof House; and for better ensuring the due Proof of Gun Barrels; and for other Purposes.

cxiv. An Act to confer further Powers on the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Company, and on the *Lancashire Union* Railways Company, with respect to certain Railways in *Lancashire* authorized to be constructed by them severally or jointly.

cxv. An Act for authorizing the Abandonment of a Portion of the Undertaking of the *Lancashire Union* Railways Company, and for extending the Time for the Completion of other Portions thereof; and for other Purposes.

cxvi. An Act to confer further Powers on the *Wolverhampton and Walsall* Railway Company.

cxvii. An Act to separate for certain Purposes Portions of the Borough of *Belfast* from the County of *Down*, and for other Purposes relating to the Improvement and Regulation of the Borough.

cxviii. An Act for conferring additional Powers on the *London and North-western* Railway Company for the Construction of new Works, and in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cxix. An Act for transferring the Waterworks of the *Dartford* Local Board of Health to the Company of Proprietors of the *Kent* Waterworks Company; and for other Purposes.

cxx. An Act for extending the Time limited for the compulsory Purchase of Lands authorized to be taken by the *London, Blackwall, and Millwall Extension* Railway Act, 1865, and also the Time limited for completing the Railways and Works under such Act; for authorizing Arrangements with other Companies; and for other Purposes in relation to the *London and Blackwall* Railway Company.

cxxi. An Act for granting further Powers to the *Saint Ives and West Cornwall Junction* Railway Company.

cxxii. An Act to authorize the *Holywell* Railway Company to divert and relinquish their authorized Railway, and to construct other Railways in substitution thereof; and for other Purposes.

cxxiii. An Act for the Abandonment of the Railways authorized by the *South-eastern* and *London, Chatham, and Dover* (*London, Lewes, and Brighton*) Railways Act, 1866.

cxxiv. An Act to authorize the Trustees of the *Clyde* Navigation to construct a Graving Dock, Quays or Wharfs, and other Works at the Harbour of *Glasgow*, and to borrow additional Money; and for other Purposes.

cxxv. An Act to amend the Metropolis Gas Act, 1860, and to make further Provision for regulating the Supply of Gas to the City of *London;* and for other Purposes connected therewith.

cxxvi. An Act for incorporating the *Eastbourne* Gas Company, and for conferring upon them further Powers for the Supply of Gas to the Town and Parish of *Eastbourne* and the Parish of *Willingdon* in the County of *Sussex;* and for other Purposes.

cxxvii. An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Halifax* to construct new Works in extension of their Waterworks; to extend their Limits of Supply; to acquire the Manufacturers' Hall; to improve the Borough of *Halifax;* and for other Purposes.

cxxviii. An Act for enabling the Corporation of the Borough of *Portsmouth* to construct a new Wharf or Quay in the *Camber;* for extending their Powers to levy Rates and Dues; and for other Purposes.

cxxix. An Act for authorizing the Local Board for the District of *Saint Mary Church* in the County of *Devon* to supply their District with Gas, to erect a Town Hall and other Buildings, and to raise Monies; and for other Purposes.

cxxx. An Act to amalgamate the Court of Record for the Hundred of *Salford* in the County of *Lancaster* and the Court of Record for the Trial of Civil Actions within the City of *Manchester*, and to constitute the said amalgamated Court the Court of Record for the Hundred of *Salford* in the County of *Lancaster*, with extended Powers, and to regulate the Practice and Procedure therein; and for other Purposes.

cxxxi. An Act to extend the Limits within which the *Staffordshire Potteries* Waterworks Company may supply Water, and to empower them to construct additional Works, and to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

cxxxii. An Act for extending the Time allowed for the Completion by the *Llanelly* Harbour and *Burry* Navigation Commissioners of certain Works; and for other Purposes.

cxxxiii. An Act for incorporating a Company for supplying with Gas the Parish of *Llangonoyd* and other Places in the County of *Glamorgan.*

cxxxiv. An Act to authorize the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to abandon certain Works; and for other Purposes.

cxxxv. An Act to enable the Metropolitan Board of Works to embank the River *Thames* between the Royal Hospital at *Chelsea* and *Battersea Bridge* in the County of *Middlesex*, and to make a Roadway and other Works connected therewith; and for other Purposes.

cxxxvi. An Act to authorize the *Greenock and Ayrshire* Railway Company to make and maintain certain Railways and Works; and for other Purposes.

cxxxvii. An Act to extend the Powers of the *Pontypool, Caerleon, and Newport* Railway Company.

cxxxviii. An Act for improving and maintaining the Harbour of *Aberdeen.*

cxxxix. An Act to authorize the *North British* Railway Company to execute various Railways and Works, and to abandon certain Railways and Works; and to extend the Time for the compulsory Purchase of Lands and Completion of Works with reference to several Railways and Works; and to amend in various Particulars the Acts relating to the Company passed in the last Session of Parliament; and for other Purposes.

cxl. An Act for authorizing the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Bradford* to make and maintain additional Waterworks, and for making additional Provision for Improvement of the Borough; and for other Purposes.

cxli. An Act to change the Name of the *Waterford and Kilkenny* Railway Company; to confer upon them further Powers; and for other Purposes.

cxlii. An Act for suspending legal Proceedings with reference to the *Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction* Railway Company; for converting the Mortgage and other Debts into Debenture Stock; for authorizing the Completion of certain Lines of Railway; for regulating the Capital and future Management of the Company; and for other Purposes.

cxliii. An Act for conferring further Powers upon the *Derby* Waterworks Company.

cxliv. An Act to enable the *Athenry and Ennis Junction* Railway Company to make Arrangements with other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cxlv. An Act for conferring further Powers on the *Great Western* Railway Company for the Construction of Works and in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cxlvi. An Act for making the Acts of Parliament relating to the Ecclesiastical Commission applicable to the reputed Parishes of *Saint Leonard* and *Saint Mary Magdalen* in the Diocese of *Chichester;* and for other Purposes connected therewith.

cxlvii. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands and Completion of Works of the *Ardmore* Harbour; and to confer further Powers on the *Ardmore* Harbour Company.

cxlviii. An Act to make Alterations in the Deed of Settlement of the *Norwich Union* Life Insurance Society; and for other Purposes.

cxlix. An Act for granting further Powers to "The *Metropolitan and Saint John's Wood* Railway Company."

P. cl. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Poor Law Board under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, with reference to the City of *Salisbury.*

P. cli. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (*Ireland*) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

P. clii. An Act to confirm a certain Provisional Order under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the District of *Tunbridge Wells.*

P. cliii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Harrogate, Layton with Warbrick, Bury, Lower Brixham, Hexham, Tipton, Gainsborough, Worthing, Aberystwith, Cockermouth, Burnham, Wednesbury, Burton-upon-Trent, Hornsey,* and *Keswick,* and for other Purposes relative to certain Districts under the said Act.

P. cliv. An Act to make better Provision for the Preservation and Improvement of the River *Lee* and its Tributaries; and for other Purposes.

P. clv. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Public Health (*Scotland*) Act, 1867," relating to the Burgh of *Tain.*

P. clvi. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Land Drainage Act, 1861."

clvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (*Ireland*) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

P. clviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (*Ireland*) Act, and the Acts amending the same.

clix. An Act for the Extension of Time and Revival of Powers for the compulsory Purchase of Lands and Completion of Works authorized by "The *Fareham and Netley* Railway Act, 1865;" and for other Purposes.

clx. An Act for the better Ecclesiastical Regulation of the Parish of *Saint Pancras* in the Diocese of *London* and the County of *Middlesex.*

clxi. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands and Completion of the *Mersey* Railway; and for other Purposes.

clxii. An Act for the Abandonment of the Railway authorized by "The *Chichester and Midhurst* Railway (Extension) Act, 1865."

clxiii. An Act to confer further Powers on the *East London* Railway Company for the Execution of Works, and otherwise with reference to their Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

clxiv. An Act to extend the Time for the compulsory Purchase of Lands and Completion of Works authorized by several Acts relating to the *Great Eastern* Railway; and to alter certain Powers of appointing Directors of the *Great Eastern* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

clxv. An Act for enabling the *Star* Life Assurance Society to sue and be sued in their own Name; and for other Purposes.

clxvi. An Act to empower the *Belfast Central* Railway Company to construct new Railways and Tramways and a Central Station, and to abandon Portions of their authorized Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

clxvii. An Act for making Street Tramways in *Liverpool;* and for other Purposes.

clxviii. An Act for making and maintaining a Market in the Borough of *Lambeth* in the County of *Surrey.*

clxix. An Act to extend the Powers of the *Waterloo and Whitehall* Railway Company with respect to a Portion of their authorized Undertaking.

clxx. An Act to provide for the Settlement of the Claims of the Contractors and others with respect to the Construction of the *Bishop Stortford* Railway, and for vesting the Possession of that Railway in the *Great Eastern* Railway Company.

clxxi. An Act to incorporate a Company for making "The *Weedon and Daventry* Railway;" and for other Purposes.

clxxii. An Act for granting certain Powers to the *South-eastern* Railway Company.

clxxiii. An Act to provide for the closing of the *Wey and Arun Junction* Canal, and the Sale of the Site thereof; and for other Purposes.

clxxiv. An Act for authorizing the *Devon and Cornwall* Railway Company to alter the Line and Levels of Parts of their Railways; and for other Purposes.

clxxv. An Act to alter and amend the Act relating to the Towns Drainage and Sewage Utilization Company; and for other Purposes.

clxxvi. An Act to make more effectual Provision for the working of the *Cork and Kinsale Junction* Railway; and for other Purposes.

clxxvii. An Act for fusing all the Revenues of the *Cambrian* Railways Company, and settling the Application thereof; and to confer Rights of Voting on the Preference Shareholders of that Company; and for other Purposes.

clxxviii. An Act to authorize the *Bristol and North Somerset* Railway Company to deviate from the authorized Line of their Railway at *Bristol;* and for other Purposes.

clxxix. An Act to extend and amend the Borrowing Powers of the *Belgravia* Road Company; and for other Purposes.

clxxx. An Act to grant further Powers to the *Cork and Macroom* (*Direct*) Railway Company.

clxxxi. An Act for making Railways in the *Isle of Wight* to connect *Newport* and *Cowes* with *Sandown, Ryde,* and *Ventnor.*

clxxxii. An Act to confer Facilities on the *Rathkeale and Newcastle Junction* Railway Company for raising Funds under their Borrowing Powers.

[PRIVATE ACTS.

PRIVATE ACTS,

PRINTED BY THE QUEEN'S PRINTER,

AND WHEREOF THE PRINTED COPIES MAY BE GIVEN IN EVIDENCE.

1. An Act to incorporate the Trustees and Managers of *Alexander Scott's* Hospital at *Huntly* in the County of *Aberdeen*, and to extend the Benefits thereof.
2. An Act to enable *William Dunn Gardner* Esquire, upon purchasing the respective Reversions of and in certain Leasehold Estates devised by the Will of *William Dunn Gardner*, deceased, to charge the said Estates with the Purchase Money and the Expenses incident to such Purchase, and to convey or cause to be conveyed the same Estates by way of Mortgage to secure the Payment of the said Purchase Money and Expenses, without incurring a Forfeiture of his Estate and Interest under the same Will; and for other Purposes.
3. An Act to enable Sir *Charles Compton William Domvile* Baronet to borrow upon the Security of his Entailed Estates situate in the County of *Dublin*, a Sum of Money for the Repayment to him of a Portion of the Monies laid out by him in the Improvement of the said Estates.
4. An Act for authorizing the Trustees under an Act passed in the Thirty-ninth and Fortieth Years of His Majesty King *George* the Third, for enabling the Duke of *Richmond* for the Time being to grant Jointures as therein mentioned, and for other Purposes, to sell certain Parts of the Duke of *Richmond's* Settled Estates, and to invest the Money to arise from such Sales in the Purchase of other Estates, to be settled to the same Uses; and also to raise a Sum of Thirty thousand Pounds by Mortgage of the Settled Estates, to be invested in the same Manner; and for other Purposes.
5. An Act to carry into effect an Arrangement approved in the Suits of "*Hamp* v. *Hamp*," "*Hamp* v. *Robinson*," and "*Hamp* v. *Bolt*," now depending in the High Court of Chancery, for the Purpose of compromising certain opposing Claims to the Real Estates of *Francis Hamp*, late of *Bacton Villa* in the Parish of *Bacton* in the County of *Hereford*, Esquire; and for other Purposes.
6. An Act to extend the Powers contained in the Will of the Right Honorable *John Savile Lumley Savile*, Earl of *Scarbrough*, deceased, and in the "*Savile* Estate (Leasing) Act, 1861," with respect to certain Estates in the County of *York*, Part of the *Savile* Estates devised by or subject to the Trusts of the said Will, and for other Purposes, and of which the Short Title is "*Savile* Estate (Extension of Powers) Act, 1868."
7. An Act to extend and amend *Ward Jackson's* Estate Act, 1853; and for other Purposes.
8. An Act to provide for the vesting and Management of certain Funds held in trust by the Town Council of *Aberdeen;* and for other Purposes.

PRIVATE ACTS,

NOT PRINTED.

9. An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to *Perry Green Gardiner* of the City of *New York* in the *United States of America*.
10. An Act to confer upon *Henry William Ferdinand Bolckow* all the Rights, Privileges, and Capacities of a natural-born Subject of Her Majesty the Queen.
11. An Act to confer upon *Christian Allhusen* all the Rights, Privileges, and Capacities of a natural-born Subject of Her Majesty the Queen.

GENERAL INDEX TO SESSION 1867-8.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

It being a principal object of this Index, that the proceedings on each Motion shall be completely recorded, some abbreviations of forms were necessary. Those who are accustomed to the proceedings of Parliament will readily fill up the voids. Those who are not so familiar, may find the following explanation useful, but will find the whole *formulæ* set out at length in the "Contents."

The names which immediately follow the title of a Bill are those of the Peers or hon. Members who have charge of the Bill.

The numbers which are added at stages of Bills are the official numbers of the prints and reprints ordered at each stage, and, with the Statute, will enable the reader to follow all the changes the Bill has undergone.

The entries—Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a;" Amendt. "this day six months;" Question put, "That 'now,' &c."—indicate the usual form of raising the issue—namely, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

"*The Ballot*, Amendt. on Committee of Supply" indicates that the Question was raised by means of an Amendment moved on the Motion (after the Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee of Supply had been read), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." In this case the issue is formally raised by the Motion "To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add" other words. The decision is taken on the Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Nos. added to the "Parliamentary Papers" are in most cases those given in the Commons' "List of Papers for Sale."

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE THIRD SESSION OF

THE NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

31° & 32° VICTORIA.

1867-8.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1^a, 2^a, 3^a, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—1*st. Div.*, 2*nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

ABINGER Lord
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, 2R. [193] 1078, 1090
Salmon Fisheries (Scotland), 2R. [192] 1629

Abyssinia
Army, Batta to, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *June* 18, [192] 1756
Army, Return of the, Observations, The Earl of Ellenborough; Reply, The Earl of Malmesbury; short debate thereon *June* 19, [192] 1810
European Subaltern Officers, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Nov* 26, [190] 178
Stores, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Dec* 2, [190] 513

Abyssinia—cont.
Volunteers, Bounty to, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Dec* 7, [190] 677
Water Supply, Question, Lord John Hay; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Dec* 3, [190] 540

Despatches, The, Question, The Earl of Ellenborough; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *May* 22, [192] 693; Questions, Mr. Stansfeld, Captain Vivian, Mr. Layard; Answers, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 22, 716; Question, Mr. Layard; Answers, Mr. Disraeli, Sir Stafford Northcote *June* 15, 1564
Foreign Office—Papers and Correspondence, Question, Mr. Wyld; discussion thereon *Dec* 5, [190] 606; Question, Colonel Sykes;

Abyssinia—cont.

Answers, Lord Stanley, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 21, 1005

Indian Estimate of Cost, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 2, [191] 703; *April* 23, 1148

Magdala, Capture of, Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 27, [191] 1337

Merchant Ships, Return of, Question, Mr. Young; Answer, Mr. Corry *Nov* 29, [190] 420

Mule Drivers, Alleged Flogging of, Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 3, [191] 834

Postage from, Question, Mr. Butler; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 5, [190] 1115

Routes, Exploration of, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Nov* 28, [190] 336

Routes, Memorandum of, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Nov* 25, [190] 153

Telegraphic Communication, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Nov* 21, [190] 106; Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 22, [192] 718

Cameron, Consul, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Nov* 21, [190] 104; Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 26, 180

Envoys, The—Compensation to, Question, Lord Houghton; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *July* 27, [193] 1814

Krapf, Rev. Mr., Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Nov* 26, [190] 180

Mules, Purchase of—Contract with Messrs. Wetherell, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 22, [190] 145

Motion for an Address (*Captain Vivian*) *Nov* 28, 336; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 9, 1223

Presents from King Theodore to Consul Cameron and Mr. Rassam, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Dec* 6, [190] 643

Queen's Letter to King Theodore, Question, Mr. Schreiber; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 26, [190] 179

Rassam, Mr., Mission of, Observations, Mr. Schreiber; short debate thereon *Dec* 7, [190] 678

Egypt and Abyssinia, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 18, [190] 887; Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 21, 1003

Napier, Sir Robert, and Ex-Governor Eyre, Question, Captain Archdall *May* 22, [192] 715

See titles—*Supply—East India*, *Troops and Vessels*

Parl. Papers—

Correspondence, Papers, Routes, and Maps . . . . [2281] [2295]
Names of Prisoners . . . [3962]

[*cont.*

Abyssinian Expedition

LORDS—

192] *Vote of Thanks to the Army*, Observations, The Earl of Malmesbury *May* 26, 897; *June* 8, 1221

Vote of Thanks to Lieut.-Gen. Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., and the Land and Sea Forces serving on the Expedition into Abyssinia (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 2, 473; Resolutions agreed to, after debate

193] . The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That he had received a Letter from Lieut.-General Lord Napier of Magdala, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., in return to the Thanks of this House and to the Resolutions of the 2d Instant, communicated to him in obedience to an Order of this House of the said 2d Instant: The said Letter being read—Was Ordered to lie on the Table, and to be entered on the Journals *July* 20, 1459

. *Sir Robert Napier, Pension to*, Message from the Queen *July* 9, 865 [228S]

. Message read *July* 10, 973; after short debate, an Address agreed to *Nemine Contradicente*

COMMONS—

192] *Vote of Thanks to the Army*, Observations, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Gladstone *May* 26, 925

193] *Vote of Thanks to Lieut.-Gen. Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., and the Land and Sea Forces serving on the Expedition into Abyssinia* (*Mr. Disraeli*); Resolutions agreed to, after short debate *July* 2, 522

. Mr. Speaker acquainted the House, that he had received a Letter from Lord Napier of Magdala, dated the 18th day of this instant July, acknowledging the Thanks of this House to himself and other Officers for the success attending the Abyssinian Expedition; Letter read *July* 20, 1485

. *Sir Robert Napier, Pension to*, Message from Her Majesty *July* 9, 914

. Message from Her Majesty considered in Committee *July* 10, 1066

Resolved, *Nemine Contradicente*, That the annual sum of Two Thousand Pounds be granted to Her Majesty, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to be settled upon Lieutenant General Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., and the next surviving Heir Male of his Body, for the term of their natural lives

. *Lord Napier's Pension*, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 31, 1942

Parl. Papers—

Correspondence and Papers [3955 I. to VI.]
Names of Prisoners . . . [3962]
Routes and Plans . . . [3964]
Estimates . . . . . . P. 8, 219
Vote of Credit, 1868-9 . . 260
Ships Charters 91
Trade with India . . . 111
Letter from General Merewether 125
Condensing Vessels . . . 174
Despatches 337
European Officers . . . 206, 410

Acland, Mr. T. D., *Devonshire, N.*
Agriculture, Motion for a Committee, [192] 579
Army—Military Education, Res. [191] 1837
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1968
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 4, [190] 1420
Public Schools, Re-comm. [192] 1648; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1649, 1650; *cl.* 3, 1653, 1656; *cl.* 6, 1927, 1929, 1930, 1931; *cl.* 12, 1933; *cl.* 15, 1939; *cl.* 16, 1941; *add. cl.* [193] 822
Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 185
Supply—Volunteer Corps, [191] 275, 280, 282
Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 235

Adam, Mr. W. P., *Clackmannan, &c.*
Army—Storehouses for the War Office, [193] 1826
Bristol Writ, [193] 677
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1623
India—Mutiny Medal, [193] 305

Adderley, Right Hon. C. B. (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Staffordshire, N.*
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 1408
British Guiana—Clergy Act, [193] 1819
Canada—Alleged Flogging in a Prison, [192] 1698
Cape of Good Hope—Basuto Territory, [190] 1975; [192] 114
Ceylon—Affairs of, [190] 2027, 2030; [193] 1477
  Crops in, [192] 1755
  Unauthorized Publication of a Despatch, [192] 1015
Ceylon—Condition of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 975, 976, 978
Colonial Bishops, [192] 111
Darling, Sir C., [192] 1398
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1475
Eyre, Ex-Governor, and his Expenses, [192] 1477
Hudson's Bay Company, [192] 17
Jamaica—Clergy Act, [193] 1820
  Established Church in, [192] 1922, 1923
Lake Superior and the Pacific, &c., Motion for a Commission, [192] 1343
Mauritius—Condition of, [192] 713
  Fever in, [191] 660, 661; [192] 1856
New South Wales—Treason Felony Act, [192] 1754
New Zealand—Alleged Cruelties in, [193] 1104
  British Regiments in, [190] 1979
  Defence Corps, [190] 1890
Nova Scotia—British North American Confederation, Motion for an Address, [192] 1677
Passenger Acts, [191] 1575
Postal—Communication with Malta, [190] 801, 1102
  West India Mails, [190] 731
Queensland—Labourers from the South Sea Islands, [190] 1590; [191] 1882; [192] 816; [193] 1366

[*cont.*

Adderley, Right Hon. C. B.—*cont.*
Sierra Leone—Assistant Judge of, [192] 656; [193] 1818, 1819
Tortola—Alleged Submersion of, [190] 92
Vancouver's Island and British Columbia, [193] 1143;—Post Office, 1289
Victoria—Case of the Convict Millar, [191] 1576
  Despatches from, [192] 925
West Indies, Lords Amendts. [193] 1887, 1888
West Indies—Ecclesiastical Establishments in the, [190] 1004
  Hurricane in the, [190] 421

Adjouri, Case of
Motion for "Copy of Papers and Correspondence relative to the absconding of Adjouri from Manchester, leaving large debts owing to the merchants of that city" (*Mr. Bazley*) *June* 30, [193] 387; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Admiralty Monies and Accounts
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and report (1st) as to the application of Monies voted by Parliament for the use of the Admiralty; and (2ndly) as to the Accounts of the Department, and more especially as to the method in which they should be prepared for presentation to this House" (*Mr. Seely*) *Feb* 18, [190] 890; after debate, Motion amended, by inserting after "Admiralty" words "in the building, repairing, and equipment of Her Majesty's Ships," and agreed to
And, on *Mar* 9, Committee nominated as follows:— Mr. Seely (Chairman), Major Anson, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Candlish, Mr. Childers, Mr. Dalglish, Mr. Du Cane, Mr. Dyke, Sir Daniel Gooch, Sir John Hay, Lord Henry Lennox, Mr. Liddell, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Scourfield, Mr. Frederick Stanley, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy, and Mr. Weguelin
Report of Select Committee *July* 27 (*Parl. P.* No. 469)

Admiralty Suits Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Longford*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 29 (No. 182)
Read 2ª* *July* 7
Committee*; Report *July* 9
Read 3ª* *July* 10
c. Read 1°* *July* 13 [Bill 234]
Read 2°* *July* 16
Committee*; Report *July* 17
Read 3°* *July* 18
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 78]

Adulteration of Food or Drink Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Dixon, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Goldney*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Dixon*) *June* 9, [192] 1351; Bill ordered
Read 1°* *June* 10 [Bill 161]
Read 2°* *June* 23
Bill withdrawn* *July* 8

ADVOCATE, The Lord (Right Hon. E. S. Gordon), *Thetford*
Canongate Annuity Tax, 2R. Amendt. [191] 1091, 1096
Capital Punishment within Prisons, 2R. [190] 1141; Comm. *add. cl.* [191] 1063
Court of Justiciary (Scotland), Leave, [190] 1094
Court of Session (Scotland), Leave, [190] 1081, 1092; 2R. [192] 1516, 1524
Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland), Leave, [190] 1285
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1624, 1625
Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Leave, [190] 1282; Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1526; *cl.* 23, 1529
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 10, [193] 1879
Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [193] 1511
Registration of Writs (Scotland), 2R. [191] 100
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 811; 2R. 1264, 1265
192] Comm. 460; *cl.* 3, 474, 481, 484, 840 Amendt. 841, 843, 850, 852; *cl.* 4, 855; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 856; *cl.* 8, 882; Amendt. 893; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 959, 979; Amendt. 981; *cl.* 10, 983, 991, 992; *cl.* 12, 1006; *cl.* 15, 1008; *cl.* 25, 1009; *cl.* 51, *ib.*; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 1233; *add. cl.* 1234, 1235, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1239; *cl.* E, 1240; *cl.* O, 1241, 1242; Schedule A, 1251, 1255; Consid. *add. cl.* 1446, 1447; Lords Amendts. [193] 919
Scotland—Questions, &c.
  Agricultural Labourers' Dwellings, [190] 1287
  Bridge of Dunkeld, Tolls on the, [190] 885, 886; [193] 1671
  Committals, [193] 369, 370
  Education, [190] 1591; [191] 2002
  Established Church, [191] 1884
  Judicial Statistics, [190] 988
  Judicial System, [192] 2137
  Law Procedure, [190] 797
  Legislation for, [192] 245
  Middle Class Schools, [193] 649
  Ministers' Stipends, Edinburgh, [190] 1889
  Parochial Assessment, [193] 1483
  Poor Law, [192] 1631
  Railway Property, Assessment of, [193] 912
  Roads, [191] 357
  "Running his Letters," [193] 1166
  Supreme Civil Courts, [190] 537
  Trawling for Herrings, [191] 1882
Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland), Leave, [190] 1283

African Slave Trade—"The Aberdeen Act"
Observations, Mr. Layard; Reply, Lord Stanley *May* 22, [192] 718

AGAR-ELLIS, Hon. L. G. F., *Kilkenny Co.*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1369
Ireland—State of, Motion for Committee, [190] 1515
Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [193] 1503

AGNEW, Sir A., *Wigtonshire*
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 103, 153
Representation of the People (Scotland), [192] 18; Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. 857
Scotland—Poor Law, [192] 1631
Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts. [192] 1860
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [192] 306

Agricultural Labour, &c.—Report of Commission
Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 11, [192] 1397

Agriculture—Special Department for
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the functions of various Government Offices so far as they affect questions relating to Agriculture, with a view to provide for the due consideration of such questions by one Department responsible to Parliament" (*Mr. Acland*) *May* 19, [192] 579; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

AIRLIE, Earl of
Army—Conveyance of Troops—The War Office and India Office, [190] 174
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 510
Education, 2R. Amendt. [191] 1305, 1331
Harbour and Coast Defences, [190] 787
Nova Scotia—Motion for an Address, [193] 705
Poor Relief, Comm. [191] 464
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [193] 362, 364; 3R. 808
Salmon Fisheries (Scotland), 2R. [192] 1629
Scotland—Poor Assessment, Motion for Returns, [191] 328
  Poor Rate, Motion for a Paper, [192] 919

AKROYD, Mr. E., *Halifax*
Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 2009
India—Survey of, [193] 1103
Spain and Prussia—Treaty of Commerce, [191] 1147

Alkali Act Continuance Bill *afterwards*—**Alkali Act, 1863, Perpetuation Bill** [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Richmond*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 14 (No. 99)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 19, [192] 509; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *May* 22 (No. 114)
Read 3ª * *May* 26
c. Read 1° * *June* 4 [Bill 153]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Stephen Cave*) *June* 8, [192] 1296; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *June* 15
Considered * *June* 16
Read 3° * *June* 17
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 36]

ALLEN, Mr. W. S., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 14, [193] 1008
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1376

AMBERLEY, Viscount, *Nottingham*
Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 431
Boundary, Comm. [192] 283
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2188; *cl.* 7, [193] 745; *cl.* 37, 1174; *cl.* 45, 1178; Motion for Adjournment, 1184; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1370; Consid. *add. cl.* 1681, 1684
Libel, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 607
Supply—British Museum, [193] 830

Andover, The late Member for
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 3, [190] 535

ANNESLEY, Hon. Colonel H., *Cavan Co.*
Army—Royal Military College, [190] 1594
Army—Warlike Stores, Res. [193] 779

ANSON, Hon. Major A. H. A., *Lichfield*
Army—Questions, &c.
  Artillery—Conversion of Guns, [190] 428
  Floating Obstruction Committee, [192] 1222
  Gunnery Experiments, [192] 1476
  Musketry Instructors, Payment of, [192] 817
  Rockets, Manufacture of, [193] 1476
Army—Royal Gun Factory, Motion for a Committee, [193] 1065, 1254
Army—Warlike Stores, Res. [193] 761, 779, 780
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 94
  Military Store Department, Amendt. [193] 959, 961
Colliers in the Wigan District, Strike of, [191] 1224
Eyre, Ex-Governor, [192] 1852
India—Case of Sir T. J. Metcalfe, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1268, 1278, 1280
Supply—Works, Buildings, &c. [191] 285, 291

ANSTRUTHER, Sir R., *Fifeshire*
Army—Control Department, Motion for Papers, [193] 1269
  Invalid Officers from India, [193] 1165
  Travelling Allowances, [193] 948
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [193] 738; *cl.* 14, 1001
India—Furlough Regulations, [193] 1554
Passenger Steamers, Overloading of, [191] 450
Representation of the People (Scotland), Lords Amendts. [193] 919
Scotland—Committals, [193] 369, 370
  Legislation for, [192] 245
  Militia, [192] 17
  "Running his Letters," [193] 1166
Supply—Volunteer Corps, [191] 277

ARCHDALL, Captain M. E., *Fermanagh Co.*
Army—Brooke, Captain, Case of, [192] 2134
Army Estimates—Full and Half-Pay, [193] 1280
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1676
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1205
Napier, Sir R., and Ex-Governor Eyre, [192] 715

ARGYLL, Duke of
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 508
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 806, 813, 819
Education, 2R. [191] 1314
Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1448, 1453; [192] 1921
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 169, 177, 183, 193
Foreshore and Bed of the Sea, [192] 1814, 1824, 1834
India—Government of, [190] 985
Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 572, 583
Reform Act, 1867—Ratepaying Clauses, [190] 1550, 1570
Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. [192] 1915; Comm. *cl.* 27, Amendt. [193] 364; *cl.* 48, 366; Report, 715; 3R. 804; Commons Amendts. 975
Salmon Fisheries (Scotland), Comm. [192] 1915
University Elections (Voting Papers), 2R. [193] 983
Victoria—Appropriation Act, [191] 1974, 1976, 1977

ARMAGH, Archbishop of
Burials (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [193] 1095, 1098; Comm. *add. cl.* 1362
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 58, 297

ARMSTRONG, Mr. Serjeant R., *Sligo Bo.*
Bankruptcy (Ireland), [191] 830
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 623
Libel, Comm. [192] 600; *cl.* 1, 608
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1779

ARMY

Army Estimates, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 20, [190] 992; *Mar* 20, 1982; Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 2, [193] 521
  (See *Supply—Army Estimates*)

Army, Preaching in the, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 29, [193] 1923

Artillery
Artillery Practice, Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 9, [193] 910—*at Dover, &c.*, Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 6, 719—*at Portsmouth*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 2, 517; *July* 23, 1668
Gunnery Experiments, Question, Major Anson; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 12, [192] 1476
Rifled Ordnance—Studded Shot, Question, Mr. Esmonde; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 28, [192] 951

[*cont.*

ARMY—ARTILLERY—*cont.*

Shoeburyness Experiments, Questions, Mr. Powell, General Dunne; Answers, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 17, [190] 1813; Observations, Mr. O'Beirne; Reply, Sir John Pakington; short debate thereon *July* 18, [193] 1426

Shrapnel Shell, The, Petition of H. N. S. Shrapnel (*The Earl of Cardigan*) *Mar* 6, [190] 1147

Small Arms

Ammunition, Storing of, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 13, [193] 1106

Ball Cartridges to Soldiers in Barracks, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 8, [191] 2002

Breech-Loading Rifles, Questions, Lord Elcho; Mr. Newdegate; Answers, Sir John Pakington *Nov* 22, [190] 142; Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 9, 1225

Report on *Parl. P.* L. [1236]

Cartridges, Manufacture of, Question, General Dunne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 23, [193] 1667

Defective Ammunition, Question, Mr. Herbert; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 21, [192] 654

Brooke, Captain, Case of, Questions, Mr. Stacpoole, Captain Vivian; Answers, Sir John Pakington *June* 22, [192] 1855; Question, Captain Archdall; Answer Sir John Pakington *June* 25, 2134

Cavalry Enlistment, Question, Mr. Bagwell; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 12, [190] 1453

Cavalry Regiments, Majors in, Question, Mr. Bryan; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Dec* 6, [190] 648

Cavalry Uniforms, Question, Sir George Stucley; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 4, [192] 1111

Civil Appointments, Officers holding, Question, Mr. White; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 27, [191] 1333

Clothing, Tenders for, Question, Mr. C. Edwards; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 20, [190] 990

Commissions, Question, Sir Thomas Lloyd; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 27, [191] 358

Conveyance of Troops

Detention of Soldiers' Baggage, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Nov* 29, [190] 420

The 40th Regiment, Question, Sir Robert Collier; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Dec* 2, [190] 511

War Office and India Office, Question, The Earl of Airlie; Answer, The Earl of Longford *Nov* 26, [190] 174; Questions, Mr. Otway, Mr. Childers, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answers Sir John Pakington, Mr. Corry *Nov* 28, 337

Cooking Apparatus

Captain Warrens', Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 26, [191] 257

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

Messrs. Jeakes', Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 30, [191] 468

Curragh Camp, Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Nov* 25, [190] 163

Daily Payment of Men, Question, Colonel W. Stuart; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 26, [191] 263

Depôt Battalions, Officers of, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 5, [192] 1180; *June* 29, [193] 313

Distinguished Service Majors, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 14, [190] 733; Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 17, 798

Distribution of Troops in the North of Ireland, Question, Sir Hervey Bruce; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 16, [193] 1287

Engineer Department, Clerks, Question, General Dunne; Answer, Sir John Pakington; short debate thereon *June* 4, [192] 1124

Expenditure, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. White *Mar* 16, [190] 1687

Fortifications

Questions, Lord Elcho, General Dunne; Answers, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 19, [190] 1922; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 27, [193] 1817

Coast Defences, Committee on, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 28, [191] 1456

Dockyards and Naval Arsenals, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 12, [192] 112

Floating Obstruction Committee, Question, Major Anson; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 8, [192] 1222

Fortifications at Chatham, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 9, [190] 1221

Harbour and Coast Defences, Question, The Earl of Airlie *Feb* 17, [190] 787; Answer, The Earl of Longford, 792

"*Malta and Gibraltar Shield,*" *The,* Question, General Dunne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Nov* 25, [190] 165; Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Dec* 3, 537; *Feb* 14, 729; *Mar* 12, 1456

Report of Special Commission . [4003]
Observations of Col. Jervois . . [4003-I]

Plymouth Breakwater Fort, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 20, [190] 990

Treasury Minute, Aug. 16, 1867—*Audit of Expenditure,* Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 26, [191] 260

Parl. Papers—
Account of Monies Issued 488
Instructions for Committee of Inquiry . 309

Hale's Rockets, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Dec* 2, [190] 514; *July* 13, [193] 1106; Question, Major Anson; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 20, 1476

Horse Guards, The — Sentence of a Court Martial, Motion for Papers (*Mr. Darby Griffith*) *July* 9, [193] 920

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Household Brigade, Questions, Mr. Neate, Mr. Otway ; Answers, Sir John Pakington *July* 31, [193] 1944

India, Invalid Officers from, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 14, [193] 1165

India, Malt Liquor for the Troops in, Questions, Mr. M. T. Bass, Mr. Greene ; Answers, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 11, [192] 15

India, Transport of Troops to, Question, Sir George Stucley ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 4, [192] 1111

March of Troops from Aldershot to Sandhurst, Questions, Mr. Osborne, Mr. Buxton ; Answers, Sir John Pakington *July* 27, [193] 1828 ; Observations, Sir John Pakington *July* 28, 1902

Medical Department, Question, Mr. O'Beirne ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 27, [193] 1821

Military Expenditure, Question, Captain Vivian ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 9, [193] 909—*Increase of,* Observations, The Marquess of Hartington ; Reply, Sir John Pakington *July* 9, 948

190] *Mauritius, Fever in the—Mortality in the
86th Regiment,* Question, Mr. Whalley ;
Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 20, 991 ;
Feb 21, 1006 ; Question, Mr. Otway ;
Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 23,
191] 37 ; *Mar* 27, 360 ; Questions, Mr. Bar-
clay, Mr. Whalley ; Answers, Mr. Adder-
ley *April* 1, 660 ; Question, Mr. Whalley ;
Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 28, 1460 ;
Question, Colonel North ; Answer, Sir John
Pakington *May* 7, 1883 ; Question, Mr.
Harvey Lewis ; Answer, Sir John Pakington
June 29, [193] 302

Military Uniforms, Right of Wearing, Question, Mr. O'Reilly ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 22, [192] 712

Militia Quartermasters, Question, Colonel Stuart Knox ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 11, [192] 1395 ; Question, Colonel Kingscote ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 18, 1756

Musketry Instructors, Payment of, Questions, Major Anson, Lord Elcho ; Answers, Sir J. Pakington *May* 25, [192] 817

New Zealand, British Regiments in, Question, Mr. Gorst ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 20, [190] 1979—*Forces in,* Observations, Viscount Enfield ; Reply, Mr. Disraeli ; short debate thereon *July* 3, [193] 640

Non-combatant Officers, Question, Captain Vivian ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 3, [193] 608

Non-Purchase Corps — Report of the Select Committee, Question, Mr. Childers ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Nov* 28, [190] 335
(*Parl. P.* No. 396)

Non-Purchase Corps Retirement, Question, Mr. Childers ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 22, [192] 1855

Ordnance Select Committee Report, Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 12, [190] 1456

Ordnance Survey Maps, Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 29, [193] 1921

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Pensioners, Senior Staff Officers of, Question, Mr. Wyld ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 29, [193] 1922

Perth Barracks, Question, Mr. Bayley Potter ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Nov* 28, [190] 329

Promotion—Indian Colonels, Question, Captain Vivian ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 19, [190] 1887

Promotions in the Coldstream Guards, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 30, [191] 1579 ; *May* 7, 1883 ; Observations, Sir Patrick O'Brien *July* 9, [193] 922

Queen's Regulations, 1868, Question, Mr. O'Reilly ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 29, [193] 306

Reports of the Officers with the Prussian and Austrian Armies, Question, Mr. Otway ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 9, [193] 612

Royal Artillery, Colonels in the, Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 29, [193] 1922

Royal Artillery, &c. Retirements, Question, Mr. Childers ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 9, [190] 1214 ; Question, General Dunne ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 27, [193] 1821—(*Parl. P.* No. 371)

Royal Military College, Question, Colonel Annesley ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 13, [190] 1594

Shoeing Horses, M. Charlier's Method of, Question, Mr. St. Aubyn ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 27, [193] 1817

Shorncliffe Camp, Question, Mr. Vanderbyl ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 29, [193] 301

Soldiers, Employment of, Question, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 20, [193] 1483

Staff Appointments, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Nov* 21, [190] 106 ; *Mar* 9, 1223

Superannuation Allowances—Army, Ordnance, Navy, and Marines, Question, Colonel North ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 25, [192] 2133

The 36th Regiment, Question, Mr. Otway ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 21, [193 1556

The Volunteers

7th Surrey Volunteers, Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 27, [193] 1823

Wimbledon Meeting—Corporal Peake, Question, Mr. Bazley ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 28, [193] 1902

192] *Windsor, Volunteer Review at,* Question,
Lord Truro ; Answer, The Earl of Malmes-
bury *June* 15, 1557 ; Question, Lord Elcho ;
Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 15, 1566 ; Ques-
193] tion, Lord Elcho ; Answer, Sir John Paking-
ton *June* 29, 310 ; *July* 9, 911 ; Question,
Earl Spencer ; Answer, Lord Truro ; short
debate thereon *July* 10, 988 ; Question, Lord
Elcho ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 31,
1945

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

Travelling Allowances, Observations, Sir R. Anstruther *July* 9, [193] 948

Troops, Knapsacks for the, Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 27, [193] 1827

War Department—Army Estimates, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 5, [192] 1182—*Subordinate Officers*, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 28, 950

War Office, Storehouses for the, Question, Mr. Adam; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 27, [193] 1826

Windsor Cavalry Barracks, Question, Colonel Leslie; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 6, [193] 718

Woolwich Arsenal — Repair of Machinery, Question, Captain Pack-Beresford; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 28, [191] 1455

Army—Administration of the

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it would be advantageous and convenient to substitute a system of weekly in lieu of daily payments to those non-commissioned Officers and Soldiers of the Army whose previous conduct might warrant the extension of this indulgence" (*Mr. Percy Wyndham*), [191] 2003; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Control Department

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Draft Regulations for the Control Department originally sent in by the War Office to the Treasury, together with any memoranda thereupon by the Assistant Under Secretary of State for War, together with the reply thereto by the Controller in Chief" (*Colonel Jervis*) *July* 16, [193] 1265; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to; Observations, Mr. Disraeli; short debate thereon, 1273

Control Department, The—Appointment of Sir Henry Storks, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 20, [190] 985; Questions, Colonel Jervis; Answers, Sir John Pakington *July* 7, [193] 810; Question, Observations, Earl De Grey and Ripon; Reply, The Earl of Longford; short debate thereon *July* 15, 1233

Army—Controller-in-Chief

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 9, To leave out from "That," and add "the Controller in Chief should be an Under Secretary of State; and that the audit of the War Office accounts should be entirely independent of the War Office" (*Colonel Jervis*), [193] 922; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Employment of Discharged Soldiers

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 29, To leave out from "That," and add "it is expedient to employ in Government situations non-commissioned officers and privates discharged from the Army with good character" (*Sir Charles Russell*), [193] 314; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Employment of Old Soldiers—Corps of Commissionaires, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 14, [192] 246; Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answers, Sir John Pakington, Lord John Manners *July* 2, [193] 520

Army — Fortifications — Dockyards and Naval Arsenals

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "two Members of this House and another Civil Engineer should be added to the Committee appointed to consider the question of the Fortifications for the defence of the United Kingdom and of the Colonies, and that arrangements shall be made to stop, as far as possible, all further outlay until that Committee shall have reported to this House" (*Mr. O'Beirne*), [191] 2021; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Another Amendt. To leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, no further outlay on the Fortifications for the defence of the United Kingdom and of the Colonies, except such as may be absolutely necessary under existing Contracts, or to complete works which cannot be suspended without serious inconvenience, ought to be incurred until the Report of the Committee recently appointed shall have been laid before this House" (*Mr. Childers*), 2049; Question, "That the words, &c.," put; A. 93, N. 48; M. 45

Army—India and the Colonies

Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the duties performed by the British Army in India and the Colonies, and also how far it might be desirable to employ certain portions of Her Majesty's Native Indian Army in our Colonial and Military dependencies, or to organize a force of Asiatic Troops for general service in suitable climates" (*Major Anson*) *Mar* 6, [190] 1207

And, on *Mar* 19, Committee nominated as follows: — Viscount Cranborne (Chairman), Major Anson, Mr. Childers, Sir James Fergusson, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Hayter, Lord William Hay, Colonel Percy Herbert, Mr. Laing, Colonel North, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Sir William Russell, Sir Harry Verney, Captain Vivian, and Major Walker

Report of Select Committee *April* 3
(*Parl. P.* No. 197)

Army—Military Education

Motion for an Address, "Praying that a Royal Commission composed of Military and Civilian Members be appointed to inquire into the present state of Military Education in this Country, and more especially into the training of

[*cont.*

Army—Military Education—cont.

Candidates for Commissions in the Army, and into the constitution, system of Education, and discipline of the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich, and of the Royal Military College at Sandhurst, as well as into the rules and regulations under which Candidates are admitted into those Colleges" (*Lord Eustace Cecil*) *May* 5, [191] 1819 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Army—Military Reserve Funds

Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the origin of the Military Reserve Funds, the sources from which they are derived, and the objects to which they are applied" (*Lord Hotham*) *Feb* 17, [190] 850

And, on *Feb* 19, Committee nominated as follows : — Lord Hotham (Chairman), Mr. Baxter, Mr. Childers, Mr. Goschen, The Marquess of Hartington, Colonel Hogg, Colonel North, Major O'Reilly, General Peel, Colonel Edward Somerset, Mr. Trevelyan, Sir John Trollope, Captain Vivian, and Mr. Percy Wyndham

Report of Select Committee *May* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 298)

Army of Reserve

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon our Military Organization, in so far as it relates to the establishment of a sufficient and economical Army of Reserve, and the means it offers of speedy and efficient expansion to meet the requirements of war, more especially for home defence" (*Lord Elcho*) *June* 23, [192] 1942 ; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

Question, Major Walker ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 19, [192] 512

Army Reserve and Militia Reserve, Question, Major Walker ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 19, [192] 512

Reserve Forces—Militia Regulations, Question, The Marquess of Hartington ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 5, [191] 1787

Reserved Forces, Organization of, Question, Lord Truro ; Answer, The Earl of Longford ; short debate thereon *July* 17, [193] 1350

Regulations for Discipline and Payment of—(*Parl. P.* No. 321, 322)

Army—Royal Gun Factories

Motion for a Select Committee (*Major Anson*) *July* 10, [193] 1065 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 15, To leave out from "That," and add "a Committee of Five Members be appointed by the Committee of Selection to inquire into the following allegations : — That in 1864 the Royal Gun Factories, on being applied to by the Ordnance Select Committee for Estimates for cheaper 9-inch guns than those that were being made at that time, sent in erroneous comparative Estimates, on the strength of which the Ordnance Select Committee decided in favour of the gun proposed by the Royal Gun Factories ; that a sample 9-inch gun was then made by the Royal Gun Factories, the details of the cost of which, on being compared with the details of the cost of similar guns manufactured two years afterwards, show great and apparently inexplicable discrepancies ; and that like errors have been made by the Royal Gun Factories with regard to the comparative cost of new wrought-iron and converted guns, thereby entailing a heavy and unnecessary expense upon the country" (*Major Anson*) *July* 15, [193] 1254 ; Question, "That the words, &c."

Amendt. to add the words, "That Sir John Pakington and Major Anson be added to the Committee, for the purpose of examining witnesses, and taking part in the proceedings, but without the power of voting" (*Captain Vivian*) ; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Another Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "a Committee of Seven Members be appointed, &c." (*Major Anson*), 1260 ; Question, "That the words, &c." negatived ; words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to : Committee appointed

And, on *July* 18, Committee nominated as follows : — Major Anson (Chairman), Mr. Baggally, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Howes, Mr. Laird, Mr. Samuda, and Mr. Scourfield

Report of Select Committee *July* 24 (*Parl. P.* No. 459)

Army — Sale and Purchase of Commissions

Moved, "That the Purchase and Sale of Military Commissions be discontinued after a date fixed for that purpose" (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *May* 19, [192] 514

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the ground of complaint against the operation of the Purchase System in the Army would be greatly diminished, and the efficiency of the Service improved, by the abolition of Purchase above the rank of Captain in the Cavalry and the Infantry of the Line" (*Captain Vivian*) ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Army—Soldiers' Orphans

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to direct that an Institution shall be established to receive and educate the Orphan Daughters of Non-commissioned Officers and Soldiers of our Army" (*Colonel North*) *July* 16, [193] 1261 ; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Warlike Stores

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "in order to ensure economy in our Expenditure on Warlike Stores, it is advisable to have an [*cont.*

Army—Warlike Stores—cont.
annual Statement laid upon the Table of this House, showing the quantity and value of each description of Stores in the possession of the Troops, or in the Arsenals and Storehouses, the quantity issued and consumed during each year, and the replacement in consequence of a change of pattern or of the ordinary annual consumption; that in order to prevent the manufacture of Warlike Stores becoming a mere monopoly in the hands of the Government Establishments it is advisable to purchase a certain proportion of the articles required for Military purposes from the private trade; and to ensure accuracy of accounts, economy of production, and fair comparison of Government with trade prices, the Manufacturing Departments shall be treated as private firms, the Government purchasing the articles required at remunerative prices, to be provided from Army and other Votes, and the capital charges of the Establishments (whether for buildings, plant, or working capital,) being provided by advances at interest made by the Public Works Loan Commissioners" (*Major Anson*) *July* 6, [193] 760; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Wooden Huts for Troops
Motion for "Copy of all Correspondence between Government and the Medical Men or Officers in the command of Regiments stationed at Aldershot, Shorncliffe and Colchester, as to the impolicy and hardship of keeping in Wooden Huts, during this severe winter, old rheumatic soldiers from hot climates and young recruits" (*Colonel French*) *Feb* 19, [190] 982; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Army Chaplains Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Longford*)
l. Presented; read 1a* *May* 25 (No. 116)
192] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a" *June* 9, 1298; after short debate, Bill read 2a
. Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee" *June* 11, 1385; after short debate, further Debate adjourned
. Adjourned Debate on Motion, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee" *June* 12, 1465; after debate, agreed to; Committee
Report* *July* 6 (No. 146)
Read 3a* *July* 7
c. Read 1°* *July* 8 [Bill 225]
Read 2°* *July* 13
Committee*; Report *July* 20
Read 3°* *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 83]

Art Catalogue—Publication of the Universal
Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 9, [190] 1218

Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Bill
(*Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Locke*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Nov* 20 [Bill 1]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 11, [190] 1431; after short debate, Bill read 2°
191] Committee—R.P. *April* 1, 672
. Committee; Report *April* 21, 1063 [Bill 88]
. Considered *April* 29, 1564; after short debate, Debate adjourned
. Adjourned Debate on Question [29th April], "That the Clause (Act not to apply to cases in which freeholder has successfully instituted proceedings and carries out necessary repairs) (*Sir Francis Goldsmid*) be now read 2°" *May* 6, 1875; after short debate, Motion and clause withdrawn
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens*) *May* 8, 2060
Amendt. to leave out from "Bill be" and add "re-committed, for the purpose of amending the Schedule" (*Mr. Ayrton*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°
l. Read 1a* (*The Lord Chelmsford*) *May* 11
192] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a" *May* 26, 899; after short debate, Bill read 2a (No. 93)
Moved, "That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee" (*Lord Portman*); Motion agreed to; Bill referred to a Select Committee
And, on *May* 29, Committee nominated as follows:—Ld. Privy Seal, D. Somerset, D. Beaufort, E. Derby, E. Shaftesbury, E. Carnarvon, E. Cadogan, E. Kimberley, L. Bp. London, L. Sundridge, L. Foley, L. Portman, L. Chelmsford, L. Westbury, L. Meredyth, and L. Penrhyn
. Personal Explanation (*Lord Portman*) *May* 28, 946
Report of Select Committee *July* 7 (*Parl. P.* No. 227-228)
Committee* *July* 9
Report *July* 10, [193] 984
Read 3a* *July* 13
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 130]

Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings [Stamp Duty]
c. Resolution in Committee *July* 16
Resolution reported *July* 17

Ashton, Staleybridge, Birmingham, &c., Riots at
192] Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *May* 25, 817; Personal Explanation,
. Mr. Newdegate *May* 26, 927; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy
. *May* 29, 1042; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; debate thereon
. *May* 29, 1085

Assessed Taxes
Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 20, [193] 1475
Appeal Courts, Observations, Mr. Treeby; Reply, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 20, [190] 2050; *July* 14, [193] 1199
Collection and Payment of Rates, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 9, [193] 911

[*cont.*

Assessed Taxes—cont.
Collection in the South of London, Question, Mr. Thomas Hughes; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 17, [193] 1367

Assignees of Marine Policies Bill
(*Mr. Candlish, Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. Norwood*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 28 [Bill 147]
Read 2° * *June* 24
Committee; Report *June* 30, [193] 419
Committee * (*on re-comm*); Report *July* 2
Considered * *July* 6 [Bill 203]
Read 3° * *July* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl De Grey*) *July* 7 (No. 225)
Read 2ª * *July* 14
Committee *; Report *July* 16 (No. 260)
Read 3ª * *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 86]

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir J. B. Karslake), *Andover*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Consid. [191] 1565
Bankruptcy Act Amendment, 2R. [192] 1908
Bankruptcy Law, [190] 336, 988; [191] 268
Bristol Writ, [193] 423;—Election, 1745
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), 2R. [190] 1829; Comm. [192] 170
Court of Chancery and County Courts, [193] 1711
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, Comm. [191] 1198; *cl.* 1, 1201
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 689; *cl.* 6, [193] 741, 742; *cl.* 7, 744; *cl.* 8, 746; *cl.* 17, 1018; *cl.* 37, 1174; *cl.* 43, 1177; *add. cl.* 1442; Consid. 1648, 1676
Expatriation, Law of, [190] 2008, 2010
Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 127
Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1231
Judicial Patronage, [192] 343
Juries "De Medietate Linguæ," [190] 1449
Libel, 2R. [191] 665; Comm. [192] 597; *cl.* 1, 607; *cl.* 3, 608
Life Policies Assurance, 2R. [190] 956
Lottery Act, [192] 390
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1367
Patent Office Inquiry, Motion for Papers, [193] 1932
Payment of Rates—The Compounding System, [190] 1888
Publications, Registration of, [192] 1511
Rating under the Representation of the People Act, [190] 167;—Personal Rating, 516, 518
Registration, Comm. *cl.* 29, [193] 566
Regulation of Railways, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1785, 1789, 1792
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), 2R. [191] 663
Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts. [192] 1861
Small Pamphlets, Exemption of, from Security, [190] 1974
Supply—Prosecutions, [192] 495
Totnes, &c. Writs, Leave, [190] 522
West Indies, Lords Amendts. [193] 1919

Australia—Postal Communication with
Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 12, [192] 1472

Austria, Commercial Treaty with—The Tariff
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 21, [192] 652; Question, Mr Layard; Answer, Mr. E. C. Egerton *July* 2, [193] 515
Commercial Convention—Papers No. [4033]
Treaty of Navigation . . . . No. [4065]

AYRTON, Mr. A. S., *Tower Hamlets*
Abyssinia—Foreign Office, The, [190] 626
Army Estimates, [190] 1937, 1938
Land Forces, [191] 75
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 674; *cl.* 28, 678; *add. cl.* 1064, 1065; Schedule, Amendt. 1066; Consid. Motion for Adjournment, 1565, 1567, 1569, 1875; Amendt. 1876, 1877, 1878; 3R. 2060
Bristol Writ, [193] 421, 422
Coal Mines, [192] 1082
Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1906
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 975; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1418, 1419, 1420
Consular Courts in Turkey and Egypt, [193] 1053
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, Comm. [191] 1197
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 715; Comm. [191] 316, 321; *cl.* 1, [192] 670; *cl.* 5, 690, 692
193] *cl.* 6, Amendt. 738, 740, 741; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 749; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1003, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014; *cl* 17, 1017, 1018, 1019; *cl.* 37, Amendt. 1173; *cl.* 43, 1177; *cl.* 45, 1182; *cl.* 46, 1369; *cl.* 47, Amendt. 1371; *cl.* 54, 1373; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1375, 1386, 1454, 1457; Consid. 1635; *add. cl.* 1644, 1675, 1682
Electric Telegraphs, [191] 706; [192] 1231; 2R. 1333, 1564, 1805, 1808; Nomination of Committee, 1978, 1980; Comm. *cl.* 15, Amendt. [193] 1600, 1601, 1603; *cl.* 24, 1604
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1419, 1420; Res. 1906, 1907, 1927
Government of India Act Amendment, 2R. [192] 1598; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1885, 1888, 1889, 1891; *cl.* 2, [193] 859
Governor General of India, 2R. [192] 1601
Honduras—Treaty of Guarantee, [190] 146
India—Bank of Bombay, [191] 430, 2055
Libel, 2R. [191] 666; Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 614
Libel (Ireland), Comm. [193] 471
Local Taxation, [190] 1033
London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. [191] 200; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 202, 204; *add. cl.* 205; Consid. *add. cl.* 326, 327
Marine Mutiny, Comm. [191] 559
Metropolis Gas, Res. [190] 1080
Metropolis Subways, 2R. [190] 1279
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm.
193] 154, 639, 1297, 1298, 1324, 1339, 1341, 1342; Preamble, 1517, 1527, 1528; *cl.* 2, 1536; *cl.* 3, 1540, 1541, 1748, 1759; Motion for Adjournment, 1763, 1770, 1771, 1772, 1776
Metropolitan Police, [192] 926
Metropolitan Police Funds, 2R. Amendt. [193] 345
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [190] 107; 2R. 168; Comm. *cl.* 1, 409, 413; Lords Amendts. 652; Amendt. 664

[*cont.*

Ayrton, Mr. A. S.—*cont.*
  Mines, Accidents in, [192] 1505
  Mines Assessment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 850; Amendt. 852, 853; Consid. 1224
  Ministerial Statement, [191] 1724, 1746, 1801; [193] 917
  Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [192] 1739
  Parliament—Business of the House, [191] 1680
  Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1807
  Petroleum, Comm. [192] 1619
  Postal—India, China, and Japan Mails, [190] 453, 456
    Service with the United States, [190] 681, 686
  Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2012
  Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [191] 194
  Public Schools, Leave, [190] 634; 2R. 752, 763, 774, 1072; Motion for a Select Committee, 2052; Re-comm. [192] 1641; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1650, 1656; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1931; *cl.* 14, 1937; *cl.* 16, 1939, 1940; *cl.* 21, Amendt. [193] 814, 815; *add. cl.* 825, 827; Lords Amendts. 1904
  Publications, Registration of, [192] 1509
  Registration, Comm. *cl.* 29, [193] 566; *add. cl.* 568, 570
  Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 17, [193] 1734; *add. cl.* 1735
  Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1802
  Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 990, 993
    Burlington House, [192] 397, 400
    Glasgow, University of, [192] 401
    Metropolitan Police, [192] 503
    Royal Palaces, [191] 1009, 1010, 1011, 1013
    Volunteer Corps, [191] 272
  Supply — Proceedings in, Resolution, [191] 1025, 1466
  Thames Embankment, &c. Amendment, 2R. [192] 1219
  West Indies, Lords Amendts. [193] 1918

Aytoun, Mr. R. Sinclair, *Kirkcaldy*
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 76
    Military Store Department, [193] 960
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1902, 1916, 1924; Instruction, [192] 1185, 1196
  Lake Superior and the Pacific, &c., Motion for a Commission, [192] 1343
  Nova Scotia—British North American Confederation, Motion for an Address, [192] 1637
  Passenger Steamers, Overloading of, [191] 450
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* K, [193] 1884
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 854; *cl.* 10, 985; *add. cl.* 1236
  Scotland — Burntisland and Granton Ferry, [190] 1004
  Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 232
    British Embassy Houses, [191] 987
  Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1178
  West Indies, Lords Amendts. [193] 1920

Baby Farming
  Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, The Duke of Marlborough *July* 28, [193] 1896
    (See *Metropolis*)

Bagnall, Mr. C., *Whitby*
  Coble, Mr., Case of, [191] 1457
  Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1869
  Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 168

Bagwell, Mr. J., *Clonmel*
  Army—Cavalry Enlistment, [190] 1453
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1942
  Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 121
  Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 211
  Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 784; Comm. 937; *add. cl. ib.*
  Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 11, [191] 221; Amendt. 223
  Ireland—Habeas Corpus Act, [191] 1784
  Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [192] 175; [193] 410
  Mines, Accidents in, [192] 1506
  Representation of the People (Ireland), Leave, [190] 1951; Comm. [192] 1574; *cl.* 10, 1586; *add. cl.* 1779, 1802; Consid. 1895

Baillie, Rt. Hon. H. J., *Inverness-shire*
  Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 323
  Libel, Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 617
  Peel Statue, The, Res. [192] 2145
  Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1580
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 854; *cl.* 8, 866; *cl.* 11, 995; Amendt. 1004, 1005
  Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts. [192] 1862

Baines, Mr. E., *Leeds*
  Charitable Institutions, Rating of, [190] 331; [193] 313
  Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 4, [190] 1422
  Education—Revised Code, [192] 952
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1446, 1450
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 1612
  Registration, 2R. [192] 1609; Comm. [193] 570
  Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 166
  Spain—Religious Persecution in, [193] 1478

Bandon, Earl of
  Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 223
  Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [193] 802

Bank Holidays Bill *Amended Title*—**Bank Holidays and Bills of Exchange Bill**
  (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Stacpoole*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Nov* 28 [Bill 15]
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 19, [190] 941; after short debate, Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee

[*cont.*

Bank Holidays and Bills of Exchange Bill—cont.
And, on *April* 23, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Colman O'Loghlen (Chairman), Viscount Amberley, Mr. Barnett, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Graves, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Lusk, Mr. Paull, Mr. Pim, Mr. Rothschild, Mr. Alderman Salomons, and Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie
Report of Select Committee *June* 22 [Bill 180]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 26
Considered * *June* 29
Read 3° * *June* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *July* 2
Read 2ª * *July* 14 (No. 200)
Order for Committee discharged * *July* 21

Bank of Bombay Bill
(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 17 [Bill 178]
Read 2° * *June* 22
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Considered * *June* 30
Read 3° * *June* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 2 (No. 196)
Read 2ª * *July* 6
Committee *; Report *July* 7
Read 3ª * *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 16 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 63]

Bankruptcy Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
c. Question, Mr. Moffatt; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 20, [190] 988
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 9 (No. 31)
Read 2ª * *Mar* 23
Question, Lord Chelmsford; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *April* 3, [191] 802
Committee; Report; Bill re-committed *April* 24 (No. 75)
Order for Committee discharged *May* 11, [192] 5

Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Charles Forster*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 28 [Bill 145]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Moffatt*) *June* 22, [192] 1908; Bill read 2°
Committee *—R.P. *June* 29
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Considered * *July* 1
Read 3° * *July* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Cranworth*) *July* 3
193] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 9, 866; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee—R.P. *July* 14, 1158 (No. 208)
Committee *July* 17, 1363
Report * *July* 20 (No. 270)
Read 3ª * *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 104]

Bankruptcy Acts Repeal Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 9 (No. 30)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 23, [191] 1; after debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee; Report *April* 24, 1217 (No. 74)
Bill re-committed
Order for Committee discharged *May* 11, [192] 5

Bankruptcy Law Amendment
Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, The Attorney General *Nov* 28, [190] 336; Observations, Mr. Moffatt; Reply, The Attorney General *Mar* 26, [191] 265

BARCLAY, Mr. A. C., *Taunton*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 93
Mauritius—Fever at the, [191] 660

BARING, Mr. T., *Huntingdon*
Bank Holidays, 2R. [190] 948
India—Postal Communication with Penang, [192] 1109
Mexico — Diplomatic Relations with, [190] 1007
Supply — Post Office Packet Service, [193] 837, 845
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1176

BARNETT, Mr. H., *Woodstock*
Bank Holidays, 2R. [190] 951
Cattle from Africa, [193] 908
Life Policies Nomination, 2R. [190] 954
Public Schools, Re-comm. *add. cl.* [193] 826

BARRON, Sir H. W., *Waterford City*
Burials (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1382
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 805
Ireland—Royal Residence in, Motion for an Address, [192] 358
University of Dublin, [192] 1044
Parliament—Business of the House, [192] 1570
Parliament—Divisions of the House, Res. [193] 385
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 10, [193] 1875
Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 690; Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1590, 1591

BARROW, Mr. W. H., *Nottinghamshire, S.*
Commissions, Permanent Expenses of, Res. [191] 1294
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1552
Italy—Conference, The proposed, [190] 512
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1780

BARRY, Mr. Serjeant C. R., *Dungarvan*
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 771
Libel, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 606
Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [192] 172, 1981; [193] 418
Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1956; Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1590; *cl.* 26, 1597; *add. cl.* 1768, 1770; Consid. *add. cl.* 1902; Motion for Adjournment, 1906

BARTTELOT, Colonel W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 319
Army—Soldiers Orphans, Motion for an Address, [193] 1264
Army Estimates—Military Store Department, [193] 960
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 967

[*cont.*

Barttelot, Colonel W. B.—*cont.*
Ecclesiastical Commissioners—Benefice of Kilpec, [191] 701
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 22, [193] 1604
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [191] 1418 ; Res. 1, 1466
Marriage, Law of, [190] 886
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 153
Portugal—Commercial Treaty with, [190] 331
Registration, Comm. [193] 561
Supply—Volunteer Corps, [191] 268

Bass, Mr. M. T., *Derby*
Army—Malt Liquors for Troops in India, [192] 15
Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 428
Boundary, Comm. [192] 252, 261
Bristol Writ, Amendt. [193] 421, 677
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1451, 1457
Licences, Res. [191] 155, 158

Bateson, Sir T., *Devizes*
Gladstone, Mr., and the East Worcestershire Election, [192] 1110, 1112
Ireland—Presbytery of Antrim, [191] 1581

Bath, Marquess of
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1141
Parliament—Business of the House, Report, [191] 568
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 1624
West Indies, 2R. [193] 797

Bathurst, Mr. A. A., *Cirencester*
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1961
Post Office — London Letter Carriers, [192] 1853

Battle of Königratz
Question, Mr. Otway ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 10, [193] 1000

Baxter, Mr. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1608
Navy—Iron Ballast in Dockyards, [190] 1219
Nova Scotia—British North American Confederation, Motion for an Address, [192] 1676
Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2010
Postal—American Mails, [192] 342
Treaty with the United States, [190] 987, 1685 ; [192] 2132
Representation of the People (Scotland), [190] 690 ; Leave, 819 ; [192] 346 ; Comm. Amendt. 435 ; *cl.* 3, 477 ; *cl.* 4, 853 ; *cl.* 7, 858 ; *cl.* 8, 860 ; Amendt. 879, 881, 883, 884, 891, 893 ; *cl.* 9, 960, 981 ; *cl.* 10, 988
Scotland—Bridge of Dunkeld, Tolls on the, [190] 885, 886
Judicial System, [192] 2137
Supply—Public Buildings, [192] 293

Bazley, Mr. T., *Manchester*
Adjouri, Case of, Motion for Papers, [193] 387
Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2051
Wimbledon Meeting, [193] 1902
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Leave, [190] 996
Cotton Statistics, 2R. [191] 1874
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 15, [193] 1603; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 1604
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [193] 1864
Girls, Sale of, [193] 1666
India—Irrigation Works, Motion for Papers, [193] 532
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1330, 1331
Parliament — House of Commons' Arrangements Committee, [190] 509
Railways, Revision of, [191] 35
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1735
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 855
Riots at Ashton, &c. [192] 1098
Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 167, 180

Beach, † Sir M. E. Hicks-, (Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners), *Gloucestershire, E.*
Compound Householder, The, [192] 246
† Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 979 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1419
† Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 719
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, Motion for Adjournment, [191] 1534, 1584
Local Rating, Motion for a Committee, [192] 1492, 1498
Metropolis—Lambeth Workhouse, Motion for Papers, [190] 2048
Militiamen, Families of, [192] 1475
Mines Assessment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 849, 852
Poor Law—Assessment, [193] 1941
Gravesend Board of Guardians, [191] 704
Pauper Idiots and Lunatics, [190] 1887
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1421, 1422, 1423 ; *cl.* 6, 1608 ; *cl.* 7, 1613 ; *cl.* 8, 1614 ; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1871, 1876 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1880, 1881 ; *cl.* 21, *ib.* ; *cl.* K, 1882 ; *add. cl.* 1885, 1886 ; Consid. 1909
Poor Relief Assessment Returns, [192] 1470
Rogers, Dr., Medical Officer of the Strand Union, [191] 262
Vagrancy, [193] 1103

Beach, Mr. W. W. B., *Hampshire, N.*
Schools Inquiry Commissions, [193] 102
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1720
Witnesses, Expenses of, [193] 1819

Beauchamp, Earl
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [193] 495, 510, 513
Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 577

Beaumont, Mr. Wentworth B., *Northumberland, S.*
  Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 433
  Boundary Commission, [190] 733
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1450; Amendt. *ib.* 1451, 1452; Consid. 1632, 1635; *add. cl.* 1679; Amendt. 1681
  Metropolis—Hyde Park Improvements, [193] 716
  Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1872; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [193] 848, 852
  Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1735; Consid. Amendt. 1791

Beecroft, Mr. G. S., *Leeds*
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 892

Beke, Dr., Mr. Rassam, and others—see title—*East India, Troops and Vessels*

Belgium, Riots in
  Question, Mr. Grant; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 3, [191] 837

Belper, Lord
  Regulation of Railways, Report, *cl.* 14, [192] 415

Bentinck, Mr. G. Cavendish, *Whitehaven*
  Courts of Justice, New, [190] 732; [192] 2130, 2131; Motion for a Committee, [193] 338
  Disraeli's, Mr., Speech at Merchant Taylors' Hall, [192] 2156
  Dogs, Stray, [193] 314
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, 2R. [191] 327; Comm. Amendt. 1195; *cl.* 1, 1200
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1379
  Knights of Windsor, Motion for an Address, [192] 1973
  Ireland — Alleged Seditious Speaking, [190] 1682
  Metropolis — Burlington House Colonnade, [192] 1335
    St. Mary Somerset Church, [192] 2149
  Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [190] 411
  Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. Amendt. [192] 1735
  Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. [193] 448, 454
  Patent Office Inquiry, Motion for Papers, [193] 1929
  Public Schools, 2R. [190] 767; Motion for a Select Committee, 2052; Re-comm. *cl.* 6, [192] 1927; *cl.* 21, [193] 814
  Record Publications, Res. [193] 168
  Supply—Burlington House, [192] 397, 399
    Courts of Justice, New, [192] 290
    National Gallery Enlargement, [192] 393, 1172
    Palmerston Monument, [192] 403
    Parliament, Houses of, [192] 305, 311
    Public Buildings, [192] 294
    Royal Palaces, [191] 1005, 1009
    Science and Art, [192] 1170, 1172
[*cont.*

Bentinck, Mr. G. C.—*cont.*
  Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 229
  United States—Case of the "Springbok," [190] 1812; [191] 2002
  Library Committee of Philadelphia, [193] 1901

Beresford, Capt. D. W. Pack-, *Carlow Co.*
  Army Estimates—Full and Half Pay, [193] 1280
  Army—Woolwich Arsenal, [191] 1455
  Ireland—Ranger of the Curragh, [192] 1754

Berkeley, Hon. F. H. F., *Bristol*
  Bristol Writ, [193] 678;—Election, 1745
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [191] 302; Consid. [193] 1630
  Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for Adjournment, [192] 1801, 1802
  Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1870

Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes Bill [H.L.] (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 2 (No. 65)

Blake, Mr. J. A., *Waterford City*
  Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 211
  Ireland—Questions, &c.
    Dietary of County Prisons, [190] 1102
    Medical Officer, Mountjoy Convict Prison, [190] 1102
    Searching Suspicious Persons, [191] 468
  Ireland—Dietary of Workhouses, Res. [193] 1020, 1024
  Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1778
  Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [193] 415
  Parliament—Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1743
  Record Publications, Res. [193] 167
  Regulation of Railways, Consid. [193] 1786, 1787
  Sea Fisheries, Comm *cl.* 27, [190] 1276, 1277; Lords Amendts. [192] 1868
  Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2012, 2018, 2020

Board of Trade
  Compulsory Pilotage, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 27, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, representing that, in the opinion of this House, measures ought to be taken for the early abolition of Compulsory Pilotage, with due regard to existing interests, and for requiring Pilotage Authorities to examine and license all competent persons applying to them for the purpose of qualifying to act as pilots" (*Mr. Candlish*), [191] 361; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
  Passenger Acts—Overloading of Passenger Steamers, Question, Mr. Sinclair Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 27, [191] 450—*Foreign Transatlantic Steamers*, Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Adderley *April* 30, 1574
[*cont.*

Board of Trade—cont.
  Private Bills — Board of Trade Reports, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 3, [191] 831
  Rule of the Road at Sea, Question, Mr. Holland; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 2, [191] 705; *June* 25, [192] 2136

Bonham-Carter, Mr. J., *Winchester*
  Boundary, Comm. [192] 278
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 726; Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 681; *add. cl.* [193] 1448; Consid. *add. cl.* 1647, 1684
  Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1809
  Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1810
  Supply—Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1002

Boroughs and Divisions of Counties Bill—*Afterwards*
Boundary Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir James Fergusson*)
191] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*) *Mar* 24, 196; Bill ordered
  Read 1° * *Mar* 26 [Bill 78]
. Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 2, 706
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *April* 20, 1014
  After short debate, Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Serjeant Gaselee*); Motion withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
. Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 5, 1786
192] Committee—r.p. *May* 14, 248
  Committee—r.p. *June* 8, 1257
. Committee *June* 11, 1404; after long debate, Bill reported [Bill 165]
  Considered * *June* 18
  Read 3° * *June* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 23
  Read 2ª * *June* 25 (No. 170)
193] Committee—r.p. *July* 2, 495
. Committee; Report *July* 6, 710
  Read 3ª * *July* 7
  Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 46]

Boundaries of Boroughs — Boundary Commission — Assistant Boundary Commissions—see *Representation of the People Act*, 1867

Bourne, Colonel J., *Evesham*
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1245

Bouverie, Rt. Hon. E. P., *Kilmarnock, &c.*
  Army Estimates—Surveys, [193] 964
  Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1397
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, 2R. [191] 327; Comm. 1199
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 717; Comm. [191] 313; *cl.* 5, [192] 682, 686, 692; Motion for Adjournment, 2191, 2196

[*cont.*

Bouverie, Right Hon. E. P.—*cont.*
193] 722; *cl.* 6, 742; *cl.* 10, 759; *cl.* 14, 1002, 1007,
. 1008, 1012, 1015; *cl.* 15, 1016; *cl.* 17, 1018,
. 1020, 1168, 1170; *cl.* 23, *ib.*; *cl.* 41, Amendt.
. 1175; *add. cl.* 1375, 1378; Amendt. 1382,
. 1385, 1451, 1452; Amendt. 1454; Consid.
. 1617, 1626, 1648, 1676, 1678, 1683
  Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1807; Nomination of Comm. Amendt. 1978
  India—Irrigation Works, Motion for Papers, [193] 529
  Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 23, [192] 1529
  Marine Mutiny, Consid. [191] 573
  Ministerial Statement—Re-construction of the Ministry, [190] 1120; [191] 1726; [192] 634
  Mutiny, 3R. [191] 571
  Parliament—Business of the House, [192] 1759
  Parliament—Divisions of the House, Res. [193] 385
  Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 884, 1811
  Postal—West India Mail, [193] 1669
  Promissory Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [193] 857
  Public Schools, Lords Amendts. [193] 1905
  Registration, Leave, [192] 1403; Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 568
  Registration of Voters Act, [192] 371, 379, 380
  Representation of the People (Scotland), [190] 1890; [191] 1885; Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [192] 473, 484, 486, 634, 840; *cl.* 5, 856; *cl.* 8, 872, 890; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 978, 980, 981, 982; *cl.* 10, 992; *cl.* 11, 995; *cl.* 6, 1010; *add. cl.* 1236; Lords Amendts. [193] 919
  Roman Catholic Oath, [191] 1582
  Supply—Civil Service Estimates, [192] 1010
    Consular Establishments Abroad, [192] 2172
  West Indies—Lords Amendts. [193] 1887
  Whitsuntide Recess, [192] 926

Bowen, Mr. J. B., *Pembrokeshire*
  Ireland—Royal Residence in, Motion for an Address, [192] 358
  Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1869

Bow, English Porcelain at
  Question, Mr. Schreiber; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 19, [190] 1888

Bowyer, Sir G., *Dundalk*
  Abyssinia—Foreign Office, The, [190] 624
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 81
  Army—Warlike Stores, Res. [193] 780
  Boundary, Comm. [192] 285
  Brougham, Lord, The Late, [193] 1831
  Burials (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1381
  Capital Punishment within Prisons, 2R. [190] 1132
  County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), 2R. [190] 1829
  Courts of Justice, New, [190] 732; [192] 1050
  Egypt—The Viceroy and the Societè d'Agricole, [192] 1394
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [191] 301; *cl.* 1, [192] 659; *cl.* 37, [193] 1174, 1175
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1422, 1424; Leave, [192] 316; Comm. 1195
  Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 118

[*cont.*

BOWYER, Sir G.—*cont.*
India—Case of Sir T. J. Metcalfe, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1280
Ireland—Spirit Licence Duty, [190] 434
Ireland — State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1467
Lee River Conservancy, Leave, [190] 998
Licences, Res. [191] 159
London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [191] 205
Lottery Act, [192] 389
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [190] 109; 2R. 171; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 408, 413, 414; Lords Amendts. 662
Ministerial Statement—Re-construction of the Ministry, [190] 1125; [191] 1745; [192] 641
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), Leave, [191] 1863
Navy Estimates—Wages, [192] 91
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [193] 1401
Parliament—Business of the House, [191] 1680
Peerage (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1564
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 1611
Postal—Communication with Malta, [190] 801, 1102, 1226
Prison Ministers Act, Res. [193] 381
Promissory Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 2, [193] 856
Public Accounts, Res. [192] 119
Registration 2R. [192] 1612; 3R. [193] 721
Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1488
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 778, 1780
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 468, 469
Riots at Ashton, Staleybridge, &c. [192] 830
Roman Catholic Prisoners, [190] 549
Sentences, Remission of, Motion for an Address, [190] 570
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 987
  Learned Societies, Grants to, [192] 1132
  National Gallery Enlargement, [192] 393, 394
  Parliament, Houses of, [192] 303, 310
  Post Office Packet Service, [193] 839, 844
  Royal Palaces, [191] 1010, 1012
  Royal Parks, &c. [192] 300
  Volunteer Corps, [191] 277
United States—The "Alabama" Claims, Motion for an Address, [190] 1183
Ways and Means—The Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 349

BRADY, Mr. J., *Leitrim Co.*
Ireland — Imprisonment of Messrs. Sullivan and Pigott, [191] 449
Ireland—Royal Residence in, Motion for an Address, [192] 358
"Oliver Twist," Play of, [191] 834
Representation of the People (Ireland), Leave, [190] 1947; 2R. [191] 1957; Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1593; *add. cl.* 1779; Motion for Adjournment, 1801, 1802, 1804, 1805; Consid. 1892

Brazil, War in—Mediation
Question, Mr. Horsman; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 27, [191] 359

BRETT, Sir H. B., *see* Solicitor General, The

BRIGHT, Sir C. T., *Greenwich*
Electric Telegraphs, Purchase of the, [190] 800

BRIGHT, Mr. Jacob, *Manchester*
Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 1993
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1510
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1360
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 639, 1309
Parliament, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1737, 1738
Supply—University of Glasgow, [192] 402

BRIGHT, Mr. John, *Birmingham*
Army—Perth Barracks, [190] 330
Barrett, The Convict, [192] 832
Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Commission, [192] 427, 428, 431
Boundary, Comm. [192] 263, 281; Preamble, 1273, 1275; *cl.* 4, 1409, 1413
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 722
Electric Telegraphs, [192] 1231
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 645, 720, 769; Res. 1, 1649, 1908, 1932, 1941; 2R. [192] 744
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1602, 1642
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1730, 1746, 1794; [192] 626
Nova Scotia—British North American Confederation, Motion for an Address, [192] 1658, 1694
Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2020
Ratepaying Clauses, [190] 1893
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 477, 485; *cl.* 8, 875; *cl.* 9, 966, 971, 972, 980; Schedule A, 1252, 1254, 1256

Bristol Election
Bristol, Representation of, Question, Mr. Neville - Grenville; Answer, Mr. Powell *Mar* 27, [191] 359
Petition of Electors of the City of Bristol referred to the General Committee of Elections *May* 12, [192] 175
And, on *June* 17, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Howes (Chairman), Mr. Bazley, Mr. Goldney, Lord George J. Manners, Mr. R. J. More
Report of the Committee "That John William Miles, esquire, is not duly elected a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Bristol. That the last Election for the said City is a void Election"
House further informed that the Committee had agreed to certain Resolutions. Minutes of Evidence to be laid before this House (*Mr. Howes*) *June* 25, 2130
(*Parl. P.* Nos. 372, 372-I)
Bristol New Writ
Ordered, That the Evidence taken before the Bristol Election Committee having been delivered, Mr. Speaker do not issue his Warrant for a New Writ for the City of Bristol until three days' Notice of a Motion for the Writ shall have expired (*Mr. Bass*) *July* 13
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Bristol, in the room of John William

Bristol Election—New Writ—cont.
Miles, esquire, whose Election has been determined to be void" (*Mr. Noel*) *June* 30, 193] 420
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Writ for the City of Bristol be not issued till seven days after the evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Bristol Election Petition has been printed" (*Mr. Bass*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Labouchere*)
Moved, "That the Report of the Bristol Election Committee be read" (*Mr. Ayrton*)
Report [25th June] read; after short debate, debate adjourned till Thursday
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new Writ for the electing of a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Bristol, in the room of John William Miles, esquire, whose Election has been determined to be void" (*Mr. Neville-Grenville*) *July* 3, 675
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "no Writ be issued for the City of Bristol until seven days after the evidence taken before the Election Committee for that city shall have been in the hands of Members" (*Mr. Bass*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn
Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, The Solicitor General *July* 16, 1275; Observations, Mr. Neate; Reply, The Attorney General *July* 24, 1744

British Guiana
Clergy Act of, Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 27, [193] 1819

British Museum—Institutions of Science and Art—Administration of
Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Nov* 25, [190] 166
British Museum—South Kensington Museum, Observations, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Beresford Hope; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 27, [191] 388
Accounts—(*Parl. P.* No. 254)
(See *Supply*)

British North America—Lake Superior and the Pacific, &c.
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the capability for settlement and the best means of settling Her Majesty's Territory lying between Lake Superior and the Pacific, especially as to the provision for Telegraphic and other Communication through Her Majesty's Dominions from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean" (*Sir Harry Verney*) *June* 9, [192] 1336; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Despatches—(*Parl. P.* No. [4036]
(See title—*Nova Scotia*)

BROMLEY, Mr. W. DAVENPORT- *Warwickshire, N.*
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 1425
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1558
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [190] 412
Peel Statue, The, Res. [192] 2146
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 16, [192] 1940

Brougham, Lord, The Late
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Roebuck*) *July* 27, [193] 1829; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Broughty Ferry Provisional Order Confirmation Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Bill ordered* *April* 21
Read 1°* *April* 22 [Bill 90]
Read 2°* *April* 23
Committee*; Report *April* 27
Read 3°* *April* 28
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *April* 30 (No. 86)
Read 2ª* *May* 8
Committee*; Report *May* 11
Read 3ª* *May* 12
Royal Assent *May* 29

BROWNE, Lord J. T., *Mayo Co.*
Burials (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [192] 1381
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1584; *cl.* 18, 1590, 1592; *add. cl.* 1779, 1780, 1797
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 476, 478

BROWNLOW, Earl
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 6

BRUCE, Right Hon. Lord E. A. C. B., *Marlborough*
Richmond Green and Hyde Park, [190] 1223

BRUCE, Rt. Hon. H. A., *Merthyr Tydvil*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Consid. [191] 1567
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 1425, 1440
Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1080
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1550
Education—Revised Code, [192] 952
Education, Technical—Mr. Whitworth's Endowment, [191] 699
Elementary Education, Leave, [190] 1816; 2R. [192] 1983, 1995
Infectious Diseases, Motion for an Address, [191] 2011
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1295, 1319
Mines, Accidents in, [192] 1498
Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1868; Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 848, 851, 853; Consid. 1223
Sale of Poisons, &c. Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1219
Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 180, 181
Supply—Education, Public, [192] 1139, 1143, 1160, 1161
Science and Art, [192] 1170
Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 234

Bruce, Sir H. H., *Coleraine*
Burials (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1384
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 616
Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 210
Ireland—Troops in the North of, [193] 1287
Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [193] 1510
Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1957 ; Comm. [192] 1578, 1805
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2168

Bruce, Mr. C. L. **Cumming-**, *Elgin & Nairnshire*
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 854 ; *cl.* 8, 864 ; *cl.* 10, 984 ; *cl.* 11, 996

Bruen, Mr. H., *Carlow Co.*
India—Bonus Committee, The, [191] 261
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1730

Bryan, Mr. G. L., *Kilkenny Co.*
Army—Majors in Cavalry Regiments, [190] 648

"Bubulina," Explosion of the, in the Mersey
Question, Mr. Vance ; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 2, [190] 518

Buccleuch, Duke of
Foreshores, Motion for Papers, [193] 1550, 1552

Buckingham and Chandos, Duke of (Secretary of State for the Colonies)
Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1393
Canada—Assassination of Mr. D'Arcy M'Gee, [191] 1109
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1113
Cotton Statistics, Comm. [192] 918
Gambling in Hong Kong and Heligoland, [190] 523
Hudson's Bay Company, 2R. [193] 1101
New Forest—Deer Removal, &c. Act, Motion for a Commission, [192] 696
Newfoundland—Grants of Land on French Coast, [192] 706, 707
Nova Scotia—Motion for an Address, [193] 690
Parliament—Business of the House, [191] 1682
South Africa—Motion for a Paper, [193] 590
Victoria—Appropriation Act, Motion for an Address, [190] 1108 ; [191] 1967, 1976, 1977
West Indies, 2R. [193] 784, 799 ; Comm. 1101

Buller, Sir E. M., *Staffordshire, N.*
Electors, Registration of, [191] 1458

Burial Societies—Frauds upon
Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 26, [192] 920

Burials (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Monsell, Mr. Sullivan*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Nov* 25 [Bill 5]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Monsell*) *April* 22, [191] 1067
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Colonel William Stuart*) ; Question, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 74, N. 51 ; M. 23 ; Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Monsell*) *June* 10, [192] 1378 ; after short debate, agreed to ; Committee—R.P.
Committee * ; Report *June* 30 [Bill 204]
Considered * *July* 2
Read 3° * *July* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *July* 6
193] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 13, 1093 ; Bill read 2ª · (No. 212)
Moved, That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House
Amendt. to leave out from ("Bill") and insert ("be referred to a Select Committee" (*The Archbishop of Armagh*) ; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; original Motion agreed to
. Committee *July* 17, 1361
. Report *July* 20, 1473 (No. 269)
Read 3ª * *July* 21
c. Lords Amendts. [Bill 251]
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 103]

Burials (Ireland) Bill—Mr. Monsell and the Dean of Cork
Explanation, Mr. Monsell *April* 28, [191] 1454

Burrell, Sir P., *New Shoreham*
Foreign Office and their Agents Abroad, [190] 631
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1772

Butler, Mr. C. S., *Tower Hamlets*
Abyssinia—Postage from, [190] 1115
Customs—Examining Officers, [192] 2135

Butler-Johnstone, Mr. H. A., *Canterbury*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 88
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1697

Buxton, Sir T. F., *King's Lynn*
Navy Estimates—Wages, [192] 91
Slave Trade—Zanzibar, [191] 1578
Supply—Volunteer Corps, [191] 283

Buxton, Mr. C., *Surrey, E.*
Army—Alleged Flogging of Mule Drivers in Abyssinia, [191] 834
March of Troops from Aldershot to Sandhurst, [193] 1828
Brougham, Lord, The Late, [193] 1832
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. [191] 1039
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1470

[*cont.*

Buxton, Mr. C.—*cont.*
Expatriation, Law of, [190] 1999
Libel, Comm. [192] 603
Metropolis—Westminster Improvements, [190] 1977
Statistical Abstracts, Annual, [190] 1977

Cairns, Lord (see Chancellor, The Lord)

Cambridge, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
Abyssinia—Return of the Army, [192] 1812
Vote of Thanks, [193] 482
Army—Volunteer Review at Windsor, [193] 994
War Office—Department of Control, [193] 1240
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 683

Camoys, Lord
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, 3R. [193] 355
Railway Bills—Increase of Rates, [193] 1070

Campbell, Lord
Canning Statue, The, [193] 1460, 1664
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 803
Metropolis—Special Constables, Motion for a Return, [190] 1880
Nova Scotia, [192] 1749; Motion for an Address, [193] 679, 709

Camperdown, Earl of
University Tests, [192] 1024

Canada
Alleged Flogging in a Prison, Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 17, [192] 1698
D'Arcy M'Gee, Mr., Assassination of, Question, The Earl of Carnarvon; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *April* 23, [191] 1108

Candlish, Mr. J., *Sunderland*
Army—Control Department, Motion for Papers, [193] 1274
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [191] 675; *cl.* 11, *ib.*; *cl.* 14, Amendt. *ib.*, 676; Consid. 1567; Schedule, 1877
Assignees of Marine Policies, Comm. [193] 419
Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 433
Boundary, 2R. [191] 1014
British Guiana—Clergy Act, [193] 1819
Burials (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1382
Canongate Annuity Tax, 2R. [191] 1098
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 4, [191] 1060
Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1755
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 1427, 1428
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 46, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1185; Consid. *add. cl.* 1680; 3R. 1724

cont.

Candlish, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 15, [193] 1602
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 11, [191] 222, 223
Jamaica—Clergy Act, [193] 1820
London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. Amendt. [191] 196
Merchant Shipping Acts, [192] 1852
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1342, 1343; Preamble, 1521; *cl.* 3, 1768
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [190] 413
Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1869
Navy Estimates—Naval Stores, [193] 1145
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [193] 1395
Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1125
Parliament—Statue of Oliver Cromwell, [190] 1450, 1451
Pilotage, Compulsory, Res. [191] 361, 373, 387
Poor Law, [190] 164
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 10, [193] 1878; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1881; *add. cl.* 1885
Poor Relief Assessment Returns, [192] 1470
Postal—Cape Mail, [192] 923
Registration, 3R. [193] 720
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1733
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1594
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 858; Schedule A, 1254
Rivers, Pollution of, [190] 1072
Spain—Case of the "Tornado," [193] 1820
Stamper, Case of, and the Overseers of Sunderland, [193] 904, 905
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 996
Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1000, 1002
Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2168
Portpatrick Railway Company Compensation, [193] 1211
Post Office Packet Service, [193] 840
Science and Art, [192] 1171
Works, Buildings, &c. [191] 296
Supply—Government Prisons, [192] 1106; Amendt. 1107, 1108
Supply—Public Buildings, Amendt. [192] 294

Canongate Annuity Tax Bill
(*Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Baxter*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 11 [Bill 60]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. M'Laren*) *April* 22, [191] 1087
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*The Lord Advocate*); after debate, Question, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 59, N. 86; M. 27; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1107
Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1385
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1123; Comm. [193] 600
Education, 2R. [191] 1309
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2089
Ritual Commission, [190] 1880;—Reports of the, [192] 333
Uniformity of Public Worship, 2R. [193] 878, 893

Cape of Good Hope—The Basuto Territory
Question, Mr. Miller ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 20, [190] 1975 ; Question, Mr. Cardwell ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 12, [192] 114

Capital Punishment within Prisons Bill (*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Attorney General*)
190] *c.* Question, Mr. Hibbert ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Nov* 26, 176
. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *Feb* 20, 1127
Bill ordered, after debate ; read 1° [Bill 36]
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *Mar* 5, 1127
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Serjeant Gaselee*)
On Question, "That 'now' &c. ;" A. 181, N. 25 ; M. 156 ; Bill read 2°
191] Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 21, 1033
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient, instead of carrying out the punishment of death within prisons, that Capital Punishment should be abolished" (*Mr. Gilpin*) ; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c. ;" A. 127, N. 23 ; M. 104
. Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to ; Committee ; Report, 1055
Considered * *April* 27
Read 3° * *April* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *April* 30
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Duke of Richmond*) *May* 7, 1879 ; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 83)
Committee * ; Report *May* 8
Read 3ª *May* 11, [192] 14
Amendt. "To provide that all prisoners who might be within the walls of the prison at the time when an execution took place, should be present when the punishment was inflicted" (*The Lord Ravensworth*) ; after short debate, Amendt. negatived ; Bill passed
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 24]

Captain Pim's Electoral Address
Question, Mr. Neate ; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *July* 20, [193] 1480

CARDIGAN, Earl of
Army—Shrapnel Shell, [190] 1147

CARDWELL, Right Hon. E., *Oxford City*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 93
Boundary, Comm. [192] 281
Cape of Good Hope—Basuto Land, [192] 114
Ceylon—Affairs of, [190] 2031
East Worcestershire Election, [192] 1120
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, [191] 1200
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2196 ; *cl.* 46, [193] 1369 ; *add. cl.* 1378
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 888
Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1233
Lake Superior and the Pacific, &c., Motion for a Commission, [192] 1350
[*cont.*

CARDWELL, Right Hon. E.—*cont.*
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1745, 1799
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [193] 541
Nova Scotia—British North American Confederation, Motion for an Address, [192] 1688
Parliament—Business of the House, [191] 1680
Dissolution of, [192] 1076
Peel Statue, The, [192] 2142, 2144
Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1806
Representation of the People (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [192] 1905
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 885 ; *cl.* 9, 970
West Indies, Lords Amendts. [193] 1887

CARLISLE, Bishop of
Army Chaplains, 2R. [192] 1300
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1141 ; Comm. [193] 606
Consecration of Churchyards Act Amendment, 2R. [192] 508
Uniformity of Public Worship, 2R. [193] 886

CARNARVON, Earl of
Abyssinian Expedition—Vote of Thanks, [193] 490
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 26
Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1392
Canada—Assassination of Mr. D'Arcy M'Gee, [191] 1108
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1127
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1845
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 2, 23, 262, 288
Newfoundland—Grants of Land on French Coast, [192] 700
Nova Scotia, [192] 1749 ; Motion for an Address, [193] 694
Parliament—Business of the House, Report, [191] 562 ; Res. 695
Construction of the House, Re-appointment of Commission, [192] 510
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 1623, 1627
South Africa, Motion for a Paper, [193] 587
Union Workhouses and Infirmaries, Motion for Papers, [190] 323
University Tests, [192] 1017
Vagrants—Guildford Union, Motion for Correspondence, [192] 95, 100, 102
Victoria—Appropriation Act, [191] 1979
West Indies, 2R. [193] 786, 797

CARNEGIE, Hon. C., *Forfarshire*
Agriculture, Motion for a Commission, [192] 587
Court of Session (Scotland), 2R. [192] 1521
Money Orders and Stamped Receipts, [192] 2134
Navy—Chaplains, [193] 1557
Representation of the People (Scotland), Consid. *add. cl.* [192] 1445
Scotland—Law of Hypothec, [190] 1149

Carriers' Act, General
Question, Mr. Carter ; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 25, [192] 2131

CARTER, Mr. S., *Coventry*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 622
General Carriers' Act, [192] 2131

Castle, Mr., Case of
Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 27, [193] 1826

CASTLEROSSE, Right Hon. Viscount, *Kerry Co.*
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1732

Cattle Plague
Africa, Cattle from, Question, Mr. Barnett; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 9, [193] 908
Austria, Rinderpest in, Question, Mr. Moffatt; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 3, [193] 609
Cattle Plague Reports, Question, Mr. Evans; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 10, [190] 1287; Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *April* 30, [191] 1578
Cattle Plague Compensation, Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 16, [193] 1288
Fairs, Sale of Cattle at, Question, Mr. Hodgkinson; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Nov* 21, [190] 105
Foreign Cattle, Importation of, Question, Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson; Answer, Lord Robert
190] Montagu *Nov* 28, 335; Observations, Lord Robert Montagu; Reply, Mr. Horsfall
191] *April* 23, 1149; Question, Mr. Russell Gurney; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu
192] *May* 11, 18; Question, Mr. Corrance; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 12, 115; Questions, Sir Robert Collier; Answers, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 18, 424; Question, Mr. Horsfall; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 18, 1758; Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Lord Stanley; short
193] debate thereon *July* 16, 1284; Observations, Mr. Headlam; Reply, Lord Robert Montagu; short debate thereon *July* 24, 1749—*Foreign Sheep,* Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 16, 1287
Foreign Cattle Market, Question, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 11, [192] 1395
Legislation, Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Nov* 20, [190] 92
Outbreak in Berwickshire, Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Nov* 29, [190] 419—*In Norfolk,* Question, Colonel North; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 9, 1226
Outbreak on the Continent, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 24, [193] 1715
Schleswig-Holstein, Smallpox among Sheep in, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 27, [193] 1828
Zurich Veterinary College, Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 18, [192] 1755; Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 22, 1852
Parl. Papers—
Petitions and Memorials 180
Orders of Council in force . . . 451

CAVE, Rt. Hon. S. (Paymaster of the Forces and Vice President of the Board of Trade), *New Shoreham*
Admiralty Jurisdiction, [190] 176
Alkali Act (1863) Perpetuation, 2R. [192] 1296
Assignees of Marine Policies, Comm. [193] 419
Bank Holidays, 2R. [190] 944
Board of Trade—Private Bills, [191] 831
Carriage of Parcels by Railway, [191] 1333, 1334
Cattle, Importation of, [192] 115
Ceylon—Great Basses Lighthouse, [193] 309
Circular Delivery Company and the Commissionaires, [193] 1200
Commerce, Chambers of, [190] 606
Tribunals of, [190] 605
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), 2R. [190] 1828; Comm. [192] 164
Deal Boatmen, Charges by, [190] 1115
Electric Telegraphs, [192] 1564
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1604
Foreshores and Bed of the Sea, [190] 419
"Garonne," Loss of the, [192] 1042; [193] 371
General Carriers' Act, [192] 2131
International Monetary Conference, [190] 601
Ireland—Daunt's Rock, Cork Harbour, [190] 794
Irish Ordnance Map, Revision of the, [190] 1451
Lee River Conservancy, Leave, [190] 997
Mercantile Marine, [190] 536
Merchant Shipping Acts, [192] 513, 1853
Merchant Shipping Consolidation, [191] 699
Merchant Ships, Overloading of, [193] 372
Metropolis—Thames Embankment, [190] 1686
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [193] 543
Oyster and Mussel Fisheries, Leave, [190] 1280
Passenger Steamers, Overloading of, [191] 451
Pilotage, Compulsory, Res. [191] 371
Parliament—Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 879, 1809;—Standing Order 131 Repeal, [191] 143; Explanation, 351, 356
Railway Engines, Fires from, [193] 1288
Railways and Joint Stock Companies, Leave, [190] 1280; 2R. [191] 1539
Railways (Extension of Time), Leave, [190] 1000
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [191] 206
Regulation of Railways, 2R. [192] 1294; Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1733; *cl.* 17, 1734; *add. cl.* 1735, 1736; Consid. 1782, 1787, 1790, 1792
Ribbons, Importation of Foreign, [193] 308
Rule of the Road at Sea, [191] 705; [192] 2136
Scotland — Burntisland and Granton Ferry, [190] 1004
Sea, Collisions at, [190] 642
Sea Fisheries, Leave, [190] 1074; Comm. 1271, 1274; *cl.* 6, 1276; *cl.* 27, 1277; Lords Amendts. [192] 1859, 1863, 1869
South Eastern, &c. Railway, Lords Amendts. [193] 1249
Statistical Abstracts, Annual, [190] 1977
Storm Warnings, [190] 145
Sugar, Refining of, at Cologne, [193] 305

[*cont.*

Cave, Right Hon. S.—*cont.*
  Supply—Board of Trade, [193] 1204, 1206
    Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1000
    Lighthouses Abroad, [191] 1003, 1004
  Thames, Navigation of the — Main Drainage Outfall, [190] 105, 106
    Obstructions in the, [191] 1577
  Trent Valley Railway, Accidents on the, [190] 732
  Weights and Measures (Metric System), Leave, [190] 1074 ; 2R. [192] 204 ; [193] 1927
  Wreck Registers, [190] 507, 1687

Cave, Mr. T., *Barnstaple*
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, Motion for Adjournment, [192] 2188
  Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1318
  Postal—India, China, and Japan Mails, Res. [190] 463
    West India Mail Packet Station, [190] 666
  Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2019
  Sale of Poisons, &c. Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1218

Cavendish, Lord E., *Sussex, E.*
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1611

Cavendish, Lord F. C., *Yorkshire, W.R.N.*
  Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 2008

Cavendish, Lord G. H., *Derbyshire, N.*
  Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1869 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 851 ; Consid. 1224
  Turnpike Trusts, Motion for an Address, [191] 2017

Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G., *Essex, S.*
  Army—Curragh Camp, [190] 163
  Army—Military Education, Res, [191] 1819
  Contagious Diseases Act, [190] 797
  Main Drainage—Inhabitants of Barking, [192] 954, 1853
    Sewage Obstructions in the River, [190] 1220
  New Zealand, Forces in, [193] 642
  Poor Laws—Pauper Idiots and Lunatics, [190] 1887
  Weights and Measures, False, Commission on, [191] 467

Ceylon
  Affairs of, Observations, Mr. Gorst ; debate thereon *Mar* 20, [190] 2012 ; Question, Mr. Gorst ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 20, [193] 1477
  Condition of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 20, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the condition of Ceylon and the action of its Government" (*Mr. Watkin*), [191] 971 ; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to
  Crops in, Question, Mr. Watkin ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 18, [192] 1755
[*cont.*

Ceylon—cont.
  Lighthouse on the Great Basses, Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy ; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 29, [193] 309
  Unauthorized Publication of a Despatch, Question, Mr. Watkin ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 29, [192] 1041
    Papers relating to—(*Parl. P.* No. 39)

Chambers, Mr. M., *Devonport*
  Army—Clerks in the Engineer Department, [192] 1125
  Army—Military Education, Res. [191] 1836
  Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1082
  Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* , [191] 1058 ; *cl.* 4, 1061
  Courts of Justice, New, [192] 288, 368, 1049, 2131 ; Motion for a Committee, [193] 339
  Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Court, 2R. [191] 1874
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 743 ; *cl.* 8, 747 ; *cl.* 14, 1007 ; *cl.* 17, 1019, 1169 ; *cl.* 26, 1171 ; *cl.* 46, 1371 ; *cl.* 47, 1372 ; *add. cl.* 1377 ; Amendt. 1381
  Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 123
  Navy Estimates—Dockyards and Naval Yards, [193] 560
    Naval Stores, [193] 1144, 1147
    Wages, [192] 85
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 10, [193] 1879
  Publications, Registration of, [192] 1514
  Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1592
  Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. [193] 401
  Sale of Poisons, &c. Comm. *cl.* 17, [193] 1217
  Supply—British Museum, [193] 831
    Post Office, [193] 832
    Public Buildings, [192] 294
    Royal Parks, &c. [192] 298, 300
    University of London Buildings, [192] 395
  Vancouver's Island and British Columbia, [193] 1142

Chambers, Mr. T., *Marylebone*
  Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 673 ; *cl.* 35, Amendt. 678
  Cab Fares, [190] 1398
  Libel, Comm. [192] 594 ; *cl.* 1, 605, 606 ; *cl.* 3, 611
  Metropolis—Regent's Park—The Ornamental Water, [190] 145
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1422 ; *cl.* 4, 1605 ; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1607 ; *cl.* 8, 1614 ; *cl.* 10, 1872, 1876, 1878 ; *cl.* 11, 1879 ; *cl.* 13, 1881 ; *cl.* K, Amendt. 1882, 1884

Chancellor, The **Lord** (Lord **Chelmsford**)
  Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 501, 508
  Court of Appeal Chancery (Despatch of Business) Amendment, 1R. [190] 1035
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, 1R. [190] 1208
  Parliament—Business of the House, [190] 1099
    Opening of the Session, [190] 1
  Promissory Oaths, 1R. [190] 689 ; 2R. 851, 856, 858
  Sales of Reversions, 2R. [190] 527

CHANCELLOR, The LORD (Lord CAIRNS)
Abyssinia, Army of—Vote of Thanks, [193] 1459
Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1387, 1392
Bankruptcy Act Amendment, 2R. [193] 866; Comm. 1160, 1161; *cl.* 1, Amendt. *ib.*
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, 2R. [191] 1, 30, 803; Comm. 1217, 1219, 1220; Withdrawal of Bill, [192] 5
Burials (Ireland), Report, *cl.* 4, [193] 1474, 1475
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1136; Comm. [193] 597, 601; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 609; Report, *cl.* 7, 897; *cl.* 8, 901, 902, 903; 3R. 1100
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), 2R. [192] 1553, 1554
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 106, 1838, 1846, 1848; [193] 1935
Courts of Justiciary (Scotland), 2R. [193] 1163
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, 3R. [190] 1677, 1678
Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland, Motion for a Committee, [191] 252
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 2R. [193] 1803, 1807, 1808; Comm. *cl.* 24, 1894
Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1446; [192] 1749
*Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 243, 262, 283, 289
Foreshore and Bed of the Sea, [192] 1831; [193] 1552
Ireland—Quarter Sessions Courts, [190] 1794
Judgments Extension, 2R. [193] 367
Larceny and Embezzlement, 2R. [193] 1364
Liquidation, 2R. [193] 366
Lodger's Property Protection, 2R. [193] 977
Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 580
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1687, 1689
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [191] 692
    Prorogation of, [193] 1937, 1940
Promissory Oaths, Commons Amendts. [193] 1227, 1233
Public Schools, Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1655, 1656; *cl.* 16, 1659; Report, 1701, 1707
Reform Act, 1867—Ratepaying Clauses, [190] 1565
Registration, 2R. [193] 803
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [192] 7; *cl.* 19, 13; *add. cl.* 420, 421
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), 2R. [192] 235; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1742
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 27, [193] 364; Amendt. 365; Commons Amendts. 976
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, 2R. [193] 1080, 1089
Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 337
Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment, Report, *add. cl.* [192] 1630
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 238, 239, 241; Re-comm. 917
South Coast Railways, Commons Amendts. [193] 1547
Uniformity of Public Worship, 2R. [193] 879
United States—The "Alabama" Claims, Motion for Papers, [191] 342, 349

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR, The Lord—*cont.*
University Elections (Voting Papers), 2R. [193] 982
Victoria—Appropriation Act, [191] 1987, 1994, 2000
West Indies, 2R. [193] 795

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Right Hon. B. Disraeli), *Buckinghamshire*
Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 988, 989
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 72
British Museum, [190] 166
Compound Householder, The, [190] 730, 796, 886
Education, [190] 741
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 693, 728
Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 690
Representation of the People (Scotland), [190] 690; Leave, 842
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 181, 194, 303
(see DISRAELI, Right Hon. B.)

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Right Hon. G. W. Hunt), *Northamptonshire, N.*
Abyssinian Expedition — Expenditure, [190] 1684
Charitable Institutions — Exemption from Rating, [193] 313
Coinage—Half-Crowns, [192] 1850
Commissions, Permanent Expenses of, Res. [191] 1294
Court of Chancery — Salaries and Expenses, [191] 700
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 364; [193] 1665
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 686, 2193, 2196; *cl.* 6, [193] 739; *cl.* 8, 746; *cl.* 17, 1019; *cl.* 45, 1182, 1183; *add. cl.* 1452; Consid. 1621, 1629, 1634, 1638
Electric Telegraphs, Leave, [191] 678, 681, 706; [192] 654, 1231; 2R. 1301, 1567, 1806, 1807, 1809; Nomination of Committee, Instruction, 1978, 1979, 1980; [193] 720; Comm. 1557, 1585, 1586, 1590; *cl.* 4, 1598, 1600; *cl.* 15, 1601, 1602, 1603; *cl.* 22, 1604; Consid. 1651
Financial Statement, The, [190] 1892
Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1227, 1232
Foreign Cattle Market, [192] 1395
Income Tax Commissioners, [193] 1774, 1775
Ireland—Compulsory Presentments, [193] 828
    Railways, [192] 1752; [193] 847
    Records, [193] 717
    Royal Irish Academy, [193] 1200
Licences, Res. [191] 153
Metropolis—Clerkenwell Explosion, [192] 1923
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1290, 1315, 1317, 1335, 1337; *cl.* 2, 1532, 1533; *cl.* 3, 1539, 1540, 1541, 1542, 1672, 1673, 1748, 1756, 1758, 1764, 1766, 1768, 1769, 1771, 1772, 1773, 1780
Mortgages, Taxation of, [193] 1944
Parliament—Business of the House, [191] 1680
    Dissolution, The, [192] 1129, 1130, 1223
    Public Petitions — Breach of Privilege, [192] 1751

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
- Portpatrick and Belfast, &c. Railway, 2R. [193] 781
- Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2017
- Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [191] 194
- Post Office and Circular Delivery Company, [193] 1922
- Public Accounts, Res. [192] 128
- Public Health, &c.—Department of, Res. [193] 1195
- Rates, Collection and Payment of, [193] 911
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 884; *cl.* O, 1242, 1243; Lords Amendts. Amendt. [193] 919
- Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. [192] 1536, 1538; [193] 389; Amendt. 390, 391
- Stamp Duty on the Transfer of Debenture Stock, [192] 1227
- Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 988, 990, 994, 996
  - Civil Service Estimates, [190] 1793; [192] 1010
  - Compensation—Explosion at Clerkenwell, [193] 1212
  - County Courts, [192] 502
  - Courts of Justice, New, [192] 291
  - Government Prisons, [192] 1106, 1107
  - Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1002
  - Metropolitan Police, [192] 504
  - Miscellaneous Expenses, [192] 1174; Report, 1605
  - Mission House, Teheran, [191] 999
  - Post Office, [193] 834
  - Prosecutions, [192] 496, 498
  - Royal Palaces, [191] 1011
  - Scottish Universities, Grants to, [192] 1134
  - Superannuation, [192] 1173
- Supply, Proceedings in, Resolution, [191] 1029, 1031, 1464
- Thames Embankment, &c. Amendment, 2R. [192] 1212, 1215
- Valuation (Ireland), [192] 2136
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1149, 1173, 1190; Comm. Res. 1, 1751, 1770, 1772; Res. 2, 1774

(see HUNT, Mr. G. W., Secretary to the Treasury)

Charitable Institutions, Taxation of
- Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Nov* 28, [190] 331; Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 4, [191] 1693; Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 29, [193] 313

CHEETHAM, Mr. J., *Salford*
- Boundary, Comm. Schedule, [192] 1443
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1341
- Turkey and Egypt, Consular Courts in, [193] 1052

CHELMSFORD, Lord (see also CHANCELLOR, the Lord)
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [192] 899, 907; Report, [193] 984
- Bankruptcy Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, Motion for adjournment, [193] 1162, 1363

CHELMSFORD, Lord—*cont.*
- Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, 2R. [191] 26, 802, 803
- County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), 2R. [192] 1554
- Judgments Extension, 2R. [193] 367
- Larceny and Embezzlement, 2R. [193] 1364
- Marriage Laws Commission, [193] 1090
- Parliament — Business of the House, Res. Amendt. [191] 696
- Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), 2R. [192] 235
- West Indies, 2R. [193] 797, 798

CHICHESTER, Earl of
- Public Schools, 2R. [193] 1471
- South Coast Railways, 2R. [192] 1456

CHILDERS, Mr. H. C. E., *Pontefract*
- Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 423;—Expenditure, 1684
- Army—Questions, &c.
  - Conveyance of Troops—War Department and India Office, [190] 338, 420
  - Non-purchase Corps, Report of Select Committee, [190] 335; [192] 1855
  - Retirements from the Royal Artillery, &c. [190] 1214
- Army—Control Department, Motion for Papers, [193] 1269
- Army—Controller in Chief, Res. [193] 944
- Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2047
- Army Estimates — Full and Half Pay, [193] 1278, 1280
  - Land Forces, [191] 77, 79; [193] 521
  - Surveys, [193] 962
- Art Catalogue, Publication of the, [190] 1219
- Australia—Postal Communication, [192] 1472
- Ceylon—Condition of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 979
- Civil Service Estimates, [191] 830
- Commissions, Permanent Expenses of, Res. [191] 1284
- County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), Comm. [192] 170
- Court of Chancery — Salaries and Expenses, [191] 700
- Court of Session (Scotland), 2R. [192] 1524
- Courts of Justice, New, Motion for a Committee, [193] 338
- Diplomatic Service, [192] 936, 937
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2181; *add. cl.* [193] 1453; Consid. 1642
- Electric Telegraphs, [192] 1567; 2R. 1806; Nomination of Committee, 1980; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [193] 1596; *cl.* 15, 1603
- Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1232
- Government of India Act Amendment, 2R. [192] 1599
- Income Tax, Comm. *cl.* 2, [190] 521
- Land Writs Registration (Scotland) Fees, [191] 830; Comm. *cl.* 23, [192] 1528
- Metropolis—Guardians of St. Luke's Parish, [190] 650
  - Hyde Park—Ride in Rotten Row, [193] 372
- Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Lords Amendts. [190] 661
- Middlesex Registry Office, [191] 1146
- Ministerial Statement, [191] 1726
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 67, [191] 325
- Navy—Dockyard Commission, [190] 1595
  - Greenwich Hospital, [193] 1403

CHILDERS, Mr. H. C. E.—*cont.*
Navy—Admiralty Monies and Accounts, Motion for a Committee, [190] 915
Navy—Dockyards, Royal, Res. [190] 2044
Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1138
Navy—Wooden Ships, Motion for Returns, [190] 1953
Navy Estimates, [191] 147
Coast Guard Service, [193] 540
Dockyards and Naval Yards, [193] 559
Greenwich Hospital, &c. [193] 1156
Medicines, &c. [193] 1155
Men and Boys, [190] 1938
Naval Stores, [193] 1147
Officers, Salaries of, [193] 537
Wages, Amendt. [192] 70, 79, 81, 92
Parliament—Business of the House, [191] 1681
Dissolution, The, [192] 1126, 1129, 1223
Portpatrick and Belfast, &c. Railway, 2R. [193] 782
Postal—India, China, and Japan Mails, Res. [190] 463, 471, 472
Post Office—Case of A. J. Duffy, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1298
Public Accounts, Res. [192] 132
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 447
Stamp Duty on the Transfer of Debenture Stock, [192] 1227
Supply—Board of Trade, [193] 1203
British Embassy Houses, [191] 989, 991, 992, 994, 996
Civil Service Estimates, [190] 1793; [193] 1185
Common Law Courts (Ireland), [192] 1104
Consular Establishments Abroad, [192] 2171
Convict Establishments (Colonies), [192] 504, 505
Flax, Cultivation of (Ireland), [192] 1175
Government Prisons, [192] 1105, 1106; Report, 1176, 1602, 1609
Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1001
Home Office, [193] 1202
Lighthouses Abroad, [191] 1003
Miscellaneous Expenses, [192] 1174
Mission House, Teheran, [191] 999
Portpatrick Railway Company Compensation, [193] 1211
Post Office Packet Service, [193] 845
Prosecutions, [192] 495, 496, 499
Royal Palaces, [191] 1004, 1006
Scottish Universities, Grants to, [192] 1134
Works, Buildings, &c. [191] 286, 292, 294, 295
Supply, Proceedings in, Resolution, [191] 1030, 1031
Valuation of Property, [190] 602
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1182; Comm. Res. 1, 1767, 1769

Children, &c. Protection Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 29 (No. 187)
Bill withdrawn* *July* 10

China
Ambassador from—Mr. Burlinghame, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. E. C. Egerton *Feb* 17, [190] 799—*Mr. J. M. Brown,* Question, Mr. Osborne; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 9, 1224
[*cont.*

China—cont.
Treaty of Tien-tsin, Question, Mr. Osborne; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 6, [190] 1149; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 23, [191] 1147; *July* 31, [193] 1947
Memorial respecting—*Parl. P.* [3996]

Cholera in the Mediterranean
Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 2, [191] 703

Church of England
Church Rates Bills, Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 2, [190] 506; Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Dec* 3, 544
Colonial Bishops, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 12, [192] 111
Diocese of Salisbury—Charge of the Bishop of Salisbury, Petitions presented (*Lord Portman*) *Nov* 22, [190] 130
Fees on Ordinations, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 27, [193] 1822
Ritual Commission, Second Report *Parl P.* [4016]
Ritual Commission, Recommendations of the, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Ga-
190] thorne Hardy *Nov* 25, 164—*Second Report,* Question, Observations, Lord Taunton; Answer, The Archbishop of Canterbury *Mar* 19, 1877; Question, Mr. Waldegrave - Leslie; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 12,
192] 112—*Royal Commission — Legislation on the Reports,* Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury; debate thereon *May* 15, 332
Universities and the Established Church, Petition presented (*The Bishop of London*) *Mar* 19, [190] 1872
See *Established Church* (*Ireland*)—*South Africa—Consecration of Bishops*

Church Rates Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Baines, Mr. Gilpin*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Dec* 3 [Bill 21]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 21

Church Rates Commutation Bill
(*Mr. Newdegate, Colonel Stuart*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Nov* 27 [Bill 10]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Newdegate*) *April* 29, [191] 1535; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Bill withdrawn* *July* 29

Church Rates Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Beresford Hope*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Dec* 3 [Bill 22]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Hubbard*) *Mar* 11, [190] 1398
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon Wednesday the 8th day of April next" (*Mr. Hardcastle*), 1407; Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; 2R. deferred
Bill withdrawn* *July* 29
(See *Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Bill*)

Circular Delivery Company and the Commissionaires
Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 14, [193] 1200

City of London Gas Bill—*Formerly* **Metropolis Gas Bill**
(*Mr. Morrison, Mr. Locke, Mr. Gorst*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 5 [Bill 49]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Morrison*) *April* 2, [191] 798; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *April* 3 [Bill 85]
Re-committed to the Select Committee on the Metropolis Gas Bills
Report * *May* 13 [Bill 115]
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *—R.P. *May* 18
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *; Report *May* 19
Considered * *May* 20
Read 3° * *May* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *May* 22 (No. 109)
Read 2ª * *June* 8
Committee * *June* 25 (No. 168)
Report * *June* 26
Read 3ª * *June* 29
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. cxxv.]

Clancarty, Earl of
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 230
Regulation of Railways, Report, *cl.* 14, [192] 412, 415; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 418; *add. cl.* 421; 3R. 708

Clanricarde, Marquess of
Brecon and Neath Railway—Accident on the, [191] 1879, 1881
Burials (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1362
Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland, Motion for a Committee, [191] 248, 250
France—Coasting Trade of, Address for a Paper, [193] 980, 981
Ireland—Quarter Sessions Courts, [190] 1794
Marriage Laws Commission, [193] 1090
Nova Scotia—Motion for an Address, [193] 706
Parliament—Business of the House, Report, [191] 569; Res. 693, 694
Parliament — Petitions, Public, Motion for a Select Committee, [191] 690
Railway Bills—Increase of Rates, Res. [193] 1074
Railways (Ireland), Motion for an Address, [190] 1209
Regulation of Railways, 2R. [190] 1968; Comm. *cl.* 15, [192] 9; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 12, 13; Report, *add. cl.* 417
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [193] 800
Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy, Comm. [192] 1556; 3R. 1748
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 237, 239, 242; Re-comm. 916
South Eastern and London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Companies, 2R. Amendt. [192] 1448, 1462; 3R. [193] 353, 362
Tenure (Ireland), 1R. [190] 1039, 1108; 2R. 1432, 1447, 1448

Clarendon, Earl of
Clerks of the Peace (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1162
Established Church (Ireland), 1R. [192] 1741; 2R. 2079
Public Schools, Address for Papers, [192] 1546
Public Schools, 2R. [193] 1468

Clay, Mr. J., *Kingston-on-Hull*
Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1755
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 743; *cl.* 10, 760; *cl.* 45, 1178, 1183; *add. cl.* 1454, 1456; Consid. 1637
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1923
Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 23, [192] 1529
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1318
Parliament—Dissolution of, [192] 1081
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1737; Consid. 1785
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. [192] 1537; [193] 399
St. Petersburg, British Factory at, [193] 1666, 1824
Supply—Foreign Office, New, [192] 313
Parliament, Houses of, [192] 305
Prosecutions, [192] 500

Clerkenwell Prison
Attack on the—The Convict Barrett, Question, Mr. Bright; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 25, [192] 832
Clerkenwell Explosion Compensations, Question, Mr. Neate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 23, [192] 1923
Special Constables, Motion for "Return of the Number of Special Constables who have respectively enrolled themselves in the different Parishes of the Metropolis after the explosion in Clerkenwell" (*The Lord Campbell*) *Mar* 19, [190] 1880; Motion agreed to

Clerks of the Peace, &c. (Ireland) Bill
(*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 25 [Bill 194]
Read 2° * *July* 1
Committee *; Report *July* 2
Considered * *July* 3
Read 3° * *July* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 7 (No. 224)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 14, [193] 1162; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 261)
Committee * *July* 16
Report * *July* 17
Read 3ª * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 98]

Cleveland, Duke of
East London Museum Site, Report, [190] 861
London, Brighton, &c. Railways, 3R. [193] 362
Parliament — Business of the House, Report, [191] 569; Res. 692
Poor Relief, 3R. *add. cl.* [192] 1912
Railway Bills—Increase of Rates, Res. [193] 1074

[*cont.*

Cleveland, Duke of—*cont.*
Regulation of Railways, Report, *add. cl.* [192] 419
Vagrancy—Guildford Union, Motion for Correspondence, [192] 104
West Indies, 2R. [193] 799

Clinton, Lord A. P., *Newark*
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, Amendt. [190] 1330

Clinton, Lord (Under Secretary of State for India)
Metropolis—Special Constables, Motion for a Return, [190] 1883
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [190] 528
Scotland—County and Burgh Police, Motion for a Committee, [192] 3
Thames Embankment, &c. 2R. [192] 1917
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [193] 1549
University Elections (Voting Papers), 2R. [193] 981, 982

Clive, Mr. G., *Hereford City*
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1552
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 752
Ireland—Irish Church Commission, [190] 1457 ; [193] 324
Medico-Legal Inquiries, [193] 609
Turnpike Trusts, Motion for an Address, [191] 2012
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1722

Coal Fields of Great Britain
Question, Mr. Henderson ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Nov* 28, [190] 332

Coal Mines—The Committee on
Question, Mr. Greene ; Answer, Mr. Ayrton ; short debate thereon *May* 29, [192] 1081
Coal Mines Regulation, Question, Mr. Neate ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 18, [190] 941

Coble, Mr., Case of
Question, Mr. Bagnall ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 28, [191] 1457

Cochrane, Mr. A. D. R. W. Baillie, *Honiton*
Abyssinia—Batta to the Army, [192] 1756
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 368, 1045
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 1248, 1255
Disraeli's, Mr., Speech at Merchant Taylors' Hall, [192] 2158, 2161
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 519
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [192] 719, 1185 ; [193] 1387
Parliament—Public Business, [193] 1421
Peel Statue, The, [192] 2144
Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. [190] 1235 ; Comm. [192] 449 ; *cl.* 3, 486 ; *cl.* 12, 1006
"St. Abbe," Survivors of the, [191] 260
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [192] 305
Turkey—Annexation of Epirus and Thessaly to Greece, [190] 328
West Indies—Hurricane in the, [190] 421

Cogan, Right Hon. W. H. F., *Kildare Co.*
Curragh of Kildare, 2R. [192] 1620
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1920 ; Comm. [192] 1195
Ireland—Alleged Seditious Speaking, [190] 1681
Workhouses, Dietary in, [193] 1482
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 639
Parliament, Dissolution of, [192] 1074, 1075
Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1494
Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 1204 ; Consid. *add. cl.* [192] 1902

Coinage—Half-Crowns
Question, Sir Frederick Heygate ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 22, [192] 1849
Account of, 1858 to 1867—(*Parl. P.* No. 340)

Colchester, Lord
Boundary, Report, [193] 713
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1131

Cole, Hon. J. Lowry, *Enniskillen*
Burials (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1384

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire*
Court of Session (Scotland), Leave, [190] 1090 ; 2R. [192] 1520
Government of India Act Amendment, [192] 1567 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1889
Governor General of India, 2R. [192] 1602
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 836
192] Comm. *cl.* 3, 849 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 852, 854, 855 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 856 ; *cl.* 8, 893 ; *cl.* 9, 977, 978, 979 ; *cl.* 10, 988 ; *cl.* 12, 1006, 1007 ; *cl.* 51, 1009 ; *cl.* 41, 1233 ; *add. cl.* 1237 ; Schedule A, 1251, 1254
Scotland—Judicial Statistics, [190] 988
Supply—Register House (Edinburgh), Report, [192] 1176
Volunteer Corps, [191] 274

Coleridge, Mr. J. D., *Exeter*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [191] 797, 837, 850
Foreshores and Bed of the Sea, [190] 419
Libel, Comm. [192] 600
Oxford and Cambridge Universities, Leave, [190] 926 ; 2R. [192] 209 ; [193] 469
Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts. [192] 1862

Collier, Sir R. P., *Plymouth*
Army—Conveyance of Troops, [190] 510
Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 433
Boundary, Comm. [192] 285
Cattle, Importation of Foreign, [192] 424
Darling, Sir C., [192] 1397
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 707 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 662 ; *cl.* 5, 2192 ; [193] 728, 733 ; *cl.* 6, 743 ; *cl.* 7, 745 ; *cl.* 14, 1001, 1007, 1014 ; *add. cl.* 1386 ; Consid. 1630
Expatriation, Law of, [190] 1994
India—Civilian Judges (Bombay), [191] 1460
Libel, 2R. [190] 312 ; [191] 664 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 608, 617

[*cont.*

Collier, Sir R. P.—*cont.*
Mines Assessment, Consid. Amendt. [193] 1220
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1741
Parliamentary Boroughs—Payment of Rates, [190] 446
Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 569, 570
Registration of Voters Act, [192] 382
Stamper, Case of, and the Overseers of Sunderland, [193] 907

Colliers in the Wigan District, Strike of
Question, Major Anson; Answer, Sir James Fergusson *April* 24, [191] 1224
Riots in Lancashire and Staffordshire, Question, The Earl of Lichfield; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *April* 24, [191] 1221

Colliery Accidents
Observations, Mr. Greene *April* 28, [191] 1464
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into Colliery Accidents" (*Mr. Greene*) *May* 26, [192] 939; after short debate, House counted out

Colliery Prosecution—Dismissal of Inspectors' Summons
Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 15, [192] 1558

Colonial Governors' Pensions Act Amendment Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Resolution in Committee* *June* 25
Resolution reported; Bill ordered *June* 26
Read 1° * *June* 29 [Bill 202]
Read 2° * *June* 30
Committee *; Report *July* 9
Read 3° * *July* 10
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*) *July* 10 (No. 239)
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *July* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 29
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 128]

Colonial Shipping Bill (*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Adderley*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 14 [Bill 236]
Read 2° * *July* 16
Committee *; Report *July* 17
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*) *July* 20 (No. 274)
Read 2ª * *July* 21
Committee * *July* 23
Report * *July* 24
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 129]

Colonsay, Lord
Registration of Writs (Scotland), 2R. [190] 1147

Colville, Lord
Regulation of Railways, Report, *cl.* 14, [192] 413, 415

Commerce, Chambers of — Companies Act 1867
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. S. Cave *Dec* 5, [190] 606

Commerce, Tribunals of
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. S. Cave *Dec* 5, [190] 605

Commissionaires, Corps of—Employment in Civil Departments
Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 14, [192] 246

Commissions, Permanent Expenses of
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 24, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the expenses of the Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission, Inclosure and Drainage Acts, and Charity Commission, ought not to be borne by the public" (*Mr. Goldney*), [191] 1280; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 104, N. 105; M. 1; Question, "That those words be there added;" A. 106, N. 105; M. 1; words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Companies Amendment Act, 1867
Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, The Solicitor General *Dec* 5, [190] 605

Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Bill (*Mr. Gladstone, Sir G. Grey, Sir R. Palmer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Nov* 28 [Bill 13]
190] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *Feb* 19, 957; after long debate, Bill read 2°
. Committee; Report *Mar* 11, 1415 [Bill 59]
. Considered *Mar* 17, 1830
Amendt. to leave out "to vote upon any question as to making any such voluntary rate, or" (*Mr. Henley*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c." agreed to
. Question, Mr. Walpole; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 20, 1983
. Re-comm. in respect of Amendments to be proposed to Clauses A and C *Mar* 20, 2053
Report *Mar* 20 [Bill 72]
191] Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 23, 39
. 3R. deferred, after short debate *Mar* 23, 101
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *Mar* 24, 206
After short debate, Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Newdegate*) put, and negatived; Question again proposed
Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Schreiber*); A. 28, N. 131; M. 103
After further short debate, original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl Russell*) *Mar* 26 (No. 55)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 23, 1108; after debate, Bill read 2ª
. Statement (*Earl Russell*) *April* 24, 1217
. Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill" *April* 30, 1570

[*cont.*

Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Bill—cont.
After short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill referred to a Select Committee
And, on *May* 1, Committee nominated as follows:—Ld. Chancellor, L. Abp. York, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Somerset, D. Richmond, D. Buckingham and Chandos, E. Shaftesbury, E. Carnarvon, E. Romney, E. Beauchamp, E. Russell, E. Kimberley, V. Halifax, L. Bp. London, L. Bp. Oxford, L. Bp. Carlisle, L. Delamere, L. Stanley of Alderley, and L. Westbury
Report of Select Committee *June* 12 (*Parl. P.* No. 143)
Bill as amended (No. 144)
193] Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee" *July* 3, 594; after short debate, Committee
Report *July* 9, 896 (No. 211)
Read 3ª *July* 13, 1098
Moved, That the Bill do pass; after short debate, on Question? resolved in the affirmative; Bill passed
c. Lords Amendts. considered *July* 24, 1773; after short debate, Lords Amendts. agreed to [Special Entry]; Lords Amendts. (No. 232)
l. Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 109]

CONOLLY, Mr. T., *Donegal Co.*
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1722
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1712; Motion for Adjournment, 1717, 1719

Consecration and Ordination Fees
Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 27, [191] 1332

Consecration of Churchyards Act (1867) Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bishop of Oxford*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 17 (No. 16)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 19, [192] 507; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee; Report *May* 26, 897 (No. 124)
Read 3ª* *May* 28
Commons Amendts. (No. 147)
c. Read 1º* *June* 4 [Bill 152]
Read 2º* *June* 8
Committee*; Report *June* 10
Considered* *June* 11
Read 3º* *June* 12
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 47]

Consolidated Account—Charges on the
Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 9, [190] 1221

Consolidated Fund (£2,000,000) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Resolution in Ways and Means [*Nov* 28] reported; Bill ordered; read 1º* *Nov* 29
Read 2º* *Nov* 30
Committee*; Report *Dec* 2
Read 3º* *Dec* 3
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Derby*) *Dec* 3
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *Dec* 5
Read 3ª* *Dec* 6
Royal Assent *Dec* 7 [31 *Vict.* c. 1]

Consolidated Fund (£362,398, 19s. 9d.) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Resolution in Ways and Means [*Mar* 17] reported; Bill ordered; read 1º* *Mar* 18
Read 2º* *Mar* 19
Committee*; Report *Mar* 20
Read 3º* *Mar* 23
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *Mar* 24
Read 2ª* *Mar* 26
Committee*; Report *Mar* 27
Read 3ª* *Mar* 28
Royal Assent *Mar* 30 [31 *Vict.* c. 10]

Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sclater-Booth*
c. Resolution in Ways and Means [*Mar* 23] reported; Bill ordered; read 1º* *Mar* 24
Read 2º* *Mar* 25
Committee*; Report *Mar* 26
Read 3º* *Mar* 27
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *Mar* 30
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *Mar* 31
Read 3ª* *Aprli* 2
Royal Assent *April* 3 [31 *Vict.* c. 13]

Consolidated Fund (£17,000,000) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Resolution in Ways and Means [*May* 15] reported; Bill ordered; read 1º* *May* 18
Read 2º* *May* 19
Committee*; Report *May* 20
Read 3º* *May* 21
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *May* 22
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *May* 25
Read 3ª* *May* 26
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 16]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *July* 17
Read 2º* *July* 18
Committee*; Report *July* 20
Read 3º* *July* 21
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 21
Read 2ª* *July* 23
Committee*; Report *July* 24
Read 3ª* *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 85]

Consular Marriages Bill
(*Sir J. Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *June* 24 [Bill 188]
Read 2º* *June* 25
Committee*; Report *June* 26
Considered* *June* 29
Read 3º* *June* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 2
Read 2ª* *July* 9 (No. 198)
Committee*; Report *July* 10
Read 3ª* *July* 14
Royal Assent *July* 16 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 61]

Contagious Diseases Act, 1866
190] Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 17, 797; Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 10, 1286; Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Sir J. Pakington *Mar* 17, 1813; Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 19, 1889; Question, Viscount Lifford; Answer, The Duke of Marlborough; short debate
192] thereon *May* 15, 324; Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 18, 425
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Contagious Diseases Act, 1866;" Motion agreed to
And, on *May* 19, Committee nominated as follows:—D. Somerset, D. Cleveland, E. Devon, E. De Grey, V. Lifford, V. Templetown, L. Silchester, L. Clandeboye, and L. Penrhyn
Report of Select Committee *May* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 113)

Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment Bill
(*Sir John Pakington, Lord Henry Lennox*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 25 [Bill 193]
Read 2° * *June* 29
Committee *; Report *July* 6
Read 3° * *July* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Longford*) *July* 9
Read 2ª * *July* 16 (No. 229)
Committee *; Report *July* 17
Read 3ª * *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 80]

Contagious Diseases Act (1866) Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 29 (No. 185)
Bill withdrawn * *July* 10

Coolie Emigration
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 25, [192] 2132

Cork, Earl of
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 68
Sea Fisheries, 2R. [191] 466

Coronation Oath
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for a Copy of the Oath taken by Her Majesty at Her Coronation: Agreed to (*The Lord Redesdale*) *July* 17, [193] 1345
Copies of—(*Parl. P.* 191, 191-I)

Corporation of London Bill
(*Mr. Mill, Mr. Thomas Hughes, Mr. Tomline, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Layard*)
c. Ordered * *May* 5
Read 1° * and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills [Bill 106]

Corrance, Mr. F. S., *Suffolk, E.*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 91
Cattle, Importation of, [192] 115
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1445, 1449; Consid. 1632; 3R. 1730
* Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1477
Local Charges on Real Property, Res. [192] 143
Local Rating, Motion for a Committee, [192] 1483, 1498
* Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 611
Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1870; Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 850
Registration, Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 566
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1718

Corry, Right Hon. H. T. L. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *Tyrone Co.*
Abyssinian Expedition—Return of Merchant Ships, [190] 420
Admiralty Monies and Accounts, Motion for a Committee, [190] 902, 907, 923
Army—Conveyance of Troops—War Department and India Office, [190] 337
India—Telegraphic Communication, [191] 1459
Maguire, Convict, Case of, [190] 107
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 99
Navy—Questions, &c.
  Dockyards, Iron Ballast in, [190] 1220
  F. G. Captains' Reserved List, [192] 1223
  Flogging on board the "Favourite," [191] 37
  "Glatton" and "Hotspur," The, [192] 652
  Greenwich Hospital, [192] 1184, 1185
  Iron-clad Fleet, [192] 32
  Naval Chaplains, [190] 536
  Naval Commissions, [190] 1680
  Naval Courts Martial, [190] 1225
  Retired Officers, [191] 1693
  Sheathing Iron Vessels (Captain Roux), [190] 330
  Training Ship "Chichester," [190] 542
Navy—Royal Dockyards, Res. [190] 2038
Navy—Wooden Ships, Motion for Returns, [190] 1953
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [190] 1938, 1939
  Wages, [192] 19, 34, 75, 79, 87
Postal—Halifax, Bermuda, and St. Thomas Mails, Res. [190] 634
Ways and Means, Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1760, 1763

Cotton Statistics Bill
(*Mr. Bazley, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Horsfall, Mr. Watkin, Mr. Cheetham*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 27 [Bill 96]
Read 2°, after short debate *May* 6, [191] 1874
Committee *; Report *May* 13
Considered * *May* 15
Read 3° * *May* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *May* 19
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 22, [192] 709
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months")

[*cont.*

Cotton Statistics Bill—cont.
On Question, That ("now") &c.; Cont. 13, Not-Cont. 6; M. 7; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 710; Bill read 2ª (No. 102)
Committee *May* 26, 918 (No. 126)
Report* *May* 28 (No. 133)
Read 3ª* *June* 8
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 33]

County and Burgh Police (*Scotland*)
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the County and Burgh Police Systems of Scotland" (*The Earl of Minto*) *May* 11, [192] 1; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *May* 18, Committee nominated as follows:—E. Doncaster, E. Morton, E. Lauderdale, E. Airlie, E. Strange, E. Minto, E. Morley, E. Camperdown, E. Innes, L. Clinton, L. Elphinstone, L. Panmure, L. Oxenfoord, L. Lyveden, L. Penrhyn, and L. Colonsay
Report of Select Committee *May* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 112)

County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction) Bill
(*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Candlish*)
c. Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Nov* 26, [190] 175
Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 18 [Bill 33]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Norwood*) *Mar* 17, 1828; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *April* 24
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 12, [192] 161
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Gorst*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c;" put, and agreed to; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." agreed to
Committee*; Report *May* 12 [Bill 94]
Considered* *May* 19
Read 3°* *May* 20
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl Granville*) *May* 22
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 15, 1553; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 108)
Committee* *July* 6
Report* *July* 7 (No. 219)
Read 3ª* *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 71]

County Financial Boards (No. 1) Bill
(*Sir William Gallwey, Mr. Hartley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 6, [190] 1206 [Bill 51]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 1

County Financial Boards (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Wyld, Mr. Hodgkinson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 6 [Bill 52]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Wyld*) *April* 29, [191] 1542
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present mode of conducting the Financial Arrangements of the Counties in England and Wales, and whether any alteration ought [*cont.*

County Financial Boards (*No.* 2) *Bill*—cont.
to be made either in the persons by whom or the manner in which such arrangements are now conducted" (*The Judge Advocate*), 1558; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 46, N. 154; M. 108; words added
Question, Sir William Gallwey; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 4, [191] 1694
And, on *May* 11, Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel Wilson Patten (Chairman), Mr. Bruce, Lord Edward Cavendish, Mr. Clive, Mr. Dent, Admiral Duncombe, Sir William Gallwey, Mr. Heneage, Lord Henley, Mr. Henniker-Major, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Hodgkinson, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Kendall, Mr. Neville-Grenville, Mr. Read, Mr. Scourfield, and Mr. Wyld
Report of Select Committee *July* 13 (*Parl. P.* No. 421)

County General Assessment (Scotland) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 2 [Bill 84]
Read 2°* *May* 29
Committee*; Report *June* 15 [Bill 172]
Re-comm*; Report *June* 22
Read 3°* *June* 29
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *June* 30 (No. 190)
Read 2ª* *July* 6
Committee*; Report *July* 7
Read 3ª* *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 82]

Court of Appeal Chancery (Despatch of Business) Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord St. Leonards*)
l. Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *Feb* 24, [190] 1038 (No. 20)
Read 2ª* *Mar* 5
Committee*; Report *Mar* 10
Read 3ª* *Mar* 12
c. Read 1°* *Mar* 18 [Bill 68]
Read 2°* *Mar* 20
Committee*; Report *Mar* 24
Read 3°* *Mar* 26
l. Royal Assent *Mar* 30 [31 *Vict.* c. 12]

Court of Chancery and County Courts
Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 24, [193] 1711

Court of Chancery—Salaries and Expenses
Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 2, [191] 700

Court of Justiciary (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *Feb* 24, [190] 1094
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° [Bill 46]
Read 2°* *June* 12
Committee*; Report *June* 15 [Bill 174]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 6
Considered* *July* 7
Read 3°* *July* 8
[*cont.*

Court of Justiciary (Scotland) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 9
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 14, [193] 1163; Bill read 2ª (No. 232)
Committee* *July* 16
Report* *July* 17
Read 3ª* *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 95]

Court of Session (Scotland) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *Feb* 24, [190] 1081
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° [Bill 45]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 12, [192] 1516; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *June* 15 [Bill 173]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 7
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 10
Read 3°* *July* 13 [Bill 214]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 13
Read 2ª* *July* 16 (No. 246)
Committee* *July* 20
Report* *July* 21 (No. 275)
Read 3ª* *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 100]

Court of Session (Scotland) [Salaries]
c. Resolution in Committee *June* 30
Resolution reported *July* 1

Courts of Chancery and Exchequer (Ireland) Fee Funds Bill (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 28 [Bill 146]
Read 2°* *June* 8
Committee*—R.P. *June* 11
Committee*; Report *June* 12
Considered* *June* 18
Read 3°* *June* 22
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *June* 23 (No. 171)
Read 2ª* *July* 20
Committee*; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª* *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 88]

Courts of Justice, The New
190] Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Nov* 29, 417; Questions, Mr. Bentinck, Sir George Bowyer; Answers, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 14, 732; Observations, Lord Denman; Reply, The Lord Chan-
192] cellor *May* 12, 105; Observations, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; short debate thereon *May* 14, 287; Observations, Mr. Denman; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *May* 15, 362; Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 21, 653; Observations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Reply, Mr. Cowper; short debate thereon *May* 29, 1045
193] *Appointment of Architects*, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 29, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the recent appointment of Architects for the New Public Buildings in the Metropolis" (*Mr. Goldsmid*), 324; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 90, N. 45; M. 45
Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 16, 1281; Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 23, 1665; Question, Lord Denman; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *July* 30, 1934
192] *National Gallery*, Question, Viscount Hardinge; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *May* 12, 93; Questions, Mr. Goldsmid, Mr. Bouverie; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 11, 1396; Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 15, 1563; Question, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answer, The Lord Chancellor; short debate thereon *June* 19, 1834; Questions, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Layard, Mr. M. Chambers; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Lord John Manners *June* 25, 2130
Parl. Papers—
Papers . . . . No. 339
Memorial relating to . . . No. 381

Courts of Law (Scotland) [Fees, &c.] Bill (*Mr. Dodson, The Lord Advocate, Sir Graham Montgomery*)
c. Resolution in Committee *May* 28
Resolution reported; Bill ordered* *May* 29
Read 1°* *June* 8 [Bill 158]
Read 2°* *June* 15
Committee*; Report *June* 25
Read 3°* *June* 29
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *June* 30
Read 2ª* *July* 6 (No. 189)
Committee*; Report *July* 7
Read 3ª* *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 55]

Coventry Election Petition
On *Mar* 10, Committee nominated on Petition presented July 31, 1867, as follows:—Sir Philip Grey Egerton (Chairman), Mr. Corrance, Mr. Greenall, Mr. Hodgson, and Mr. Pollard-Urquhart
House informed, that the Committee had determined, That Henry Mather Jackson, esquire, is not duly elected a Citizen to serve in this present Parliament for the City of Coventry. That the last Election for the said City is a void Election. And the said Determinations were ordered to be entered in the Journals of this House. House further informed that the Committee had agreed to certain Resolutions *Mar* 16, [191] 1679
Minutes of Evidence—(*Parl. P.* No. 165)

COWEN, Mr. J., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1340, 1341; *cl.* 3, 1770, 1778

COWPER, Earl
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [191] 696

Cowper, Right Hon. W. F., *Hertford*
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 367, 1049
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1601
London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 2, [191] 202
Metropolis—Burlington House, [191] 467
Hyde Park—Ride in Rotten Row, [193] 371
Parliament, Houses of—Frescoes, [193] 812
Induration of Decaying Stone, [193] 1105
Supply—Burlington House, [192] 398
Public Offices Site, [192] 391
University of London Buildings, [192] 395

Cranborne, Right Hon. Viscount, (See also **Salisbury**, Marquess of) *Stamford*
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 968
East India, Troops and Vessels (Abyssinian Expedition), Res. [190] 366, 404
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 711
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 532, 708
India—Sindh Railway, [190] 1981
Systems of Government, [191] 424
Parliament — House of Commons' Arrangements, Motion for a Committee, [190] 984
Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1801
Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 230, 231

Cranworth, Lord
Bankruptcy Act Amendment, 2R. [193] 866; Comm. 1160; *cl.* 1, 1162, 1364
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [191] 1218
Burials (Ireland), Report, *cl.* 4, [193] 1474
Capital Punishment within Prisons, 2R. [191] 1879
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1844
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), 2R. [192] 233; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1742

Craufurd, Mr. E. H. J., *Ayr, &c.*
Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 1011
Canongate Annuity Tax, 2R. [191] 1106
Court of Session (Scotland), 2R. [192] 1524
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [191] 321; *cl.* 5, [192] 2173
Exemption of Small Pamphlets from Security, [190] 1974
Hardwicke, Earl of, and the Cambridge Registration, [190] 1975
Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1526
Libel, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 606, 607; *cl.* 3, 617
Publications, Registration of, [192] 1515
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 846; 2R. 1263; [191] 829, 2005
192] Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 840, 841; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 854, 856; *cl.* 5, 857; *cl.* 9, 981; *cl.* 10, 982, 983; Amendt. 986, 991; *cl.* 11, 995; *cl.* 12, 1008; *cl.* 15, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 6, Motion for Adjournment, 1010; *cl.* 41, 1234; *add. cl.* 1235, 1236, 1237, 1246; Schedule A, 1252; Consid. *add. cl.* 1445, 1446
Scotland—Education, [190] 1591
Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts. [192] 1863
Supply—Register House (Edinburgh), Report, [192] 1176
University of Glasgow, [192] 403

Crawford, Mr. R. W., *London*
Abyssinia—Telegraphic Communication, [190] 106
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Consid. Schedule, [191] 1877
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1682
Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1314, 1326
India—Finance, [190] 1982
India — Telegraphic Communication, Motion for Papers, [193] 162
Inland Revenue, Report on, [190] 729
London Coal and Wine Duties, Consid. *add. cl.* [191] 327
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Preamble, [193] 1514, 1516; *cl.* 3, Motion for Adjournment, 1543
Metropolitan Tramways, 2R. [190] 1112
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1723, 1818
Postal—Eastern Mail Service, [191] 258
Postal Service, [192] 816, 1476
Sugar, Refining of, at Cologne, [193] 305
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [193] 835, 836, 845
Public Buildings, [192] 294
Thames, Navigation of the—Main Drainage Outfall, [190] 105, 106

Cremorne, Lord, *Monaghan Co.*
Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [193] 417

Criminal Law
Bell, James, Case of, Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 24, [193] 1713
Castle, Mr., Case of, Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 27, [193] 1826
Clerkenwell Explosion, Compensations, Question, Mr. Neate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 23, [192] 1923
(See *Supply*)
Clerkenwell Explosion—The Convict Barrett, Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *April* 3, [191] 1579; Question, Mr. Bright; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 25, [192] 832
Coldbath Fields Prison, Deaths in, Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *July* 31, [193] 1945
Committals (Scotland), Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, The Lord Advocate *June* 30, [193] 369
Devizes Gaol, Question, Mr. Marsh; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 28, [191] 1455
Featherstonhaugh, Mr., Murder of, Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *April* 28, [191] 1459
Imprisonment for Costs on a dismissed Charge, Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 21, [193] 1553
Johnston, Mr., Case of, Question, Colonel Forde; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 30, [191] 469
Juries "De Medietate Linguæ," Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 12, [190] 1449
Leominster Magistrates, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 29, [193] 304
Military Prisons, Question, Mr. D. Griffith; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 23, [191] 38
[*cont.*

Criminal Law—cont.
Millar, The Convict (*Victoria*), Question, Mr. Hurst; Answer, Mr. Adderley *April* 30, [191] 1576
Portland Convict Prison, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Nov* 26, [190] 179
Roman Catholic Prisoners — Tothill Fields House of Correction, Observations, Mr. Maguire *Dec* 3, [190] 547; short debate thereon
Sentences, Remission of—See that title
(See *Ireland*)

CROSSLEY, Sir F., *Yorkshire, W.R.—N.*
Boundary, Comm. [192] 273; Preamble, 1289; Schedule, 1443

Curragh of Kildare Bill (*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 21 [Bill 134]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*The Earl of Mayo*) *June* 15, [192] 1620
After short debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Lord Otho FitzGerald*); Motion withdrawn
Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee of Eleven Members, Six to be nominated by the House and Five by the Committee of Selection
Committee nominated as follows:—The Earl of Mayo (Chairman), Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. W. Cogan, General Dunne, Lord Otho FitzGerald, Sir Graham Montgomery, Sir John Neeld, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Lord Proby, Mr. Stopford, Colonel Stuart (Cardiff), and Mr. Sturt (Dorset)
Report of Select Committee *June* 25 [Bill 192]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 29
Read 3°* *June* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Richmond*) *July* 2
Read 2ª* *July* 9 (No. 195)
Report* *July* 10
Committee*; Report *July* 13
Read 3ª* *July* 14
Royal Assent *July* 16 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 60]

Customs
Appointments in the Customs, &c., Question, Mr. A. Russell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 16, [193] 1286
Clerks in the Customs Department, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 29, [193] 303
Coble, Mr., Case of, Question, Mr. Bagnall; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 28, [191] 1457
Customs Officers, Grievances of—Report of Commission, Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 28, [191] 1455; *July* 18, [193] 1426
Examining Officers, Question, Mr. Butler; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 25, [192] 2135
Extra Clerks, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 22, [192] 713; Observations, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Reply, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 17, [193] 1407
Outdoor Officers of, Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 19, [192] 513
(See *Ireland*)

Customs and Income Tax Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered* *May* 6
Read 1°* *May* 8 [Bill 108]
Read 2°* *May* 11
Committee*; Report *May* 13
Read 3°* *May* 14
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *May* 15
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *May* 18
Read 3ª* *May* 19 (No. 100)
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 28]

DALGLISH, Mr. R., *Glasgow*
Navy—Royal Dockyards, Res. [190] 2044
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 480, 513; *cl.* 5, 857; *cl.* 8, 883, 894; *cl.* 9, 963, 978; Schedule A, 1252; Consid. *add. cl.* 1446
Supply—University of Glasgow, [192] 401
Ways and Means, Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1766

DALHOUSIE, Earl of
Scotland—County and Burgh Police, Motion for a Committee, [192] 3

Danube Works Loan Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Lord Stanley, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Resolution in Committee *July* 9
Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *July* 10 [Bill 227]
Read 2°* *July* 13
Committee*; Report *July* 17
Read 3°* *July* 18
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 20
Read 2ª* *July* 27 (No. 272)
Committee*; Report *July* 28
Read 3ª* *July* 29
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 126]

DAVENPORT-BROMLEY *see* BROMLEY

DAWSON, Mr. R. Peel, *Londonderry Co.*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 605
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. [191] 217
Ireland—Small Debts Recovery, [190] 1679
Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1952; Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1595
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2167

Deal Boatmen—Charges by the
Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr Stephen Cave *Mar* 5, [190] 1115

DE GREY AND RIPON, Earl
Army Chaplains, 2R. [192] 1299; Comm. 1467
Army—Questions, &c.
Organization of the Reserved Forces, [193] 1357
Volunteer Review at Windsor, [193] 996
War Office—Department of Control, [193] 1233
Explosive Materials in War, [193] 1664
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 687
Parliament—Business of the House, Report, [191] 567
Public Schools, Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1656; Report, 1704
Ritual, Report of the Commission on, [192] 338, 340

De Grey, Hon. T., *Norfolk, W.*
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1340 ; *cl.* 3, 1767

De La Poer, Mr. E., *Waterford Co.*
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1730

Denbigh, Earl of
Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 590
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 813
Mazatlan—Blockade of, [193] 1359, 1361

Denison, Right Hon. J. E., *see* **Speaker**, The

Denman, Lord
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Report, *cl.* 7, [193] 898
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 105 ; [193] 1934, 1935
Public Schools, Report, [193] 1709
Registration (Ireland), 3R. [193] 1900
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 42, [193] 365
Uniformity of Public Worship, 2R. [193] 896
West Indies, 2R. [193] 799

Denman, Hon. G., *Tiverton*
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 3, [191] 1057 ; *cl.* 4, 1061
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 362
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 657 ; Motion for Adjournment, 658, 667, 680, 682 ; *cl.* 5, 2178, 2192, 2193 ; *cl.* 7, [193] 745 ; *cl.* 10, 750
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1496
Life Policies Nomination, 2R. [190] 956
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1372
Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1868 ; Consid. [193] 1223
Public Schools, Lords Amendts. [193] 1907
Registration, 2R. [192] 1616
Stamper, Case of, and the Overseers of Sunderland, [193] 908
Supply—Burlington House, [192] 399

Dent, Mr. J. D., *Scarborough*
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 5, [190] 1423, 1424
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 152 ; Preamble, 1518
Supply—Volunteer Corps, [191] 272
Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 231

Derby, † Earl of (First Lord of the Treasury)
Abyssinia—Expedition to, Res. [190] 578, 594
Papers, [190] 156, 157
† Vote of Thanks, [193] 490
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 35, 42, 47
† Alkali Act Continuance, 2R. [192] 509
† Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [192] 913

Derby, Earl of—*cont.*
† Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1124 ; Comm. [193] 600, 602 ; 3R. 1098
Crete—Insurrection in, [190] 314
† Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1303, 1425, 1434, 1437, 1446
† Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2091, 2106, 2116 ; [193] 177, 295, 296
Income Tax, 2R. [190] 598
Ireland—Processions, Address for Papers, [190] 531
Italy—The Roman Question, [190] 600, 601
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Report, *add. cl.* [190] 575, 578
† Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 584
Parliament—Adjournment for the Recess, [190] 527
† Public Schools, 2R. [193] 1461
Totnes, &c. Writs, 2R. [190] 573
† Uniformity of Public Worship, 2R., Previous Question, [193] 894
† University Elections (Voting Papers), 2R. [193] 981
† Whitsuntide Recess—State of Public Affairs, [192] 1032

De Ros, Lord
Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 588

Devon, Earl of († Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, *afterwards* Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law Board)
Clerks of the Peace (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1162
Poor Relief, 2R. [191] 138 ; Comm. 457 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. [192] 947 ; *cl.* 22, 948 ; *cl.* 9, 1622, 1623, 1626 ; Report, 1743, 1744 ; 3R. *add. cl.* 1911
Poor, Relief of the, Address for a Commission, [192] 1464
† Public Schools, Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1658
† Reform Act, 1867—Ratepaying Clauses, [190] 1588
Scotland—Motion for a Paper, [192] 920
Scotland — Poor Assessment, Motion for Returns, [191] 332
† Union Workhouses and Infirmaries, Motion for Papers, [190] 315, 327
Vagrancy—Guildford Union, Motion for Correspondence, [192] 97

Devonshire, Duke of
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 14, [192] 8 ; *cl.* 15, *ib.* ; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 9, 10 ; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 13
University Tests, [192] 1020

Dickson, Major A. G., *Dover*
Army—Artillery Practice at Dover, [193] 719
Contagious Diseases Act, [190] 1813
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), Comm. [192] 168

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
Art Catalogue, Publication of the, [190] 1218
Boundary Commission, [190] 1218
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1357
Libel, Comm. [192] 603
Militiamen, Families of, [192] 1475

[*cont.*

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L.—*cont.*
- Parliament—Public Business, [193] 1419
- Public Accounts, Res. [192] 116, 134, 136
- Supply—Chapter House, Westminster, [192] 396
  - Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2168
  - Royal Palaces, [191] 1008
  - Science and Art, [192] 1162, 1169
  - Sheriff Court Houses (Scotland), [192] 400
  - University of Glasgow, [192] 401
  - Volunteer Corps, [191] 277

Dimsdale, Mr. R., *Hertford*
- India — Retirement of Field Officers of the Indian Army, [191] 830

Diplomatic Service—Votes for
- Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, all sums required to defray the expenses of the Diplomatic Service ought to be annually voted by Parliament, and that Estimates of all such sums ought to be submitted in a form that will admit of their effectual supervision and control by this House" (*Mr. Labouchere*) *May* 26, [192] 927 ; after short debate, A. 76, N. 72 ; M. 4

Disraeli, Right Hon. B. (Chancellor of the Exchequer: *afterwards* First Lord of the Treasury), *Buckinghamshire*

Chancellor of the Exchequer.
- Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 988, 989
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 72
- British Museum, [190] 166
- Compound Householder, The, [190] 730, 796, 886
- Education, [190] 741
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 693, 728
- Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 690
- Representation of the People (Scotland), [190] 690 ; Leave, 842
- Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 181, 194, 303

First Lord of the Treasury.
- Abyssinian Expedition, [191] 1337
  - Despatches, The, [192] 1565
  - Vote of Thanks, [193] 522
- Army—Control Department, Motion for Papers, [193] 1273, 1274
- Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 432
- Boundary, Comm. [192] 255, 275, 278, 279 ; Preamble, 1283, 1287, 1293, 1444
- Boundary Commission, [191] 146 ; Report, [192] 1181 ;—Amended Plans, 1230
- British Museum, [191] 398
- Brougham, Lord, The Late, [193] 1833
- Charitable Institutions, Taxation of, [191] 1693
- Civil Service Estimates, [191] 830
- Compound Householder, The, [191] 1785
- Corrupt Practices at Elections, [192] 1040 ; [193] 520
- Derby Day—Adjournment, [192] 925
- Ecclesiastical Titles, [192] 1866
- Edinburgh, Duke of, Address to Her Majesty, [191] 1334
- Edinburgh, Duke of, Attempted Assassination of, [192] 1230

[*cont.*

Disraeli, Right Hon. B.—*cont.*
- Ejectments Suspension (Ireland), [193] 519
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 2R. [190] 1141 ; Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [191] 321, 702 ; *cl.* 1, [192] 677, 678, 682 ; *cl.* 5, 692, 2188, 2192, 2197 193] 737 ; *cl.* 10, 757, 759, 760, 915, 917 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1001, 1002, 1003, 1007, 1008, 1012 ; *cl.* 17, 1019, 1020 ; *cl.* 26, 1171 ; *cl.* 45, 1184 ; *cl.* 46, 1371 ; *cl.* 47, 1373 ; *cl.* 54, 1374 ; *add. cl.* 1375, 1376, 1382, 1387, 1444, 1457 ; Consid. 1615, 1617, 1634, 1636, 1647, 1649, 1650, 1675, 1686 ; 3R. 1717
- Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 33, 35
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 603, 797, 893, 920, 931, 1418, 1420, 1462 ; Res. 1, 1667, 1679 ; Res. 3, 1901, 1929, 1936, 1940, 1941, 1946 ; [192] 512 ; 2R. 787, 801, 1043
- Eyre, Ex-Governor, Prosecution of, [192] 838, 1334, 1335, 1471
- Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1233
- Gladstone, Mr., and the East Worcestershire Election, [192] 1110, 1117, 1118
- Hardwicke, Earl of, and the Cambridge Registration, [190] 1976
- Ireland—Questions, &c.
  - Cullen, Cardinal, [192] 16
  - Railways, [192] 712
  - Royal Irish Academy, [193] 1201
  - University of Dublin, [192] 1044
- Ireland—Royal Residence in, Motion for an Address, [192] 359
- Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1771
- Ireland—University Education, [192] 1042 ; Res. [193] 1064
- Member for Thetford—Titles of Dignity, [191] 832
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 154, 1308, 1327, 1330, 1331, 1339, 1340 ; Preamble, 1515, 1516 ; *cl.* 3, 1537, 1772
- Ministerial Statement—Re-construction of the Ministry, [190] 1116 ; [191] 826, 1694, 1711, 1742, 1745, 1746, 1793, 1794, 1814, 1819 ; [192] 619 ; [193] 915, 917
- Music, Royal Academy of, [192] 1753
- Napier, Sir R., Message from the Queen, [193] 915 ; Res. 1066 ;—Pension to, 1943
- Navy Estimates—Dockyards and Naval Yards, [193] 560
  - Greenwich Hospital, &c. [193] 1156
- New Zealand—Forces in, [193] 643
- Parliament—Questions, &c.
  - Adjournment, Motion for, [193] 1738
  - Arrangement of Business, [191] 264
  - Dissolution of, [192] 1065, 1076
  - Easter Vacation, [190] 1892 ; [191] 826
  - General Election, [192] 925
  - Progress of Business, [192] 494
- Parliament—Divisions of the House, Res. [193] 386
- Parliament—Public Business, [192] 1130 ; Res. 1567, 1570, 1571, 1758, 1760, 1761 ; [193] 1420
- Parliament—Rules of the House, Res. [192] 1080
- Princess of Wales, Address to the Queen, [193] 913
- Registration of Electors, [191] 1458
- Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1493 ; *cl.* 34, 1502, 1506

[*cont.*

Disraeli, Right Hon. B.—*cont.*
Registration—Small Tenements Act, [192] 1228
Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 1199, 1892; Comm. [192] 1581; *cl.* 10, 1586, 1597, 1762; *add. cl.* 1801, 1802, 1804; Consid. *add. cl.* 1902, 1904
Representation of the People (Scotland), [190] 1890; [191] 829, 1885, 2005
192] 18, 19, 346; Comm. 451; *cl.* 3, Motion for Adjournment, 484, 513, 619; *cl.* 8, 867, 889, 890, 892, 893, 894, 895, 955; *cl.* 9, 960, 972; *cl.* 11, 997; *cl.* 20, 1009; *cl.* 6, 1010; *add. cl.* 1246, 1249, 1567
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, [192] 1565
Roman Catholic Oath, [191] 1582
Speech at Merchant Taylors' Hall, [192] 2153
Stamper, Case of, and the Overseers of Sunderland, [193] 905, 906
Supply—Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, [193] 669
Full and Half Pay, [193] 1213
Household of Lord Lieutenant, [193] 1207
Miscellaneous Expenses, [192] 1174
Portpatrick Railway Company, [193] 1211
Post Office Packet Service, [193] 836
Report, [193] 1368
Salaries of Governors of Colonies, [193] 675
University of Glasgow, [192] 402
Supply, Proceedings in, Resolution, [191] 1032
Windsor, Volunteer Review at, [192] 1566
Whitsuntide Recess, [192] 927

District Church Tithes Act Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Bishop of Oxford*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *July* 9 (No. 236)
Read 2ª* *July* 13
Committee *July* 14, [193] 1163
Report* *July* 16 (No. 251)
Read 3ª* *July* 17
c. Read 1°* *July* 20 [Bill 246]
Read 2°* *July* 23
Committee*—R.P. *July* 24
Committee; Report; Considered; read 3° *July* 28, 1917
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 117]

Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Court Bill
(*Mr. C. Forster, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Karslake*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 6 [Bill 50]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. C. Forster*) *May* 6, [191] 1873; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *May* 18
Re-comm.*; Report *May* 22 [Bill 119]
Read 3°* *May* 25
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Westbury*) *May* 26
Read 2ª* *July* 14 (No. 123)
Committee*; Report *July* 16
Read 3ª* *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 77]

Dixon, Mr. G., *Birmingham*
Adulteration of Food or Drink Act Amendment, Leave, [192] 1351
Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1909, 1912
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 3R. [193] 1716
[*cont.*

Dixon, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 1989, 1992
Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 566
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 13, Amendt. [193] 1733
Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 165

Documentary Evidence Bill
(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 27 [Bill 97]
Read 2°* *April* 30
Committee*; Report *May* 7
Read 3°* *May* 8
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *May* 11 (No. 92)
Read 2ª* *May* 22
Committee* *May* 26
Report* *May* 28
Read 3ª* *May* 29
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 37]

Dodson, Mr. J. G. (Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means), *Sussex, E.*
Boundary, Comm. Preamble, [192] 1275
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 658, 682; *cl.* 14, [193] 1014; *cl.* 17, 1168, 1169; *add. cl.* 1452; Consid. *add. cl.* 1681
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1400; Res. 1908, 1913, 1924, 1925, 1931
Libel, Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 614
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, [192] 1180; Comm. *cl.* 2, [193] 1532; *cl.* 3, 1764, 1766
Navy Estimates—Wages, [192] 83
* Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 862, 884, 1808, 1810, 1811
Standing Order No. 131 Repeal, [191] 139
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1424; *cl.* 10, 1875
Registration, 2R. [192] 1617
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 26, [192] 1597; *add. cl.* 1771, 1777, 1801, 1802
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 858, 860, 875, 884, 885; *cl.* 9, 959, 971, 981; *cl.* 11, 1005; *add. cl.* 1245, 1247, 1250
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 984
Foreign Office, New, [192] 313
National Gallery Enlargement, [192] 393
Royal Palaces, [191] 1007, 1009, 1012

Dogs, Stray
Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 29, [193] 314

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, The Earl of Mayo*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Nov* 22 [Bill 4]
Read 2°* *Nov* 25
Committee*; Report *Nov* 26
Read 3°* *Nov* 27
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Richmond*) *Nov* 28
Read 2ª* *Dec* 4 (No. 3)
Committee*; Report *Dec* 5
Read 3ª* *Dec* 6
Royal Assent *Dec* 7 [31 *Vict.* c. 3]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, The Earl of Mayo*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 25 [Bill 195]
Read 2° * *June* 26
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3° * *July* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 3
Read 2ª * *July* 13 (No. 207)
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 151]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 3) Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, The Earl of Mayo*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 10 [Bill 229]
Read 2° * *July* 13
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3° * *July* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 16
Read 2ª * *July* 23 (No. 255)
Committee *; Report *July* 24
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 157]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental (No. 4) Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, The Earl of Mayo*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 14 [Bill 235]
Read 2° * *July* 15
Committee *; Report *July* 17
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 20
Read 2ª * *July* 24 (No. 273)
Committee *; Report *July* 27
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 158]

Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation Bill (*Sir J. Fergusson, Mr. Sec. G. Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 11 [Bill 169]
Read 2° * *June* 12
Committee *; Report *June* 15
Read 3° * *June* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *June* 18
Read 2ª * *June* 29 (No. 158)
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3ª * *July* 2
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 83]

Du Cane, Mr. C. (Lord of the Admiralty), *Essex, N.*
Navy—Coaling H.M. Ships, [193] 1481
  Greenwich Hospital, [193] 1396
Navy Estimates—Naval Stores, [193] 1147
  New Works, &c. [193] 1155
  Salaries of Officers, [193] 537

Duchy of Cornwall Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Portman*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 11 (No. 94)
Read 2ª * *May* 14
Committee *; Report *May* 19 (No. 107)
Read 3ª * *May* 22

[*cont.*

Duchy of Cornwall Amendment Bill [H.L.]—cont.
c. Read 1° * *May* 22 [Bill 136]
Read 2° * *May* 28
Committee *; Report *May* 29
Re-comm. *; Report *June* 11
Considered * *June* 12
Read 3° * *June* 15
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 35]

Dudley—Income Tax in
Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Nov* 26, [190] 176

Duff, Mr. M. E. Grant, *Elgin, &c.*
Disraeli's, Mr., Speech at Merchant Taylors' Hall, [192] 2150
India—Bombay, Educational Service in, [192] 426
  East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [193] 1861
Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. [193] 428
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 883; *cl.* 10, 990; *add. cl.* 1250
Scotland—Middle Class Schools, [193] 644
Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, [192] 1482
Turkey—Vice Consul at Crete, [190] 1116

Duff, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Metropolis Subways, 2R. [190] 1279
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Preamble, [193] 1521, 1524

Dufferin, Lord
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 37
Ireland—Church Commission, [193] 972
Ireland—Processions, Address for Papers, [190] 528

Duncombe, Hon. Vice-Admiral A., *Yorkshire, E.R.*
High Sheriff for the East Riding of Yorkshire, [193] 515

Dunlop, Mr. A. C. S. M., *Greenock*
Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2014

Dunne, Major-Gen. F. P., *Queen's Co.*
Army—Questions, &c.
  Artillery Officers, Retirement of, [193] 1821
  Cartridges, Manufacture of, [193] 1667
  Clerks in the Engineer Department, [192] 1124
  Fortifications, [190] 1931, 1935
  Gibraltar Shield, The, [190] 164
  Shoeburyness Experiments, [190] 1814
Army—Controller-in-Chief, Res. [193] 927
Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 321
Army Estimates—Administration of the Army, [193] 967
  Full and Half Pay, [193] 1278
  Land Forces, [191] 71
  Military Store Department, [193] 960
  Miscellaneous Services, [193] 965
  Surveys, [193] 962, 964
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1958

[*cont.*

DUNNE, Major-General F. P.—*cont.*
  Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [190] 1228
  Ireland—Questions, &c.
    Duty on Spirit Licences, [191] 38
    Post Office, [192] 1562
    Queen's Plate, The, [193] 1485
  Ireland—Record Publications, Res. [193] 166
  Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1776
  Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [193] 1502, 1507
  Registry of Deeds Office (Ireland), Motion for a Committee, [190] 1077, 1078
  Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1576; *cl.* 3, 1584; *cl.* 13, 1588; *cl.* 20, 1596
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 466
  Sea Fisheries, Leave, [190] 1077; [192] 287; Lords Amendts. 1861, 1868
  Supply—Home Office, [193] 1202
    Household of the Lord Lieutenant, [193] 1208
    Science and Art, [192] 1166

Durham County Courts
  Question, Mr. Henderson; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 25, [192] 816

DYKE, Mr. W. Hart, *Kent, W.*
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 51
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1354

East India Civil Service
  Moved, "That this House, whilst cordially approving of the system of open competition for appointments in the East India Civil Service, is of opinion that the people of India have not a fair chance of competing for these appointments as long as the examinations are held nowhere but in London; this House would therefore deem it desirable that, simultaneously with the examination in London, the same examination should be held in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *May* 5, [191] 1838
  Amendt. to leave out from "open competition," and add "as regards the appointment of untried young men to the East India Civil Service, is of opinion that natives of India who have proved in the Uncovenanted Service or otherwise their superior fitness for situations at present held exclusively by Members in the Covenanted Service should be appointed to them without undergoing a competing examination" (*Mr. Trevelyan*); Question, "That the words, &c."
  After short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

East India Revenue Accounts
  Considered in Committee *July* 27, [193] 1837; after long debate, Resolved, That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1867 was £42,122,433; the total of the direct claims and demands

[*cont.*

East India Revenue Accounts—cont.
  upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium, was £7,637,527; the charges in India, including Interest on Debt, and Public Works ordinary, were £29,848,640; the value of Stores supplied from England, was £873,363; the charges in England were £5,549,345; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £731,049, making a total charge for the same year of £44,639,924; and there was an excess of Expenditure over Income in that year amounting to £2,517,491
  Finance and Revenue Accounts—(*Parl P.* No. 270)

East India, Troops and Vessels
  Considered in Committee
  Moved, "That, Her Majesty having directed a Military Expedition to be despatched against Abyssinia, consisting mainly of Troops both European and Native at present maintained out of the Revenues of India, the ordinary Pay of such Troops as well as the ordinary Charges of any Vessels belonging to the Government of India that may be employed in the Expedition, which would have been charged upon the Revenues of India if such Troops or Vessels had remained in that Country or Seas adjacent, shall continue to be so chargeable; provided, that if it shall become necessary to replace the Troops or Vessels so withdrawn by other European or Native Forces or Vessels, the Expenses of raising, maintaining, and providing such Forces or Vessels shall be repaid out of any Monies which may be provided by Parliament for the Purposes of the said Expedition" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) *Nov* 28, [190] 359; after short debate, Question put; A. 198, N. 23; M. 175; Resolution agreed to
  Resolution reported and agreed to *Nov* 29, 450, to be communicated to the Lords, and their concurrence desired thereto

LORDS—
  The said Message communicated *Dec* 2, [190] 447
  Moved, "That this House do concur, &c." *Dec* 5, 578; after short debate, Motion agreed to, and a Message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith

  Mr. Layard, Mr. Rassam, and Dr. Beke—The Recent Debate, Explanation, Mr. Newdegate *Nov* 29, [190] 421; Explanation, Mr. Darby Griffith *Dec* 3, 550; Questions, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Layard; Answers, Lord Stanley *Dec* 6, 649
  Correspondence between Dr. Beke and others and the Foreign Office, Motion for Papers (*Mr. Layard*) *Dec* 6, [190] 668
   Amendt. to add certain words (*Mr. Newdegate*), 671; Question, "That those words be there added"; put, and negatived; after further short debate, main Question put, and agreed to; Personal Explanation (*Mr. Newdegate*) *Dec* 7, 687

East London Museum Site Bill
(*Lord Robert Montagu, Lord John Manners, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Butler*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Nov* 25 [Bill 7]
Read 2°* and committed to a Select Committee *Nov* 29
Committee nominated as follows:—Lord Robert Montagu (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Butler, Mr. Lanyon, Mr. Layard, and Lord John Manners
Committee*; Report *Nov* 30
Read 3°* *Nov* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *Dec* 2 (No. 2)
190] Moved, "That the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills be dispensed with, in order that this Bill be now read 2ª" *Dec* 4, 574; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Standing Orders dispensed with; Bill read 2ª
. Explanation, Lord Redesdale *Dec* 6, 636
. Committee *Feb* 17, 793
. Report *Feb* 18, 859 (No. 12)
Read 3ª* *Feb* 20
Royal Assent *Feb* 28 [31 *Vict.* c. 8]

East Worcestershire Election—Mr. Gladstone's Letter
Question, Sir Thomas Bateson; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 4, [192] 1110; Observations, Mr. Gladstone; Reply, Mr. Disraeli; debate thereon, 1112

EATON, Mr. H. W., *Coventry*
Foreign Ribbons, Importation of, [193] 308

EBURY, Lord
Public Schools, 2R. [193] 1473
Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 335

Ecclesiastical Buildings and Glebes (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Graham Montgomery*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 9 [Bill 58]
Read 2°* *April* 20
Committee*; Report *June* 4
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 6
Considered* *July* 7 [Bill 150]
Read 3°* *July* 8
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 9
Read 2ª* *July* 14 (No. 233)
Committee* *July* 16
Report* *July* 17
Read 3ª* *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 96]

Ecclesiastical Commissioners Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Mowbray, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 11 [Bill 168]
Read 2°* *June* 18
Committee*; Report *June* 29
Considered* *July* 3
Read 3°* *July* 6

Ecclesiastical Commissioners Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *July* 7
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 13, [193] 1091; Bill read 2ª (No. 221)
Committee* *July* 16
Report* *July* 17 (No. 259)
Read 3ª* *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 114]

Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Estates of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster
Question, Mr. Goldney; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *Dec* 6, [190] 641
Benefice of Kilpec, Hereford, Question, Colonel Barttelot; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *April* 2, [191] 701

Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
190] *l.* Presented; read 1ª *Mar* 9, 1208 (No. 33)
Read 2ª* *Mar* 12
Committee*; Report *Mar* 13
. Read 3ª, after short debate *Mar* 16, 1677
c. Read 1°* *Mar* 18 [Bill 69]
. Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 20, 1983
191] Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 26, 327
. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *April* 23, 1194
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Bentinck*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to
Committee; Report *April* 23
Read 3°* *April* 24
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 19]

Ecclesiastical Titles Bill
(*Mr. MacEvoy, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Leader*)
190] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. MacEvoy*) *Feb* 20, 992
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° [Bill 37]
. Question, Mr. Schreiber; Answer, Mr. MacEvoy *Mar* 16, 1686; *June* 5 [192] 1181
192] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 16, 1696
After short debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Colonel William Stuart*); A. 142, N. 85; M. 57; Debate adjourned
. Question, Mr. MacEvoy; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 22, 1856
. Bill withdrawn *June* 23, 1982

Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Operation of any Law or Laws as to the Assumption of Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland; and whether any and what Alteration should be made therein" (*Earl Stanhope*) *Mar* 26, [191] 239; after debate, Motion agreed to

Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland—cont.

And, on *Mar* 30, Committee nominated as follows:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. Abp. York, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Somerset, E. Stanhope, E. Carnarvon, E. Harrowby, E. Granville, E. Russell, L. Bp. London, L. Bp. Oxford, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Somerhill, and L. Lyveden

Report of Select Committee (*Parl. P.* No. 66)

Report of Select Committee of House of Commons (No. 44)

Edinburgh, His Royal Highness the Duke of—Attempted Assassination

Lords—

Resolved, after short debate, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to convey to Her Majesty the expression of the sorrow and indignation with which this House has learned the atrocious Attempt to assassinate His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh while on a Visit to Her Majesty's loyal Australian Colonies, and of their heartfelt Congratulations to Her Majesty on his Preservation from mortal Injury; and to assure Her Majesty of the Sympathy of this House in Her Majesty's present Anxiety, and of their earnest Hope for the speedy Recovery of His Royal Highness" (*The Earl of Malmesbury*) *April* 27, [191] 1304

The Queen's Answer reported *May* 1, 1682

Commons—

Resolved, after short debate, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, &c." (*Mr. Disraeli*) *April* 27, [191] 1334

Her Majesty's Answer reported *May* 4, [191] 1694

Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 8, [192] 1230

Education

Moved to Resolve, "1. That in the Opinion of this House the Education of the Working Classes in England and Wales ought to be extended and improved: Every Child has a moral Right to the Blessings of Education, and it is the Duty of the State to guard and maintain that Right. In the Opinion of this House the Diffusion of Knowledge ought not to be hindered by Religious Differences; nor should the early Employment of the Young in Labour be allowed to deprive them of Education: 2. That it is the Opinion of this House that Parliament and Government should aid in the Education of the Middle Classes by providing for the better Administration of Charitable Endowments: 3. That it is the Opinion of this House that the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge may be made more useful to the Nation by the Removal of Restrictions, and by the better Distribution of their large Revenues for Purposes of Instruction in connection with the said Universities: 4. That the Appointment of a Minister of Education by the Crown, with a seat in the Cabinet, would, in the Opinion of this House, be conducive to the Public Benefit" (*Earl Russell*) *Dec* 2, [190] 493; after debate, Question put; resolved in the negative

[*cont.*

Education—cont.

Question, Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster *Feb* 14, [190] 734; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 741

Art Catalogue—Publication of the Universal, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 9, [190] 1218

British Museum—South Kensington Museum, Observations, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Beresford Hope; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 27, [191] 388

Committee of Council on Education—Reports of 1868—*Parl. P.* No. [4051], Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 3, [193] 608

Endowed Grammar Schools, Question, Lord Taunton; Answer, The Duke of Marlborough *May* 5, [191] 1782

Paris Universal Exhibition, 1867—*Purchases for Schools of Science and Art*, Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Nov* 25, [190] 167

Payments, Question, Mr. Bayley Potter; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 27, [191] 356

Revised Code, The, Questions, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Baines; Answers, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 28, [192] 952

Revised Code—*Parl. P.* No. [3982]

Schools Inquiry Commission, Question, Mr. Beach; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 26, [193] 102; Question, W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 17, 1366

Report and Papers, Vols. I. to X.

Scientific Instruction, Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the provisions for giving instruction in theoretical and applied Science to the Industrial Classes" (*Mr. Samuelson*) *Mar* 24, [191] 160; after debate, Motion agreed to

And, on *Mar* 27, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Samuelson (Chairman), Mr. Acland, Mr. Akroyd, Mr. Bagnall, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Beecroft, Mr. Henry Austin Bruce, Lord Frederic Cavendish, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Graves, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Thomas Hughes, Sir Charles Lanyon, Mr. William Lowther, Mr. M'Lagan, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Edmund Potter, Mr. Powell, and Mr. Read

Report of Select Committee *July* 15—(*Parl. P.* No. 432)

Report . . . . . . (*Parl. P.* No. 137)

Scientific Instruction in Foreign Countries, Questions, Mr. Samuelson, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 15, [192] 1560

Technical Education, Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 17, [190] 1812—*The Whitworth Scholarships*, Question, Mr. Bruce; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *April* 2, [191] 699; Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Duke of Marlborough *April* 3, 820

Parl. Papers—

Minute . . . . . No. 194, 194-I

Report of Imperial Commission [3967]

Abstract of Evidence . . . [3967-I]

Circulars and Replies . . . [4085]

(See *Army—Military Education*)

[*cont.*

Education—cont.
Scotland
Education Bill, Question, Admiral Erskine; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 8, [191] 2001
Legislation on (*Scotland*), Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 13, [190] 1591
Middle Class Schools, Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, The Lord Advocate; short debate thereon *July* 3, [193] 644
Parl. Papers—
Education Commission, Third Report, Vols. I. and II. No. [4011]
Science and Art, 15th Report, No. [4049]
Ireland
National Education, 34th Report . . . . No. [4026]

Education Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; after debate, read 1ª *Mar* 24, [191] 105 (No. 53)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 27, 1305
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Earl of Airlie*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Bill read 2ª
Bill withdrawn, after short debate *May* 18, [192] 405

Edwards, Sir H., *Beverley*
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1810
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 459
Supply—Government Prisons, [192] 1107

Edwards, Mr. C., *Windsor*
Army—Tenders for Clothing, [190] 990

Edwards, Mr. H., *Weymouth*
Navy—Coaling H.M. Ships, [193] 1481

Egerton of Tatton, Lord
Cotton Statistics, Comm. [192] 919

Egerton, Hon. A. F., *Lancashire, S.*
Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 431
Consular Courts in Turkey and Egypt, [193] 1053

Egerton, Mr. E. C. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Macclesfield*
Austria—Treaty of Commerce with, [193] 515
Boundary, Comm. Schedule, [192] 1443
China—Ambassador from, [190] 800

Egypt
Law Courts, Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 15, [192] 1559
Slave Trade in, Question, The Duke of St. Albans; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *May* 15, [192] 330
Suez, Quarantine at, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 9, [192] 1334; Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 11, 1395
[*cont.*

Egypt—cont.
The Viceroy and the Societè D'Agricole, Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 11, [192] 1394
Viceroy, Claims on the, Question, Mr. Freville-Surtees; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 26, [192] 924

Ejectments Suspension (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Serjeant Armstrong*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 29 [Bill 100]
Question, Mr. Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 2, [193] 519
Bill withdrawn* *July* 8

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
Army—Questions, &c.
Breech-Loading Rifles, [190] 142
Musketry Instructors, Payment of, [192] 817
Shoeburyness, Experiments at, [193] 1437
Subordinate Officers in the War Department, [192] 950, 951
Volunteer Review at Windsor, [192] 1566; [193] 310, 911, 1945
Army—Control Department, Motion for Papers, [193] 1266, 1271, 1272
Army—Controller-in-Chief, Res. [193] 934
Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 318
Army—Fortifications, [190] 1922, 1936; Res. [191] 2042, 2049
Army—Royal Gun Factory, Motion for a Committee, [193] 1260
Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 565, 575
Army—Warlike Stores, Res. [193] 780
Army Estimates—Administration of the Army, [193] 966, 968
Land Forces, [191] 67, 97
Surveys, [193] 963, 964
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1942, 1970
Casual and Vagrant Poor, [190] 651
Coal Mines, [192] 1083
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1643, 1649; 2R. [192] 779
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1342
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Lords Amendts. [190] 660, 661
Mutiny, Consid. Amendt. [191] 557
Parliament, Dissolution of, [192] 1058, 1060
Peel Statue, The, Res. [192] 2138, 2144, 2147
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 881; *cl.* 11, 1003
Sale of Poisons, &c., Comm. *cl.* 16, [193] 1215; *cl.* 17, *ib.*, 1216, 1217; *add. cl. ib.*, 1218, 1219
Supply—Volunteer Corps, [191] 273, 281, 282
Works, Buildings, &c. [191] 287

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Stafford Northcote*)
190] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Feb* 13, 693
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° [Bill 27]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *Mar* 5, 1141; after short debate, Bill read 2°
[*cont.*

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill—cont.

Committee * ; Report *Mar* 16 [Bill 63]

191] Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 26, 296

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House, while earnestly desiring to provide the best tribunal for the trial of Controverted Elections, to reduce the cost of such trials, and to ensure the detection and punishment of bribery and corruption, is not prepared to assent to any measure which aims at the destruction of its ancient right and privilege to hold in its own hands the power of determining who are its Members, a right which the House has asserted and exercised to its great advantage for several hundred years, and upon the possession of which the dignity and independence of this House and the constitutional freedom of the electors greatly depend" (*Mr. Alexander Mitchell*) ; after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to ; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to

. Committee—R.P., 321

. Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 2, 702

192] Committee *May* 21, 657 ; after long debate —R.P.

. Question, Mr. Schreiber ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 29, 1040

: Committee—R.P. *June* 25, 2172

193] Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *July* 2, 520

. Committee—R.P. *July* 6, 722

. *Ministerial Statement*, Mr. Disraeli ; short debate thereon *July* 9, 915

. Committee—R.P. *July* 10, 1001

. Committee—R.P. *July* 14, 1166

. Committee—R.P. *July* 17, 1369

. Committee ; Report *July* 18, 1439

. Considered as amended *July* 22, 1615 ; after long debate, further Consideration deferred

. Further Proceeding on Consideration, as amended, resumed *July* 23, 1675 [Bill 243]

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Disraeli*) *July* 24, 1715

Amendt. to leave out "now read 3°," and add "re-committed in respect of a clause providing for returning officers' expenses out of rates" (*Mr. Fawcett*) ; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c. ;" A. 102, N. 91 ; M. 11 ; main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 3°

l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 24

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 27, 1793 ; after debate, Bill read 2ª

. Committee ; Report *July* 28, 1889 (No. 287)
Read 3ª * *July* 29
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 125]

Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections [*Salaries, &c.*]

c. Considered in Committee ; Resolution *Mar* 27
Report *Mar* 30

Election Petitions, Trial of

Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 14, [190] 728

Electric Telegraphs Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)

191] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *April* 1, 678

After debate, Bill ordered ; read 1° [Bill 82]

. Question, Mr. Ayrton ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 2, 706

192] Question, Mr. Graves ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 21, 654

. Questions, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Bright ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 8, 1231

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 9, 1301

Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the question of the expediency of purchasing the Telegraphs by the State be referred to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Leeman*); Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after long debate, Debate adjourned

. Question, Mr. Leeman ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 16, 1631

. Debate resumed *June* 18, 1805

After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Maguire*) negatived ; Amendt. withdrawn ; main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee

And, on *June* 23, Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer (Chairman), Mr. Goschen, Mr. Graham, Sir Frederick Heygate, Mr. Leeman, Major Cornwall Legh, Colonel Loyd Lindsay, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Potter (Carlisle), Mr. Sandford, and Mr. Charles Turner ; *July* 1, Colonel John W. Fane added, Major Cornwall Legh disch.

. Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on the Electric Telegraphs Bill to inquire :—1. Whether it is desirable that the transmission of messages for the public should become a legal monopoly in the Post Office ; 2. Whether it should be left to the discretion of the Postmaster General to make special agreements for the transmission of messages or news at reduced rates ; 3. What securities should be taken for insuring the secrecy of messages transmitted through the Post Office ; 4. What arrangements should be made for the working of submarine cables to foreign countries ; and, 5. To hear such Telegraph and Railway Companies and Proprietors as shall by petition, on or before the 26th instant, have prayed to be heard by themselves, their counsel or agents against such of the matters referred to the Committee as affect their particular interests ?" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *June* 23, 1978

Amendt. in last paragraph, to leave out "such of the matters referred to the Committee as affect their particular interests," and insert "the Preamble and Clauses of the Bill" (*Mr. Bouverie*) ; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to ; main Question put, and agreed to

[*cont.*

Electric Telegraphs Bill—cont.
193] Question, Colonel French; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 6, 720
Special Report of Select Committee *July* 16 [No. 435]
Report * *July* 16 [No. 436]
. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *July* 21, 1557
After debate, Committee; Report [Bill 239]
. Considered *July* 22, 1651
Read 3° * *July* 23
l. Read 1^a* (*The Duke of Montrose*) *July* 23
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a" *July* 24, 1692; after short debate, Bill read 2^a
. Committee; Report, after short debate *July* 27, 1813 (No. 282)
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^a" *July* 28, 1895
Bill read 3^a; on Question, "That the Bill do pass?" Moved, to insert in Clause 8, line 35, after ("Company") ("any Sum so voted having been approved of as fair by the Arbitrator herein-after named") (*The Lord Redesdale*); after short debate, Amendt. negatived; Bill passed
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 110]

Electric Telegraphs—Purchase of the
Question, Sir Charles Bright; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 17, [190] 800
Correspondence (*Parl. P.* No. 202)

Elementary Education Bill
(*Mr. Henry Austin Bruce, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Algernon Egerton*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Bruce*) *Mar* 17, [190] 1816
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° [Bill 64]
Moved, "That the Order for the Second Reading be discharged" (*Mr. Bruce*) *June* 23, [192] 1983
After long debate, Order discharged; Bill withdrawn

Ellenborough, Earl of
Abyssinian Expedition—Despatches, The, [192] 693
Return of the Army, [192] 1810, 1813
Vote of Thanks, [193] 488
Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 584, 596
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 1068
Income Tax, 2R. [190] 598
Parliament—Business of the House, Report, [191] 565
Poor Relief, Comm. [191] 457, 464

Ellice, Mr. E., *St. Andrews, &c.*
Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. [190] 1262; Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 475, 850; *cl.* 8, 891; Motion for Adjournment, 893; *cl.* 9, 978; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1008; *add. cl.* 1235; Schedule A, 1251

Ely, Bishop of
University Tests, [192] 1021

Endowed Schools Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1^a* *May* 12 (No. 98)
Read 2^a* *May* 18
Committee *; Report *May* 19
Read 3^a* *May* 25
c. Read 1°* *May* 28 [Bill 143]
Read 2° * *June* 4
Committee *; Report *June* 8
Read 3° * *June* 9
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 32]

Enfield, Viscount, *Middlesex*
Latymer's Charity, Edmonton, [192] 952
London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, 2R. [190] 1144
Metropolis—East London, Distress in, [190] 644
Metropolis—Lambeth Workhouse, Motion for Papers, [190] 2048
Metropolitan Police, [190] 1004
Surgeon-in-Chief of, [193] 311
Metropolitan Police Funds, 2R. [193] 349
New Zealand—Forces in, [193] 640
Public Schools, 2R. [190] 769; Motion for a Select Committee, 2052; Re-comm. *cl.* 14, [192] 1239
Sanitary Improvements, Rates for, [191] 258
Special and Common Juries, Motion for a Committee, [190] 924
Turkey—Railways, [193] 718

Entail Amendment (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 3 [Bill 86]
Read 2° * *May* 20
Committee *; Report *May* 28 [Bill 140]
Re-comm. *; Report *June* 22
Considered * *June* 25
Read 3° * *June* 26
l. Read 1^a* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *June* 29
Read 2^a* *July* 9 (No. 183)
Committee * *July* 14
Report * *July* 16 (No. 250)
Read 3^a* *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict* c. 84]

Erskine, Vice-Admiral J. E., *Stirlingshire*
"Garonne," Loss of the, [192] 1042; [193] 370
Mauritius—The 86th Regiment, [191] 1461
Navy Estimates — Coast Guard Service, Amendt. [193] 539
Salaries of Officers, [193] 537
Nova Scotia—British North American Confederation, Motion for an Address, [192] 1694
Scotland—Education, [191] 2001

Esmonde, Mr. J., *Waterford Co.*
Army—Rifled Ordnance—Studded Shot, [192 951
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2192; Motion for Adjournment, 2193
Libel, Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 612
Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [193] 417
Parliament—Divisions of the House, Report, [193] 386
Petit Juries (Ireland), [191] 263

[*cont.*

ESMONDE, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1486; *cl.* 34, 1503
Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1958; Consid. [192] 1898; *add. cl.* 1901

Established Church (*Ireland*)
COMMONS—
191] Notice of Resolutions, Observations, Mr. Gladstone; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 23, 33
. Notice of Amendment (*Lord Stanley*) *Mar* 27, 356
Acts read :—
. Moved, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into a Committee to consider the said Acts" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *Mar* 30, 469
. Amendt. to leave out from "House," and add "while admitting that considerable modifications in the Temporalities of the United Church in Ireland may, after the pending inquiry, appear to be expedient, is of opinion that any proposition tending to the disestablishment or disendowment of that Church ought to be reserved for the decision of a new Parliament" (*Lord Stanley*) *Mar* 30, 495; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Debate adjourned
. Debate resumed *Mar* 31, 575; after long debate, Debate further adjourned
. *The Approaching Division*, Questions, Mr. Yorke, Viscount Cranborne; Answers, Lord Stanley, Mr. Speaker *April* 2, 706
. *Maynooth Grant*, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 2, 708; Observations, Mr. Whalley *April* 3, 836
. Debate resumed *April* 2, 709; after long debate, Debate further adjourned
. *Regium Donum*, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 3, 835
. Debate resumed *April* 3, 837; after long debate, Question put; A. 330, N. 270; M. 60; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 941
Main Question put; A. 328, N. 272; M. 56; Acts considered in Committee—Committee —R.P.
. Acts considered in Committee *April* 27, 1338
Question again proposed, "That it is necessary that the Established Church of Ireland should cease to exist as an Establishment, due regard being had to all personal interests and to all individual rights of property" (*Mr. Gladstone*)
Amendt. to leave out from first word "That," and add "so long as the Union between Great Britain and Ireland continues to exist, it is just and consistent that the principle of the Established Church should be maintained in Ireland, and its endowment on a scale suitable to the wants of the population" (*Sir Frederick Heygate*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Committee—R.P.
. Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 28, 1462
. Acts considered in Committee *April* 28, 1466
Question again proposed; after long debate, Committee—R.P.

[*cont.*

Established Church (*Ireland*)—cont.
191] *Oath of Roman Catholic Members*, Moved, "That the Oath taken by Roman Catholic Members previous to the alteration of the Oath on the 30th of April, 1866, be read by the Clerk at the Table" (*Mr. Freville-Surtees*) *April* 30, 1582; after short debate, Question put, and negatived
. Acts considered in Committee *April* 30, 1583
Question again proposed; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put; Comm. divided; A. 330, N. 265, M. 65; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1675
Committee—R.P.
. Moved, "That the House, at rising, do adjourn till Monday next" (*Mr. Disraeli*), 1679; after short debate, Motion agreed to
. *Ministerial Statement — Defeat of the Government on the Irish Church Resolutions*, Observations, Mr. Disraeli *May* 4, 1694; debate thereon
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Conolly*); after long debate, Motion withdrawn
. Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 5, 1787
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Gladstone*); after debate, Motion withdrawn
. *Meeting at St. James's Hall*, Question, Mr. Verner *May* 7, 1886
. Acts considered in Committee *May* 7, 1886
(2.) Moved, "That, subject to the foregoing considerations, it is expedient to prevent the creation of new personal interests by the exercise of any public patronage, and to confine the operations of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of Ireland to objects of immediate necessity, or such as involve individual rights, pending the final decision of Parliament" (*Mr. Gladstone*); after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
. (3.) Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, humbly to pray that, with a view to preventing, by legislation during the present Session, the creation of new personal interests through the exercise of any public patronage, Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to place at the disposal of Parliament, Her interest in the temporalities of the Archbishoprics, Bishoprics, and other Ecclesiastical Dignities and Benefices in Ireland, and in the custody thereof" (*Mr. Gladstone*), 1898; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
. *Grant to Maynooth — The Regium Donum*, Moved, "That when the Anglican Church in Ireland is disestablished and disendowed, it is right and necessary that the Grant to Maynooth and the Regium Donum be discontinued; and that no part of the secularized funds of the Anglican Church, or any State funds whatever, be applied in any way, or under any form, to the endowment or furtherance of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland, or to the establishment or maintenance of Roman Catholic denominational schools or colleges" (*Mr. Sinclair Aytoun*), 1902

[*cont.*

Established Church (*Ireland*)—cont.

191] After debate, Amendt. to leave out from the first word "That," and add "when legislative effect shall have been given to the First Resolution of this Committee respecting the Established Church of Ireland, it is right and necessary that the Grant to Maynooth and the Regium Donum be discontinued" (*Mr. Whitbread*), 1923; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" Comm. divided; A. 85, N. 198; M. 113

. Question proposed, "That the words 'when legislative effect &c.;'" be added *May* 7, 1925

. Amendt. proposed to said proposed Amendt. by adding the words "due regard being had to all personal interests" (*Mr. Gladstone*), 1926; after short debate, Question, "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to

. Amendt. proposed to the said proposed Amendt. as amended, by adding the words, "And that no part of the Endowments of the Anglican Church be applied to the Endowment of the institutions of other religious communions" (*Mr. Greene*), 1931

Question, "That those words be added, &c.;" after short debate, Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Whalley*); Motion withdrawn; Question put, A. 97, N. 132; M. 35

Question, "That the words 'when legislative effect,' &c.;" put, and agreed to

4. *Resolved*, That when legislative effect shall have been given to the First Resolution of this Committee, respecting the Established Church of Ireland, it is right and necessary that the Grant to Maynooth and the Regium Donum be discontinued, due regard being had to all personal interests

. Moved, "That the Chairman report the Resolutions to the House" (*Mr. Gladstone*), 1941; after short debate, Resolutions reported and agreed to

. Resolved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, humbly to pray that, with a view to preventing, by legislation during the present Session, the creation of new personal interests through the exercise of any public patronage, Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to place at the disposal of Parliament, Her interest in the temporalities of the Archbishoprics, Bishoprics, and other Ecclesiastical Dignities and Benefices in Ireland, and in the custody thereof" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *May* 7, 1949

Her Majesty's Reply to the Address of May 7 *May* 12, [192] 113

LORDS—

191] *The Resolutions*, Notice (*The Earl of Derby*) *April* 27, 1303; Question, The Earl of . Derby; Answer, Earl Russell *April* 28, 1425

Ministerial Statement—Defeat of the Government in the Commons, Observations, The . Earl of Malmesbury *May* 4, 1686; short debate thereon

Established Church (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. Gladstone, Sir George Grey, Mr. Lawson*)

c. Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to prevent, for a limited time, new appointments in the Church of Ireland, and to restrain, for the same period, in certain respects, the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Ireland" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *May* 13, 232; Objected to, on point of Form (*Mr. Newdegate*); and not proceeded with

Established Church (*Ireland*) *Bill*—cont.

192] . Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 14, 247

. Motion again made *May* 14, 314

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Colonel Stuart Knox*); after short debate, Question negatived; after further short debate, main Question put; Bill ordered

. Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Verner*), 322; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 1°" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *May* 14, 322; after short debate, Bill read 1° [Bill 117]

. Personal Explanation, Colonel Stuart Knox *May* 15, 341

. Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 19, 511

. Question, Mr. MacEvoy; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 21, 657

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *May* 22, 720

. Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 312, N. 258; M. 54; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 809; main Question put; Bill read 2°

. Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 29, 1043

. Question, Lord Claud John Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 5, 1184

. Order for Committee read *June* 5, 1185

. Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power to provide in the said Bill, that the tenure of every office connected with the College of Maynooth be subject to like conditions with those to which official tenures connected with the Established Church in Ireland will be subject after the passing of this Act, and that no money shall be payable under the Act 8 and 9 Vic. c. 25, to the Trustees of the College of Maynooth for or for the use of any senior student or other student to be admitted after the passing of this Act" (*Mr. Sinclair Aytoun*), 1188

. Amendt. to leave out from "Bill, that" and add "every person who shall be appointed to any office in the College of Maynooth, after the passing of this Act, shall hold the said office subject to the pleasure of Parliament" (*Colonel Greville - Nugent*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 109, N. 185; M. 76

. Question proposed, "That the words 'every person who shall be appointed to any office in the College of Maynooth, after the passing of this Act, shall hold the said office subject to the pleasure of Parliament,' be added," 1192

[*cont.*

Established Church (Ireland) Bill—cont.

192] Amendt. proposed to the said proposed Amendt. by inserting after the word "Maynooth" the words, "And likewise every Presbyterian Minister hereafter to be appointed to receive a share of the Regium Donum" (*Sir George Grey*), 1197; Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to

Question, "That the words 'every person who shall be appointed to any office in the College of Maynooth, and likewise every Presbyterian Minister hereafter to be appointed to receive a share of the Regium Donum, after the passing of this Act, shall hold the said office subject to the pleasure of Parliament,' be added to the words 'Bill, that' in the original Question," put, and agreed to; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Newdegate*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to

. Committee; Report *June* 5, 1211

. Considered *June* 12, 1529

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *June* 16, 1697; after short debate, Bill read 3°

. *l.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 1ª" (*The Earl of Clarendon*) *June* 18, 1741; after short debate, Bill read 1ª (No. 157)

. Notice of Motion, The Lord Chancellor *June* 18, 1749

. Question, Lord Penrhyn; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *June* 23, 1909

. Petition of Clergymen of the Church of England presented, Lord Lyttelton *June* 23, 1917; short debate thereon

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*Earl Granville*) *June* 24, 2023

Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months") (*The Earl Grey*); after long debate, Debate adjourned

193] Adjourned debate resumed *June* 26, 2; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

. Adjourned debate resumed *June* 29, 169

. After long debate, on Question, That ("now") &c.; Cont. 97, Not-Cont. 192; M. 95; resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2ª on this Day Six Months; List of Cont. and Not-Cont, 298

Etwall and Repton Corporation

Question, Mr. Henley; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 9, [190] 1223

EVANS, Mr. T. W., *Derbyshire, S.*

Cattle Plague Returns, [190] 1287

Payment of Rates—The Compounding System, [190] 1888; Res. 1918

EVERSLEY, Viscount

Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 510

New Forest—Deer Removal, &c. Act, Motion for a Committee, [192] 694

EWART, Mr. W., *Dumfries, &c.*

Murder Law Amendment, [190] 989

Weights and Measures (Metric System), Leave, [190] 1072; 2R. [192] 176, 209

EWING, Mr. H. E. CRUM- *Paisley*

Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1083

Canongate Annuity Tax, 2R. [191] 1091

Court of Session (Scotland), 2R. [192] 1523

Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1526

Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1804; Consid. *add. cl.* 1899

Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. [190] 1259; Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 467; Schedule A, 1254; Lords Amendts. [193] 919

Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000) Bill

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)

c. Resolutions in Ways and Means [May 4 & 8] reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *May* 11

Read 2°* *May* 12 [Bill 112]

Committee*; Report *May* 13

Read 3°* *May* 14

l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *May* 15

Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *May* 18

Read 3ª* *May* 19

Royal Assent *May* 28 [31 *Vict.* c. 27]

EXCHEQUER, CHANCELLOR of the, *see* CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER

EXETER, Marquess of (Captain of the Gentlemen at Arms)

Army—Organization of the Reserved Forces, [193] 1353

Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 687

Expatriation, Law of

Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster *Mar* 20, [190] 1984; debate thereon

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 16 [Bill 241]

Read 2°* *July* 17

Committee*; Report *July* 20

Read 3°* *July* 22

l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 23

Read 2ª* *July* 24 (No. 280)

Committee*; Report *July* 27

Read 3ª* *July* 28

Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 111]

Explosive Materials in War—The Russian Circular

Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *July* 23, [193] 1661

Extradition
Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the state of our Treaty relations with Foreign Governments regarding Extradition, with a view to the adoption of a more permanent and uniform policy on the subject" (*Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens*) *Mar* 19, [190] 1954
And, on *Mar* 27, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Bouverie (Chairman), Mr. Thomas Baring, Mr. Baxter, Sir Robert Collier, Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. William Edward Forster, Sir Francis Goldsmid, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Graves, Mr. Layard, Mr. Mill, Mr. Neate, Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens, Mr. Walpole, and Mr. Percy Wyndham
Report of Select Committee *July* 6 (*Parl. P.* No. 393)

Eykyn, Mr. R., *Windsor*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1386
Ireland—Murder of Mr. Featherstonhaugh, [191] 1459
Knights of Windsor, Motion for an Address, [192] 1975; [193] 516
Navy—Naval Chaplains, [190] 536; [193] 424

Eyre, Ex-Governor, Prosecution of
Act of Indemnity, Question, Colonel B. Knox; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 12, [192] 1470
Expenses—Despatch, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 12, [192] 1477
Jamaica Committee, The, Questions, Colonel Stuart Knox, Colonel Jervis; Reply, Mr.
192] Speaker *May* 22, 717; Question, Colonel Jervis; Answer, Mr. Disraeli; short debate thereon *May* 25, 836; Questions, Mr. Lamont, Colonel Brownlow Knox; Answers, Mr. Disraeli *June* 9, 1334—*Petition for Re-Appointment of*, Question, Mr. Grenfell; Answer, Mr. Lamont; short debate thereon *June* 22, 1850
Letter of Lord Carnarvon (*Parl. P.* No. 355)

Fairs Bill
(*Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Hussey Vivian, Mr. Denman*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 19 [Bill 126]
Read 2°* *May* 28
Committee*; Report *June* 9
Read 3°* *June* 10
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl De Grey*) *June* 11
Read 2ª* *June* 29 (No. 141)
Committee*; Report *July* 7
Read 3ª* *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 51]

Fairs (Ireland) Bill (*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Earl of Mayo*) *Mar* 5, [190] 1146
Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 48]
Read 2°* *Mar* 12
Committee*; Report *Mar* 17
Considered* *Mar* 18
Read 3°* *Mar* 19
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *Mar* 20 (No. 47)
Read 2ª* *Mar* 24
Committee*; Report *Mar* 26
Read 3ª* *Mar* 27
Royal Assent *Mar* 30 [31 *Vict.* c. 11]

Fairs (Metropolis) Bill
(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 30 [Bill 205]
Read 2°* *July* 2
Committee*; Report *July* 3
Read 3°* *July* 6
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 7
Read 2ª* *July* 13 (No. 223)
Committee*; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª* *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 106]

Fane, Colonel J. W., *Oxfordshire*
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1970

Fawcett, Mr. H., *Brighton*
Abyssinian Expedition—Estimates, [191] 703, 1148
Water Supply, [190] 887, 889
Agricultural Labour, [192] 1397
Army—Shoeburyness, Experiments at, [193] 1439
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 3R. [191] 2061
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 680; *cl.* 5, 2192, 2197; *cl.* 10, [193] 758; *cl.* 45, 1178; *cl.* 46, 1371; *add. cl.* 1443, 1451, 1453, 1454; Consid. 1620, 1629, 1634; *add. cl.* 1678, 1680, 1681, 1689; 3R. Amendt. 1715
Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 1997
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1913, 1925
Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 116
India—East India Civil Service, Res. [191] 1838, 1851, 1859
India—East India, Troops and Vessels (Abyssinian Expedition), Res. [190] 380
India—Systems of Government, [191] 422
Ireland—Roman Catholic University, [190] 1456
Ireland—University Education, [192] 1015; Res. 3, 1054, 1064
Parliament—Public Business, [193] 1420
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1655
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [192] 1764; *add. cl.* 1777, 1790
Representation of the People (Scotland), Consid. *add. cl.* [192] 1445
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 305
Prosecutions, Amendt. [192] 496, 499
Royal Palaces, [191] 1006; Amendt. 1007, 1009, 1010
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1186

Fenianism
Alleged Bribe to a Fenian, Question, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *June* 8, [192] 1229
Clerkenwell Prison, Attack on, Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 9, [190] 1215—*The Convict Barrett*, Question, Mr. Bright; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 25, [192] 832
Fenian Prisoners, Warren and Costello, Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 16, [193] 1282

[cont.

Fenianism—cont.
  Maguire, Case of the Convict, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Corry *Nov* 21, [190] 107
  Manchester, Convicts at, Observations, Mr. Maguire *Nov* 21, [190] 113; debate thereon
  Metropolis — Special Constables, Motion for "Return of the Number of Special Constables who have respectively enrolled themselves in the different Parishes of the Metropolis after the Explosion in Clerkenwell" (*The Lord Campbell*) *Mar* 19, [190] 1880; Motion agreed to

FERGUSSON, Sir J. (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Ayrshire*
  Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 27, [191] 677; 3R. 2061
  Colliers in the Wigan District, Strike of, [191] 1224
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1910, 1934
  Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1528
  Metropolitan Police Funds, 2R. [193] 351
  Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 415; Lords Amendts. 663
  Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), Leave, [191] 1863; 2R. [192] 1739
  Petroleum, Comm. [192] 1619
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 837; 2R. 1257; Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 478, 482, 492; *cl.* 4, 856; *cl.* 5, 857; *cl.* 8, 885; *cl.* 9, 979; *cl.* 10, 983; *cl.* 12, 1008; *add cl.* 1243; Schedule A, 1251, 1252; Consid. *add. cl.* 1446
  Sanitary Improvements, Rates for, [191] 259
  Supply — Government Prisons, [192] 1106, 1107; Report, 1176
  Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1722

FEVERSHAM, Lord
  Ministerial Statement, [191] 1691

Fine Arts Copyright Consolidation and Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Westbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 12 (No. 145)

Fines and Fees (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 18 [Bill 35]
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *Mar* 9, [190] 1227
  Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*General Dunne*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and negatived; Bill put off for six months

FINLAY, Mr. A. S., *Argyllshire*
  Indo-European Telegraph, [190] 520

Fire Protection
  Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *Mar* 16, [190] 1687

FITZGERALD, Lord O. A., *Kildare Co.*
  Ireland—Police Barracks, [190] 1113
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 67, Amendt. [191] 325
  River Thames, Obstructions in the, [191] 1577

FLOYER, Mr. J., *Dorsetshire*
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 3R. [193] 1723
  Local Charges on Real Property, Res. [192] 154
  Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1542
  Supply—Burlington House, [192] 398
    Government Prisons, [192] 1105
    Vagrancy, [193] 1102

FOLJAMBE, Mr. F. J. S., *Retford (East)*
  Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 568

FORDE, Colonel W. B., *Downshire*
  Ireland—Johnston, Mr., Case of, [191] 469

FORDYCE, Mr. W. D., *Aberdeenshire*
  Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1303
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 466; *cl.* 12, 1007
  Scotland—Agricultural Labourers' Dwellings, [190] 1287
    Law of Hypothec, [190] 1149

Foreign Office and our Agents Abroad
  Question, Sir Percy Burrell; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 5, [190] 631

Foreign Office Clerks acting as Agents
190] Question, Mr. Bayley Potter; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 3, 542; Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 5, 606; Question, Mr. Bayley Potter; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 20, 986; Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 15, [192] 1562; Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 24, [193] 1712
    Names of Agents *Parl. P.* [3970] [3970-I. to IV.]

Foreshores and Bed of the Sea—The Board of Trade
  Question, Mr. Coleridge; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Nov* 29, [190] 419; Observations, The Duke of Argyll; Reply, The Duke of Richmond; short debate thereon *June* 19, [192] 1814
  Foreshores, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to request that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to order that there be laid before this House by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, Copy of each of the following privately printed Papers — namely, Report on the Right to Foreshores and the legal Decisions affecting the River Thames and the Rights of the Citizens of London from the Time of Henry III.; by J. W. Pycroft, F.S.A., M.R.A.S.; Reg. Sept. Antiq. Reg. Soc., pp. 161" [and other Papers] (*The Duke of Buccleuch*) *July* 21, [193] 1550; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

[*cont.*

practical questions were at issue, arising out of the doubt as to whether the restoration of the Indian finances after the Mutiny had been so complete that practically the equilibrium had been established. If the equilibrium had been established it would have been obviously right to incur a more liberal expenditure in useful and reproductive works than would otherwise be possible, and it was also clearly right not to impose an excessive amount of unpopular direct taxation to maintain an unnecessary surplus. On those questions he had taken a different view from that of the Secretary of State of that time. That controversy between Lord Canning's Government and the Home Government should guide them for the future. He most cheerfully bore testimony to the fact that the administration of the Home Indian Government under the right hon. Baronet and the Marquess of Salisbury had been of a much more liberal tone than the policy of earlier times; but he could not help thinking the right hon. Baronet had spoken too gloomily of Indian finance, and he (Mr. Laing) proposed to point out why a more cheerful view of things should be taken. During and after the time of the Mutiny, the financial condition of India was one of extreme distress—there was an accumulated deficit in the four years from 1858 to 1861 of £42,000,000, so that the average deficit for the four years was £10,500,000 per annum; and during 1860 and 1861, two years after the Mutiny, the annual deficit amounted to the formidable figure of £5,250,000. Great efforts were then made towards the establishment of an equilibrium, and since 1861 those efforts had been practically successful. During those six years they had been paying their way. For three years there had been a surplus, and for three years a deficit, but the six years together showed that the debt had slightly diminished; at the commencement it was £113,000,000; in 1867 it was £108,000,000. The interest paid in the year 1862 was £5,160,000, and in 1867 it was £4,829,000. It was true, however, that the cash balance in 1862 had amounted to £17,000,000, and that it stood in 1867 at only £11,000,000; so that to within a few pounds India was in the same position as regarded her public debt, less cash balances, now as she occupied in 1862. This, he thought, proved the soundness of the view entertained by Lord Canning's Government as to the preservation of an equilibrium in the Indian Budget. And he thought it right to observe that the equilibrium of the Indian Budget was very different from the equilibrium of any European Budget, because in the former works were charged to revenue which in the latter would be charged to capital. From 1862 to the present year the cost of the public works undertaken in India was £28,667,000; of which no less than £16,000,000 was for original works and improvements exclusive of the cost of maintaining. Just about one-half of that £16,000,000 was for new civil and military buildings, and might be regarded as adding to the value of the public estate; the other half was for strictly reproductive works; so that £8,000,000 had been charged to revenue, which he ventured to say in the Budget of any other State in the world would have been charged to capital. In India the compensation for land taken for railways was charged to revenue, though it was as strictly a charge against capital as was the cost of constructing the railways themselves. During the last six years £15,000,000, or £2,500,000 a year, had been charged to revenue in India, which, if we took the analogy of any European State or any private railway company, would have been charged to capital. During the same period, though there had been no large war, India had not been completely tranquil and some of the military operations there had been attended with considerable expense. If there had been no increase in the cost of pay and provisions there ought to have been a diminution of £1,500,000 or £2,000,000 as compared with the military establishments of 1861-2; but, instead of a decrease, there had been a small increase. He thought, however, that the expenditure under this head would not have been an increasing one, and he believed that if peace continued, it would be possible to effect a reduction. Here he would observe that his experience led him to believe that if we wanted economy in military matters we must have a civilian primarily responsible for that expenditure—a Minister for War in England and a Governor General in India. In other words, we must not allow a Commander-in-Chief to control his own Estimates. But the Estimates being under the control of a civilian, one man ought to be made responsible for carrying out all the details; and a military man thoroughly acquainted with all the practical details of his profession, was best adapted for this latter duty. He believed that in respect of this matter second thoughts in India had been the worst. In his opinion

FRENCH, Rt. Hon. Colonel F., *Roscommon Co.*
Army—Officers in command of Depôts, [192] 1180; [193] 313
Army—Wooden Huts for Troops, Motion for an Address, [190] 982
Electric Telegraphs, [193] 720
Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 213
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 802
Ireland—Auditor of Grand Jury Accounts, [192] 1469
  Compulsory Presentments, [193] 827
Ireland—River Shannon, Motion for a Committee [190] 994; [191] 357;—Stake Nets on the, 467
Knights of Windsor, Motion for an Address, [192] 1975
Ministerial Statement — Resignation of the Earl of Derby, [190] 1098
Parliament—Conference Room, [191] 1148
  Point of Order, [192] 15
Parliament—House of Commons Arrangements, Motion for a Committee, [190] 984
Peerage (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [191] 1563
Post Office—Case of A. J. Duffy, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1298
Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 1892; Leave, Motion for Adjournment, 1946; 2R. [191] 1951; Comm. [192] 1580; *cl.* 18, 1590, 1597; *add. cl.* 1777, 1791
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 863, 874; *cl.* 10, 990
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2019
Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, [192] 1483
Sunday Trading, 2R. [191] 1085
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 993, 995
  Burlington House, [192] 398
  Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, [193] 669
  Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1001
  Household of Lord Lieutenant, [193] 1206, 1207
  Parliament, Houses of, [192] 300
  Post Office, [193] 833
  Royal Palaces, [191] 1013
  Sheriff Court Houses (Scotland), [192] 400
Supply — Proceedings in, Resolution, [191] 1032

FRESHFIELD, Mr. C. K., *Dover*
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), Comm. [192] 166
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1298, 1299, 1301, 1341; *cl.* 3, 1770, 1771, 1772
Sunday Trading, 2R. [191] 1084, 1085

Friendly Societies Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Lichfield*)
l. Presented; read 1^{a}* *Mar* 17 (No. 43)
After short debate, 2R. deferred *May* 1, [191] 1685
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}" *May* 5, 1775; after short debate, Bill read 2^{a}
Committee *May* 19, [192] 506; after short debate, Bill withdrawn

GALLWEY, Sir W. P., *Thirsk*
County Financial Boards (No. 1), Leave, [190] 1206; 2R. [191] 1556, 1694
Metropolis—Park Lane, [192] 2138
Supply—Enrolled Pensioners, &c. [191] 284
  Salaries of Governors of Colonies, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 675

GALWAY, Viscount, *Retford* (*East*)
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 1435
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1634
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1660
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1373
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1342; Preamble, 1526
Parliament—Business of the House, [191] 1681
Petroleum, Comm. [192] 1619
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 1605
Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 569
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1589, 1591

"*Garonne,*" *Loss of the*
Question, Admiral Erskine; Answer, Mr. S. Cave *May* 29, [192] 1042; [193] 370
(*Parl. P.* No. 408)

Garter King at Arms
Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 23, [191] 39

GASELEE, Mr. Serjeant S., *Portsmouth*
Army—Artillery, Colonels in the, [193] 1922
  Artillery Practice at Portsmouth, [193] 517, 519, 910, 1668
Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2034, 2038
Army Estimates—Surveys, [193] 962
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 672
Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 432
Boundary, [191] 146; 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1014; Comm. [192] 275; Preamble, 1261
Bristol Election, [193] 1275
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Leave, [190] 996; 2R. Amendt. 1131
Ceylon—Condition of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 982
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 981; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1418; *cl.* 6, 1425
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1557, 1558, 1559
Court of Session (Scotland), Leave, [190] 1087
Disfranchised Boroughs—Totnes, &c. [190] 436
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [191] 311; *cl.* 1, [192] 661; *cl.* 5, 2192, 2197
193] 738; *cl.* 6, 743; *cl.* 8, 746; *cl.* 10, 752; *cl.* 14, 1005; *cl.* 17, 1018; *cl.* 45, 1178; *add. cl.* 1442, 1452; Consid. 1618, 1637, 1643; *add. cl.* 1649, 1675, 1677, 1688
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1907
Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 119
Libel, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 608; *cl.* 3, 613
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1541
Napier's, Sir R., Annuity, Comm. [193] 1225

[*cont.*

GASELEE, Mr. Serjeant S.—*cont.*
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [193] 542
Salaries of Officers, [193] 539
Navy—Flogging on Board the "Favourite," [191] 35
Parliament—Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 884, 1809
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 14, [192] 1938; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1939, 1941
Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 568
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1770, 1771
Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. [190] 1268; Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 974; *cl.* 10, 990; *cl.* 11, 1002; *add. cl.* 1247
Sale of Poisons, &c. Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1219, 1220
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 989, 997
Consular Establishments Abroad, [192] 2172
Embassy Houses Abroad, [192] 313
Foreign Office, New, [192] 313
Mission House, Teheran, [191] 999
Prosecutions, [192] 497; Motion for Adjournment, 501
Royal Palaces, [191] 1007, 1009, 1013
Weights and Measures, [193] 1928

GAVIN, Major G., *Limerick City*
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 938

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act Amendment Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 1 [Bill 206]
Read 2° * *July* 6
Committee *; Report *July* 10 [Bill 226]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 14
Considered * *July* 16
Read 3° * *July* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 17 (No. 267)
Read 2ª * *July* 21
Committee *; Report *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 24
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 102]

GIBSON, Right Hon. T. M., *Ashton-under Lyne*
Army — Control Department, Motion for Papers, [193] 1274
Cattle, Foreign, Importation of, [193] 1285
Electric Telegraphs, Leave, [191] 682
Libel, 2R. [191] 668
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, 2R. [190] 690; [192] 1177, 1178, 1179, 1180; Res. 1468, 1469
193] Comm. Amendt. 138, 139, 154, 1299, 1304, 1317, 1337, 1340, 1343; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1529, 1532, 1533; *cl.* 3, 1537, 1539, 1540, 1672, 1673, 1756, 1758, 1764, 1771
Parliament—Adjournment, Motion for, [193] 1738, 1741, 1742
Business of the House, [192] 1759
Dissolution of, [192] 1063
Parliament—Private Bill Legislation, Res. Amendt. [190] 1800
Pilotage, Compulsory, Res. [191] 381, 382, 384
[*cont.*

GIBSON, Right hon. T. M.—*cont.*
Publications, Registration of, [192] 1512
Riots at Ashton, Staleybridge, &c. [192] 825
Sea Fisheries, Comm. [190] 1269, 1273; Lords Amendts. [192] 1857, 1863
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [192] 208

GILPIN, Colonel R. T., *Bedfordshire*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 68

GILPIN, Mr. C., *Northampton*
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 1440
Capital Punishment within Prisons, 2R. [190] 1135; Comm. Amendt. [191] 1033
Church Rates, [190] 544
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 967
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1623
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1365
Eyre, Ex-Governor, Prosecution of, [192] 837, 838
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1297, 1304
New Zealand—Forces in, [193] 642
Oaths Commission, [190] 800
Postal—St. Thomas, Island of, [190] 508
West India Mail Packet Station, [190] 665; [192] 815
Postal—Halifax, Bermuda, and St. Thomas Mails, Res. [190] 633
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1734; Consid. 1788
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 489
Sheep, Foreign, Importation of, [193] 1287
Slave Trade Papers, [190] 1687
West Indies, Lords Amendts. [193] 1919

GLADSTONE, Right Hon. W. E., *Lancashire, S.*
Abyssinian Expedition—Vote of Thanks, [193] 526
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 65, 68
Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 319
Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 429
Boundary, Comm. [192] 248, 279, 284; Preamble, 1285
Brougham, Lord, The late, [193] 1834
Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1752
Church Rates Regulation, 2R. [190] 1411, 1412, 1414
Colonial Bishops, [192] 111
Commissions, Permanent Expenses of, Res. [191] 1291
Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1920
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 957; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1416; *cl.* 4, Amendt. *ib.*, 1421; *cl.* 5, 1422; Amendt. 1424, 1425; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1426; *add. cl.* 1430, 1983; [191] 40; 3R. 101; Lords Amendts. [193] 1773
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 370; Motion for a Committee, [193] 329
Derby Day—Adjournment, [192] 925
[*cont.*

Gladstone, Right hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Disraeli's, Mr., Speech at Merchant Taylors' Hall, [192] 2158, 2161
East India, Troops and Vessels (Abyssinian Expedition), Res. [190] 390, 403
East Worcestershire Election, [192] 1110, 1112, 1118
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, [190] 1983
Edinburgh, Duke of, Address to Her Majesty, [191] 1336
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 719 ; 2R. 1143 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 677 ; *cl.* 5, 2193 ; [193] 735 ; *cl.* 26, 1171 ; *cl.* 54, 1374 ; *add. cl.* 1379, 1384, 1447, 1451, 1454 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1691
Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1330 ; Comm. [193] 1583, 1585, 1586
Established Church (Ireland), Notice of Resolutions, [190] 1974
191] 32, 35, 356 ; Comm. 470, 500, 709, 750, 797, 924, 1364, 1379, 1418, 1423, 1463 ; Res. 1, 1650, 1660, 1679 ; Res. 2, 1886 ; Res. 3, 1898, 1901, 1914, 1916 ; Amendt. 1925, 1930, 1932, 1933, 1938 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1941, 1944 ; Reply to Address, [192] 114
192] Established Church (Ireland), Leave, 232, 247, 314, 315, 316, 317, 320 ; 1R. 323, 341, 511 ; 2R. 720, 741, 796, 1043, 1185 ; Comm. 1189, 1193, 1211 ; Consid. 1531
Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 126
Ireland—Presbytery of Antrim, [191] 1581
  Regium Donum, The, [191] 835
Ireland—Royal Residence in, Motion for an Address, [192] 361
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1396, 1740
Irish Church, The, [192] 657
Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 23, [192] 1529
Licences, Res. [191] 157
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 155, 619, 1301, 1303, 1330, 1331, 1338 ; Preamble, 1524, 1525 ; *cl.* 3, 1768
Ministerial Statement — Resignation of the Earl of Derby, [190] 1098 ;—Re-construction of the Ministry, 1100 ; [191] 827, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1745 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1787, 1818, 1819 ; [193] 917
Navy Estimates—Wages, [192] 86
Parliament—Arrangement of Business, [191] 263, 264, 1679, 1680
  Business of the House, [192] 1569
  Dissolution of, [192] 1068, 1073
  Progress of Business, [192] 494
  Public Business, [193] 1420
Parliament—Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1808
Parliament—Rules of the House, Res. [192] 1079
Parliamentary Boroughs—Payment of Rates, [190] 441
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* K, [193] 1883
Princess of Wales, Address to the Queen, [193] 914
Public Accounts, Res. [192] 135
Public Schools, 2R. [190] 762 ; Re-comm. *cl.* 16, [192] 1941
Registration, Leave, [192] 1402
Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 32, [193] 1498, 1499 ; *cl.* 34, 1506

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Right hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 1201 ; Leave, 1951 ; Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1593 ; *add. cl.* 1787, 1789, 1797 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1899, 1906
Representation of the People (Scotland), [191] 2004 ; Comm. [192] 455 ; *cl.* 8, 865, 873, 890, 955 ; *cl.* 9, 961 ; *cl.* 11, 998 ; *cl.* E, 1240 ; *cl.* O, 1243 ; *add. cl.* 1247
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. [193] 394
Roman Catholic Oath, [191] 1582
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1851
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 295, 299
  Prosecutions, [192] 497
  Report, [192] 1606
Supply — Proceedings in, Resolution, [191] 1465
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [193] 969
United States—The "Alabama" Claims, Motion for an Address, [190] 1195
Ways and Means—The Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 344, 358 ;—Financial Statement, [191] 1166, 1169, 1173, 1190 ; Comm. Res. 1, 1746, 1753, 1772

Gladstone, Mr. W. H., *Chester City*
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1725

Gloucester and **Bristol**, Bishop of
Army Chaplains, 2R. [192] 1299 ; Comm. 1386
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 3R. [193] 1099

Goddard, Mr. A. L., *Cricklade*
Metropolis—Park Lane, [192] 2137
Parish Mortuaries, [193] 516

Goddard, S. A., Petition of
Observations, Mr. H. B. Sheridan *July* 16, [193] 1250

Goldney, Mr. G., *Chippenham*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 672, 1064 ; *add. cl.* 1066 ; Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1876
Boundary, Comm. [192] 260
Commissions, Permanent Expenses of, Res. [191] 1280, 1295
Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1915
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 5, [190] 1424 ; *add. cl.* 1427, 1428
Dean and Chapter of Westminster, Estates of, [190] 641
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 726 ; Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 741 ; *cl.* 14, 1001 ; Amendt. 1014
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1359
Metropolis—Iron Gates in Devonshire Place, &c. [192] 243
Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1120
Public Schools, Leave, [190] 634 ; Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1653, 1655 ; *cl.* 20, [193] 813
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1235 ; Schedule A, 1252
Stamper, Case of, and the Overseers of Sunderland, [193] 907

[*cont.*

Goldney, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Supply—Chapter House, Westminster, [192] 396
Foreign Office, New, [192] 313
Government Prisons, [192] 1106
Land Registry Office, [192] 1104
Mission House, Teheran, [191] 999
New Palace, Westminster, [192] 396
Prosecutions, [192] 501
Public Offices Site, [192] 391
Royal Palaces, [191] 1005, 1012
Supply—Proceedings in, Resolution, [191] 1032, 1466
Turkey—Maintenance of the Ottoman Empire, [190] 642
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [193] 970
Turnpike Trusts, Motion for an Address, [191] 2015
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1725

Goldsmid, Sir F. H., *Reading*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 674; *cl.* 27, 676; Motion for Adjournment, 1063, 1064; *add. cl.* 1065, 1066; Consid. *add. cl.* 1564
Boundary, Comm. [192] 275
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 1236
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 704; Comm. *cl.* 14, [193] 1008; *cl.* 17, 1017; *add. cl.* 1439, 1457
Libel, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 605
Registration of Voters Act, [192] 385
Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts. [192] 1863

Goldsmid, Mr. J., *Honiton*
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1366; Motion for a Committee, [193] 324, 342
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 48, Amendt. [193] 1373; *add. cl.* 1376
Libel, Comm. [192] 599
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1809
Postal—Brindisi Route, [192] 1561
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [192] 1765
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 896
Wellington, Duke of, Monument to the, [192] 512

Gordon, Right Hon. E. S., *see* **Advocate**, The Lord

Gore, Mr. W. R. **Ormsby-**, *Leitrim Co.*
Burials (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1382
Ireland—Eel Weir at Roosky, [193] 1669

Gorst, Mr. J. E., *Cambridge Bo.*
Boundary, Comm. Preamble, [192] 1257, 1261
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 4, [191] 1059
Ceylon—Affairs of, [190] 2021
Ceylon—Condition of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 978; [193] 1477
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), Comm. Amendt. [192] 166

[*cont.*

Gorst, Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 46, [193] 1369; *add. cl.* 1380
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1340
New Zealand—Alleged Cruelties in, [193] 1103
British Regiments in, [190] 1979
Nova Scotia—British North American Confederation, Motion for an Address, [192] 1692
Petroleum, Comm. [192] 1619
Registration of Voters, 1868, [192] 1223
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. Schedule A, [192] 1253, 1254
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [192] 198

Goschen, Right Hon. G. J., *London*
Agriculture, Motion for a Committee, [192] 586
Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2054
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. Schedule, [191] 1066; Consid. 1568; Schedule, 1877
Bank Holidays, 2R. [190] 947
Bankruptcy Law, [190] 336
Clifton and Bedminster Workhouse Infirmaries, [190] 165
Commissions, Permanent Expenses of, Res. [191] 1295
Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1914
Duchy of Lancaster, [190] 649
Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1320; Nomination of Committee, 1980; Comm. [193] 1568
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 599, 603
India—Bank of Bombay, [191] 2059
Local Taxation, [190] 1011
London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. [191] 199; *cl.* 2, 204; *add. cl.* 205; Consid. *add. cl.* 327
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 154, 631, 636, 1339; Preamble, 1529; *cl.* 3, 1538, 1540, 1541, 1748, 1756, 1763, 1770, 1771
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [190] 414; Lords Amendts. 662
Parliament, Dissolution of, [192] 1060
Parliamentary Boroughs—Payment of Rates, [190] 444
Personal Rating, [190] 516
Postal—Service with the United States, [190] 685
Public Schools, [190] 1982; Re-comm. [192] 1639; *cl.* 3, 1656; *cl.* 14, 1934
Thames Embankment, &c. Amendment, 2R. [192] 1214
Ways and Means, Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1758

Government of India Act Amendment Bill (*Sir S. Northcote, Sir J. Fergusson*)
191] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) *April* 23, 1201
Bill ordered; read 1° [Bill 91]
192] Question, Sir Edward Colebrooke; Answer Sir Stafford Northcote *June* 15, 1567
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 15, 1598; after short debate, Bill read 2°
. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 22, 1870; after short debate, Committee—R.P.

[*cont.*

Government of India Act Amendment Bill—cont.
[193] Committee—R.P. *July* 8, 858
Moved, "That the Order of the Day to go into Committee on this Bill be discharged" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) *July* 27, 1870
After short debate, Order discharged; Bill withdrawn

Governor General of India Bill
(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 23 [Bill 92]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 15, [192] 1601; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn * *July* 27

GOWER, Lord R. S. LEVESON-, *Sutherlandshire*
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 11, [192] 994

GOWER, Hon. E. F. LEVESON-, *Bodmin*
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [193] 1589, 1590; *cl.* 15, 1602
Regulation of Railways, Consid. [193] 1790

GRAHAM, Mr. W., *Glasgow*
India—Telegraphic Communication, Motion for Papers, [193] 165
Postal—Communication with the United States—The Cunard Contract, [190] 333
India, China, and Japan Mails, Res. [190] 475
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 841; 2R. 1255; Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 956; Amendt. 959; *cl.* 6, 1010, 1231
Sunday Trading, 2R. Amendt. [191] 1085

GRANARD, Earl of
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 227

Grand Jury Cess (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Stacpoole, Mr. Corbally, The O'Conor Don*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Nov* 28 [Bill 14]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 25, [191] 209
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*The Earl of Mayo*); after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 57, N. 70; M. 13; words added; 2R. put off for six months

Grand Jury Presentments (*Ireland*)
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the several Laws under which monies are now raised by Grand Jury Presentments in Ireland, and into the nature and incidence of all charges levied under such Presentments, with the view of ascertaining what alterations might beneficially be made in these Laws" (*The O'Conor Don*) *Mar* 17, [190] 1830

[*cont*

Grand Jury Presentments (*Ireland*)—cont.
And, on *Mar* 20, Committee nominated as follows:—The O'Conor Don (Chairman), Mr. Blake, Lord John Browne, Colonel Cooper, Mr. Dawson, General Dunne, Colonel Forde, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Kendall, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Sir Charles Lanyon, Mr. Leader, Mr. Maguire, The Earl of Mayo, and Sir Colman O'Loghlen; *April* 1, Lord John Browne disch., Colonel French added
Moved, "That the Select Committee on Grand Jury Presentments do consist of Nineteen Members (*Mr. Vance*) *Mar* 23, [191] 101; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Moved, "That the Select Committee on Grand Jury Presentments do consist of Nineteen Members" (*Mr. Vance*) *Mar* 25, 238; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Report of Select Committee *July* 6 (*Parl. P.* No. 392)

GRANT, Mr. A., *Kidderminster*
Belgium—Riots in, [191] 837

GRANVILLE, Earl
Abyssinia—Papers, [190] 153, 157
Army—Volunteer Review at Windsor, [193] 997
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 499; Report, 714
Burials (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1097
Cotton Statistics, Comm. [192] 918
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), 2R. [192] 1553
Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland, Motion for a Committee, [191] 248
Education, 1R. [191] 129, 137; 2R. 1321
Withdrawal of Bill, [192] 407
Education, Technical — Whitworth Scholarships, [191] 820
Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1434, 1443, 1446
Established Church (Ireland), [192] 1920; 2R. 2023, 2056, 2072, 2117; [193] 289, 290, 295, 296
Foreshore and Bed of the Sea, [192] 1831
London, Brighton, &c. Railways, 3R. [193] 361
Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 582
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [191] 692, 694
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 22, [192] 948; *cl.* 9, 1627
Public Schools, Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1657; Report, 1701, 1706
Railway Bills—Increase of Rates, Res. [193] 1073
Reform Act, 1867—Ratepaying Clauses, [190] 1588
Registration (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1710
Regulation of Railways, Report, *cl.* 14, [192] 416
Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [193] 368
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, 2R. [193] 1088
Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy, Comm. [192] 1554, 1555; Report, 1630; 3R. 1747
West Indies, 2R. [193] 796

Graves, Mr. S. R., *Liverpool*
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 14, [191] 675; *cl.* 27, 676; *cl.* 35, 678
- Companies Amendment Act, [190] 605
- County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 171
- Customs Officers, Grievances of, [191] 1555; [193] 1426
- Electric Telegraphs, [192] 654; 2R. 1314
- Merchant Shipping Consolidation, [191] 699
- Ministerial Statement, [191] 1803
- Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1121
- Navy—Royal Dockyards, Res. [190] 2034, 2046
- Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [193] 541
  - Naval Stores, [193] 1145
  - New Works, &c. [193] 1155
  - Salaries of Officers, [193] 538
  - Steam Machinery, [193] 1154
  - Wages, [192] 83
- Passenger Acts, [191] 1574
- Pilotage, Compulsory, Res. [191] 386
- Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2020
- Postal—West India Mails, [191] 1222; [193] 519
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1246
- Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. [193] 401
- Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2018
- Supply—Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1000, 1001
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [192] 179

Gray, Sir J., *Kilkenny Bo.*
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1381
- Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [193] 1592
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 757
- Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 214
- Grand Jury Presentments (Ireland), Nomination of Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [191] 101
- Ireland—Questions, &c.
  - Irish Church Commission, [193] 323, 324
  - National Board of Education, [193] 1276
  - O'Hanlon, Michael, Case of, [193] 1280
  - Roman Catholic University, [192] 1472, 1474; [193] 313
  - Spirit Licence Duty, [190] 431, 434
  - Sullivan and Pigott, Messrs., Imprisonment of, [191] 445, 446
  - Tenure of Land, [193] 1418
- Measor, C. P., Case of, [193] 1714
- Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [193] 417
- Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1960; *add. cl.* [192] 1803; Consid. 1897; *add. cl.* 1900
- Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2168
  - Treasury, [193] 1201
  - University of Glasgow, [192] 402
  - Woods, Forests, &c. [193] 1209

Gray, Colonel W., *Bolton*
- Mines Assessment, Comm. *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 851

Greene, Mr. E., *Bury St. Edmunds*
- Army—Malt Liquor for the Troops in India, [192] 16
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 674; Consid. 1568
- Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1074
- Coal Mines, [192] 1081, 1082, 1083
- Colliery Accidents, [191] 1464; Motion for a Commission, [192] 939
- Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 1991
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. Amendt. [191] 1931, 1940
- Licences, Res. [191] 159
- Local Rating, Motion for a Committee, [192] 1492
- Metropolis Gas, 2R. [191] 798
- Mines, Accidents in, [192] 1505
- Supply—Mission House, Teheran, [191] 999
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1182

Gregory, Mr. W. H., *Galway Co.*
- British Museum, [191] 388, 405
- Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. [191] 1041
- Courts of Justice, New, Motion for a Committee, [193] 329
- Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 1236
- Ecclesiastical Titles, Leave, [190] 993
- Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1230
- India—Furloughs, [191] 1576
- Ireland—Questions, &c.
  - Cattle Plague, [191] 1784
  - Deaths from Small Pox, [191] 1784
  - Leasehold Property, [190] 1452
  - Railways, [192] 1752
  - Royal Irish Academy, [190] 1452; [193] 1200
  - Wilson, Rev. Mr., Explanation, [191] 264
- * Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1703
- Juries "De Medietate Linguæ," [190] 1449
- Metropolis—Park Lane, [193] 1283
- Peel Statue, The, Res. [192] 2149
- Public Departments, Concentration of, [193] 1105
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1577; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1588, 1591; *add. cl.* 1775, 1796; Motion for Adjournment, 1902
- Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts. Amendt. [192] 1866, 1869
- Supply—Science and Art, [192] 1164; Amendt. 1171

Grenfell, Mr. H. R., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
- Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 553
- Eyre, Ex-Governor, [192] 1850

Greville-Nugent, Colonel F. S., *Longford Co.*
- Ecclesiastical Titles, Leave, [190] 992
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 881
- Established Church (Ireland), Leave, [192] 321; Comm. Amendt. 1187, 1193; *add. cl.* 1211
- Ireland — Military Stores and Barracks, [193] 312
- Parliament—Members' Seats in this House, [191] 697

[*cont.*

Greville-Nugent, Colonel F. S.—*cont.*

Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1422
Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1489; *cl.* 34, 1503
Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1957; Comm. [192] 1580; *cl.* 18, 1595; *cl.* 10, 1767
Supply—Foreign Office, New, Motion for Adjournment, [192] 313

Grey, Earl

Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1387
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [191] 1220
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1132
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 819
Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland, Motion for a Committee, [191] 251
Established Church (Ireland), 1R. [192] 1741; 2R. Amendt. 2048, 2056, 2117
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 1060
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 686, 687
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1687, 1688
Plate, River, Hostilities in the, [191] 456
Poor Relief, Comm. [191] 464; *cl.* 22, Amendt. [192] 948; *cl.* 9, 1625
Reform Act, 1867—Ratepaying Clauses, [190] 1586
Regulation of Railways, 2R. [190] 1964; Comm. *cl.* 15, [192] 9; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 11; *cl.* 19, 13; Report, *cl.* 14, Amendt. 414, 415; *add. cl.* 419
Sea Fisheries, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 239
South Coast Railways, 2R. [192] 1460; 3R. [193] 361
Victoria—Appropriation Act, [191] 1995

Grey, Right Hon. Sir G., *Morpeth*

Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2052
Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 429
Boundary, Comm. [192] 262, 283, 284
East Worcestershire Election, [192] 1122, 1123
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 679, 682; *cl.* 5, 2187
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1913, 1934; Amendt. [192] 1196
Ireland — Roman Catholic University, [192] 714, 715
Metropolitan Police Funds, 2R. [193] 351
Police, Metropolitan, Surgeon-in-Chief of, [193] 311
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1593
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 973, 982
Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, [192] 1482

Griffith, Mr. C. Darby, *Devizes*

Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 426, 988
  Bounty to Volunteers, [190] 677
  Layard, Mr., Mr. Rassam, &c. [190] 550, 679
  Return of the Army, [192] 1813
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [190] 93
Andover, Late Member for, [190] 535

[*cont.*

Griffith, Mr. C. Darby—*cont.*

Army—Military Prisons, [191] 38
  Shoeburyness, Experiments at, [193] 1426
Army—Horse Guards, The, Motion for Papers, [193] 920
Boundary, Comm. [192] 282, 286
Boundary Commission, [191] 146;—Assistant Commissioners, [192] 1335
Bristol Writ, [193] 677
Burials (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1382
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Leave, [190] 995; Comm. *cl.* 3, [191] 1055, 1057; *cl.* 4, 1059, 1061; *cl.* 6, 1062
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 1429, 1430
Corrupt Practices at Elections, [193] 520
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1557
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 1268
Diplomatic Service, Res. [192] 938
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 726; Comm. *cl.* 5, [193] 737; *cl.* 10, 759; *cl.* 17, 1019, 1020, 1169; *cl.* 46, 1370, 1371; *add. cl.* 1380, 1387, 1442, 1447
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 3, [191] 1900, 1926, 1937
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1187
France—Arrests of Englishmen, [190] 150
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 809
Income Tax, 2R. [190] 476; Comm. *cl.* 3, 521
Ireland—Cardinal Cullen, [192] 16, 17
  Party Processions, [190] 1592
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 99
Member for Thetford—Titles of Dignity, [191] 831
Metropolis—Burlington House, [192] 1184
  Hackney Carriages Lamps Regulation, [190] 510
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 154
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1729, 1818
Mutiny, [190] 1815, 1826; 2R. [191] 238; Comm. *cl.* 32, Amendt. 325
Napier's, Lord, Pension, [193] 1942
Navy Estimates—Salaries of Officers, [193] 538
Parliament—Business of the House, [192] 1761
  Debates in the House of Lords, [191] 1786
  Public Business, [193] 1421
Parliament—Forms of the House, [192] 719; Res. 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080
Parliamentary Boroughs — Payment of Rates, [190] 443
Privilege—Production of Public Documents, [190] 666
Public Schools, 2R. [190] 769; Re-comm. [192] 1648; *cl.* 3, 1654; *cl.* 5, 1925; *cl.* 16, 1940; *cl.* 20, [193] 814; *add. cl.* 819
Ratepaying Clauses, [190] 1893
Regulation of Railways, Consid. [193] 1789
Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. [190] 1260; Comm. [192] 458; *add. cl.* 1246
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2018
Servia—National Assembly of, [192] 2135
Spain—"Queen Victoria," The, [190] 641, 1002
Suez—Quarantine at, [192] 1334
Supply—Prosecutions, [192] 501
  Salaries of Governors of Colonies, [193] 675
  Volunteer Corps, [191] 269, 284

[*cont.*

GRIFFITH, Mr. C. Darby—*cont.*
Totnes, &c. Writs, 3R. [190] 546
Ways and Means—Abyssinian Expedition, The, Res. [190] 357
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1189
Ways and Means—Comm. Res. 2, Amendt. [191] 1773
Ways and Means—Income Tax, Res. [190] 449

GROSVENOR, Hon. Capt. R. W., *Westminster*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1350

GROVE, Mr. T. F., *Wiltshire, S.*
Metropolitan Police, [192] 1854

GUINNESS, Sir A., *Dublin City*
Representation of the People (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [192] 1901

GURNEY, Rt. Hon. Russell, *Southampton*
Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 430
Boundary, Comm. [192] 271, 285; *cl.* 4, 1417, 1440; *add. cl.* 1441; Schedule, 1443
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 3, [191] 1057
Cattle—Importation of Foreign, [192] 18
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 708; Comm. *cl.* 8, [193] 747; *cl.* 10, 751; *cl.* 17, 1018; *cl.* 45, 1184; *cl.* 46, 1370; *cl.* 47, 1372; *add. cl.* 1386
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1341
West Indies, Lords Amendts. Amendt. [193] 1886

Habeas Corpus Suspension Acts, &c. (Ireland)
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Return of the number of times the Habeas Corpus Act has been suspended in Ireland since the passing of the Act of Union; the number of Arms Acts, Whiteboy and other Acts of repression in Ireland passed since the said Act of Union; the number of Persons sentenced to death, transportation, and imprisonment in each year for political offences; and a Statement of the Acts under which each person has been so sentenced" (*Mr. Rearden*) *Mar* 19, [190] 1939; after short debate, Question put, and negatived

Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance Bill
(*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Attorney General*)
190] *c.* Motion for Leave (*The Earl of Mayo*) *Feb* 14, 775
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° [Bill 28]
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 17, 802; after short debate, Bill read 2°
. Committee; Report *Feb* 18, 932
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. G. Hardy*) *Feb* 19, 982; after short debate, Bill read 3°
[*cont.*

Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Malmesbury*) *Feb* 20
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Feb* 24, 1053; after debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 18)
Committee *; Report *Feb* 25
Read 3ª * *Feb* 27
Royal Assent *Feb* 28 [31 *Vict.* c. 7]

HADFIELD, Mr. G., *Sheffield*
Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1081
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Leave, [190] 996
Charitable Institutions, Taxation of, [191] 1693
Church Rates, [190] 506
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1386
Ireland—Regium Donum, [192] 345
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1296, 1309, 1331
Middlesex Registry Office, [191] 1147
Oaths, Report of Commissioners on, [190] 333
Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1495; *cl.* 32, 1500
Religious, &c. Building (Sites), 2R. [191] 662
Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [190] 1234, 1264
Scotland—Bridge of Dunkeld, Tolls on the, [190] 886
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, Amendt. [192] 2166, 2168

HALIFAX, Viscount
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 504
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. [193] 606
Cotton Statistics, 2R. Amendt. [192] 710
Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1451, 1453
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [191] 691, 695
Public Offices, The New, [191] 104
Railways Regulation — The Parcels Clause, [191] 1425

HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord C. (Vice Chamberlain of the Household), *Tyrone Co.*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1614
Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 215
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [190] 931; Comm. [191] 219
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1620
Regulation of Railways, Consid. [193] 1789
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2017
Sunday Trading, 2R. [191] 1086

HAMILTON, Viscount, *Donegal Co.*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 886
Metropolis—Park Lane Improvements, [192] 244
Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [193] 1509

Hamilton, Lord C. J., *Londonderry City*
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 767; [192] 1184
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1595

Hamilton, Mr. E. W. T., *Salisbury*
- Compound Householder, The, [190] 795, 796, 797

Hankey, Mr. T., *Peterborough*
- Army—Cooking Apparatus, [191] 257, 468
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 1427
- Consolidated Account, Charges on the, [190] 1221
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1387, 1450
- Financial Statement, The, [190] 1892
- Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1888; *cl.* 2, [193] 859, 862
- Ireland—Royal Residence in, Motion for an Address, [192] 357
- Metropolis—New Palace Yard, [190] 1150
  - Ornamental Water in the Regent's Park, [193] 307
  - Thames Embankment, [190] 1686
- Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 1607
- Public Accounts, Res. [192] 122
- Registration — Small Tenements Act, [192] 1228
- Supply—Houses of Parliament, [192] 311
- Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 232
- Water Supply Commission, [190] 1685
- Ways and Means, Comm. Res. 2, [191] 1774
- Ways and Means—Abyssinian Expedition, The, Res. [190] 355

Hanmer, Sir J., *Flint, &c.*
- Parliament— Private Bill Legislation, [191] 353, 356

Hardcastle, Mr. J. A., *Bury St. Edmunds*
- Boundary, Comm. Schedule, Amendt. [192] 1443
- Church Rates Regulation, 2R. Amendt. [190] 1407, 1408
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 973; Re-comm. *cl.* C. Amendt. 2054
- Court of Chancery and County Courts, [193] 1711
- Italy—Consular Chaplain at Naples, [193] 1947
- River Thames — Obstructions in the, [191] 1577
- Saxony—Diplomatic Relations with, [190] 519
- Supply—University of Glasgow, [192] 402
- Turnpike Trusts, Motion for an Address, [191] 2021

Hardinge, Viscount
- Army—Organization of the Reserved Forces, [193] 1354
  - Volunteer Review at Windsor, [193] 997
- Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 685
- Metropolis—National Gallery, New, [192] 93
  - Statues in Westminster Hall, [193] 978

Hardwicke, Earl of
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 24
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1140
- Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1449
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 1059

Hardy, Right Hon. Gathorne (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Oxford University*
- Agricultural Labour, [192] 1397
- Agriculture, Motion for a Committee, [192] 589
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 673; *cl.* 8, 675
- Austin, James, Case of, [193] 1673
- Barrett, The Convict, [191] 1579; [192] 834
- Bell, James, Case of, [193] 1713
- Boroughs and Divisions of Counties, Leave, [191] 196
- Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 428, 429; Amendt. 430, 431, 433, 434
- Boundary, [191] 706; 2R. 1014, 1786; Comm. [192] 262, 280, 283, 284; Preamble, 1274
- Boundary Commission, [190] 733, 1218; Report, 1397;—Assistant Commissioners, [192] 1336
- Burial Societies, Frauds upon, [192] 921
- Cab Fares, [190] 1398
- Capital Punishment within Prisons, [190] 176; Leave, 995; 2R. 1127; Comm. *cl.* 3, [191] 1057; *cl.* 4, 1059, 1060; *cl.* 6, 1062
- Castle, Mr., Case of, [193] 1826
- Church Rates, [190] 544
- Circuits of the County of York, [193] 1823, 1942
- Coal Fields of Great Britain, [190] 332
- Coal Mines, Regulation of, [190] 941
- Coldbath Fields Prison, Deaths in, [193] 1946
- Colliery Prosecution, [192] 1558
- Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1919
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 977
- County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1548, 1558, 1559, 1694
- Customs, Appointments in the, [193] 1286
- Devizes Gaol, [191] 1455
- Dogs, Stray, [193] 314
- Dunstable Road, [192] 1396
- Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, [190] 1983; 2R. [191] 327; Comm. 1194, 1200
- Ecclesiastical Titles, Leave, [190] 993; 2R. [192] 1696
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2173; *cl.* 46, [193] 1370; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1382, 1449; Consid. 1618, 1638, 1650; *add. cl.* 1681; 3R. 1730
- Elementary Education, Leave, [190] 1826
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [191] 556, 575, 850, 1398; Res. 2, 1894
- Established Church (Ireland), *2R. Amendt. [192] 729, 748, 749; Comm. 1194
- Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 122
- Fenianism — Attack on Clerkenwell Prison, [190] 1215
- Fire Protection, [190] 1637
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 939; 3R. 982

[*cont.*

Hardy, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
High Sheriff for the East Riding of Yorkshire, [193] 515, 609
Immoral Publications and Plays, [191] 835; [192] 512, 1559
Imprisonment for Costs on a Dismissed Charge, [193] 1553
Infectious Diseases, [192] 425
Ireland—Royal Irish Institute, [193] 1214
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1532, 1537, 1540
Judicial Business in the House of Lords, [192] 953
Knights of Windsor, Motion for an Address, [192] 1976; [193] 516
Lectures on Religion, [192] 346
Leominster Magistrates, [193] 304
Maguire, Convict, Case of, [190] 107
Main Drainage—Inhabitants of Barking, [192] 954, 1853
Marriage Law Commission, [190] 510; [192] 1758
Measor, C. P., Case of, [193] 1714
Medico-Legal Inquiries, [193] 609
Metropolis—Baby Farming in the, [190] 1449
  Deptford Creek Outfalls, [191] 357
  Hackney Carriages Lamps Regulation, [190] 510
Metropolitan Improvements, [193] 1942
Metropolitan Police Funds, 2R. [193] 343
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [190] 107, 112; 2R. 170; Comm. *cl.* 1, 407, 409, 412, 414; *add. cl.* 416; Lords Amendts. 657, 663, 664
Middlesex Registry Office, [191] 1147
Mines, Accidents in, [192] 1503
Mines Assessment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 849; Consid. 1223
Ministerial Statement, [192] 646
Murder Law Amendment, [190] 989
Navy Estimates—Medicines, &c. [193] 1155
Newspaper Offices, Hours of Labour in, [190] 652
Oaths, Report of Commissioners on, [190] 333, 800
"Oliver Twist," Play of, [191] 835
Oxford and Cambridge Universities, Leave, [190] 927; 2R. [193] 455, 457
Parliament — Adjournment, Motion for, [193] 1737, 1741, 1742
  Dissolution of, [192] 1075
Patents of Queen's Counsel and of Precedence, [193] 307
Peerage (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1564
Police, Metropolitan, [190] 1005; [192] 926, 954, 1222, 1854
Pollution of Rivers, [190] 1072
Poor Law—Bethnal Green Workhouse, [190] 1454
  Vagrancy, [190] 1450
Poor Rate Assessment, [193] 999
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1422; *cl.* 4, 1606; *cl.* 10, 1876
Portland Convict Prison, [190] 179
Prison Ministers Act, Res. [193] 377
Promissory Oaths, Comm. [193] 855; *cl.* 2, 856; *cl.* 8, 858
Registration, Leave, [192] 1398; 2R. 1617; Comm. [193] 562; *add. cl.* 567, 569, 570, 571; 3R. 721
Registration Lists, [192] 1477
Registration of Voters, 1868, [192] 1223
[*cont.*

Hardy, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
Remission of Sentences, Motion for an Address, [190] 564
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 884; Amendt. 885, 890, 891, 892; *cl.* 9, 980, 981; *cl.* 10, 982; *cl.* O, 1242; Lords Amendts. [193] 1067
Riots at Ashton, Staleybridge, &c. [192] 822, 1042, 1092
Ritual Commission, Recommendations of the, [190] 164
Ritual Question, The, [192] 112
Roman Catholic Prisoners, [190] 548, 550
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1857, 1869
Salmon Fisheries in the Solway, [190] 427
Schools Inquiry Commission, [193] 1367
Scotland—Public Roads, [190] 181
Sewage Obstructions in the River, [190] 1220; —Disintegration of, [193] 308
Spirit, Wine, and Beer Licences, [190] 331
Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, [191] 702; [192] 1480, 1483
Sunday Trading, 2R. [191] 1086
Supply — Convict Establishments (Colonies), [192] 505
  Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, [193] 669
  Government Prisons, [192] 1107
  Home Office, [193] 1202
  Law Charges, [192] 495
  Metropolitan Police, [192] 503, 504
  Police Courts, [192] 503
Surrey Constabulary, Dismissal of an Inspector of the, [191] 571
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [193] 971
Turnpike Trusts, [191] 834, 1462; Motion for an Address, 2018
Turnpike Trusts, [192] 956; 2R. 1727, 1729
Water Supply Commission, [190] 1685
Weights and Measures, False, Commission on, [191] 467
Workshop Regulation Act, [193] 517

Hardy, Mr. J., *Dartmouth*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1919
Ministerial Statement, [192] 637
Peel Statue, The, Res. [192] 2149
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 874; *cl.* 9, 971

Harrowby, Earl of
Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 594
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1844
Education, 1R. [191] 137; 2R. 1313
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 2R. [193] 1811
Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1453
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 95
Friendly Societies, 2R. [191] 1780
Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 587
Parliament—Business of the House, Report, [191] 570
Poor Relief, 3R. *add. cl.* [192] 1910, 1913
Public Schools, Report, [193] 1706
Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 338

Hartington, Right Hon. Marquess of, *Lancashire, N.*
- Army—Military Expenditure, Increase of, [193] 948
  - Miscellaneous Services, [193] 966
  - Reserve Forces, [191] 1787
  - War Department, [192] 1182
- Army—Controller-in-Chief, Res. [193] 929, 930
- Army—Warlike Stores, Res. [193] 778
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 61
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1504, 1514
- Mutiny, Consid. [191] 558
- Supply—Enrolled Pensioners, &c. [191] 284, 285
- Ways and Means, Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1765

Harvey, Mr. R. J. H., *Thetford*
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 866

Hay, Lord J., *Ripon*
- Abyssinia—Water Supply, [190] 540
- Turkey—Epirus and Thessaly, [190] 512
- United States—Iron-clads, [192] 655

Hay, Lord W. M., *Taunton*
- Bank of Bombay, [191] 1223
- Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. [192] 1870, 1891; Amendt. 1892; *cl.* 2, Amendt. [193] 858, 859
- India—Kupurthulla, Raja of, [193] 1104
  - Systems of Government in, [191] 405
- India—Metcalfe, Sir T. J., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1273
- India—Telegraphic Communication with the East, Motion for Papers, [193] 155

Hay, Rear Admiral Sir J. C. D. (Lord of the Admiralty), *Stamford*
- Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2028, 2033, 2035
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1423; Res. 1, 1623
- Navy—"Achilles" and "Minotaur," [193] 1477
  - Captains on the Reserved List, [193] 521
- Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [193] 540, 543
  - Miscellaneous Services, [193] 1156
  - Salaries of Officers, [193] 537
  - Wages, [192] 76, 85, 86, 90
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 11, [192] 1005

Hayter, Mr. A. D., *Wells*
- Army—Ammunition, Storing of, [193] 1106
  - Ball Cartridges, [191] 2002
- Army—Warlike Stores, Res. [193] 771
- Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1963
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1683
- Judicial Patronage, [192] 343, 345
- Navy—Training Ship "Chichester," [190] 542
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [192] 1767
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 862; *add. cl.* 1245

Headlam, Right Hon. T. E., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
- Boundary, 2R. [191] 1014
- Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1749
- Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Court, 2R. [191] 1874
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 689; Consid. [193] 1617; *add. cl.* 1681, 1685, 1687
- Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1358
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [193] 153, 638; Preamble, 1515; *cl.* 3, 1761
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [191] 323
- Navy—Coal for the, [191] 1575
- Parliament — House of Commons' Arrangements, [190] 509; Motion for a Committee, 983, 984; [193] 1000
- Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), 2R. [191] 663
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 493
- Spain—"Mermaid," Destruction of the, [190] 328
- Supply—Royal Palaces, [191] 1013

Heathcote, Sir W., *Oxford University*
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1598
- Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. [192] 228

Henderson, Mr. J., *Durham City*
- Coal Fields of Great Britain, [190] 332
- Durham County Courts, [192] 816
- Mines Assessment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 849

Henley, Lord, *Northampton*
- Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1915
- County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1547
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 14, [193] 1010
- Parliamentary Boroughs—Payment of Rates, [190] 438
- Registration Lists, [192] 1477
- Supply—Education, Public, [192] 1141
- Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 233
- Turnpike Trusts, Motion for an Address, [191] 2014
- Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1720

Henley, Right Hon. J. W., *Oxfordshire*
- Army—Shoeburyness, Experiments at, [193] 1439
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 672; *cl.* 27, 676; Consid. 1569
- Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1081; Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1382
- Compounding for Rates, [190] 1911
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 964; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1415; *cl.* 4, 1416, 1418; *cl.* 5, 1423; *cl.* 8, 1427; *add. cl.* 1430; Consid. Amendt. 1830; 3R. [191] 206
- County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1551
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 714; Comm. [191] 319; *cl.* 5, [192] 692; [193] 732; *cl.* 17, 1018; *cl.* 41, 1175; *cl.* 45, 1183; *cl.* 47, 1372; *add. cl.* 1380, 1441, 1451, 1454 Consid. 1630; *add. cl.* 1687; 3R. 1727
- Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 22, [193] 1604

[*cont.*

Henley, Right Hon. J. W.—*cont.*
- Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 2008
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 716
- Etwall and Repton Corporation, [190] 1223
- Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1231
- Libel, 2R. [191] 670; Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 616
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 153, 625, 1337, 1338; Preamble, 1517; *cl.* 2, 1535; *cl.* 3, 1543, 1762
- Parliament—Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1805
- Parliamentary Boroughs—Payment of Rates, [190] 440, 442
- Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1425; Consid. 1911
- Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 20, [193] 813; *add. cl.* 821
- Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 17, [193] 1734; Consid. 1784
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1572; *add. cl.* 1786
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1863
- Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 182
- Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1726

Henniker-Major, Hon. J. M., *Suffolk, E.*
- Lucifer Matches, Careless use of, [193] 654
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, [193] 1773

Herbert, Right Hon. Major General Percy E. (Treasurer of the Household), *Shropshire, S.*
- Army—Defective Ammunition, [192] 654
- Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 320
- Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2038
- Army—Military Education, Res. [191] 1835
- Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 555, 564
- Army—Warlike Stores, Res. [193] 780
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 84, 92
- Navy Estimates—Wages, [192] 84, 86, 88

Herbert, Mr. H. A., *Kerry Co.*
- Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 547
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1940
- Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1627

Heygate, Sir F. W., *Londonderry Co.*
- Coinage—Half-Crowns, [192] 1849
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1635
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Amendt. [191] 1345; Res. 1, 1675; Res. 2R. 1897
- Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 753; 3R. 1697
- Ireland—Bribe, Alleged, to a Fenian, [192] 1229
    - County Gaols, [190] 332
    - Party Processions Act, [192] 814, 1229
- Ireland—Royal Residence in, Motion for an Address, [192] 356
- Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, Amendt. [190] 1323

[*cont.*

Heygate, Sir F. W.—*cont.*
- Ireland—University Education, Res. [193] 1064
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1574; Consid. *add. cl.* 1903, 1907
- Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2168

Heygate, Mr. W. U., *Stamford*
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1630
- Public Schools, Re-comm. *add. cl.* [193] 823
- Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [193] 1505, 1511
- Supply—Board of Trade, [193] 1204, 1206

Hibbert, Mr. J. T., *Oldham*
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 28, Amendt. [191] 677, 678
- Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 428
- Boundary, [191] 1786; Comm. [192] 258; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1405, 1439
- Capital Punishment within Prisons, [190] 176; Leave, 996; 2R. 1139; Comm. *cl.* 3, [191] 1056; *cl.* 4, 1059, 1061
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 4, [190] 1419
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 691, 2181
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1939
- Mines Assessment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 850
- Ministerial Statement, [192] 639
- Parliament—Dissolution of, [192] 1057
- Registration, 2R. [192] 1615; Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 568
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1594
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 848
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1850, 1870; Motion for a Select Committee, 1871
- Supply—Police Courts, [192] 503
    - Prosecutions, [192] 500

Hodgkinson, Mr. G., *Newark-upon-Trent*
- Cattle Plague, [190] 105
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 4, [190] 1420
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 847

Hogg, Colonel J. M., *Bath*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 60
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 3R. [191] 2061
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1501
- Government of India, Comm. *cl.* 2, [193] 861
- Local Taxation, [190] 1028
- London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. [191] 200; *cl.* 2, 202, 204
- Metropolis — Park Lane Improvements, [192] 244; [193] 1711
- Metropolis Subways, 2R. [190] 1279
- Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [192] 1738
- Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 10, [193] 1874

HOLLAND, Mr. E., *Evesham*
Collisions at Sea, [190] 642
Rule of the Road at Sea, [191] 475; [192] 2136

Honduras—Treaty of Guarantee
Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 22, [190] 146

Hong Kong and Heligoland—Gambling in
Question, Lord Taunton; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *Dec* 3, [190] 523
Agreement—*Parl. P.* No. [3987]

HOPE, Mr. A. J. Beresford, *Cambridge University*
British Museum, [191] 396
Church Rates Regulation, 2R. [190] 1407, 1408
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 5, [190] 1423
Courts of Justice, The New, [190] 417; [192] 367; Motion for a Committee, [193] 334
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 674; *cl.* 10, [193] 759; *add. cl.* 1441, 1457; Consid. 1636, 1639; *add. cl.* 1680; 3R. 1724
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 852
India—Church Services, [192] 1475
Metropolis—Burlington House, [192] 1183
Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. [193] 432
Peel Statue, The, Res. [192] 2141
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 6, [192] 1929; *cl.* 14, 1935; *cl.* 21, [193] 817
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 467; *cl.* 7, 858; *cl.* 8, 860, 896; *cl.* 9, 964; *cl.* O, 1241
Supply—Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, [193] 671
Science and Art, [192] 1163
Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 224
* Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. Amendt. [192] 186; Comm. [193] 426

HORSFALL, Mr. T. B., *Liverpool*
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [192] 1439
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), Comm. [192] 170
Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1806
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 748, 750
Foreign Cattle, Importation of, [191] 1149; [192] 1758
Petroleum, Comm. [192] 1619
Pilotage, Compulsory, [191] 378
Railways, Royal Commission on, [192] 115
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1867
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [193] 837

HORSMAN, Right Hon. E., *Stroud*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 75
Boundary, Comm. [192] 286
Brazil—War in, [191] 359
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1393, 1398, 1400; Res. 1931
[*cont.*

HORSMAN, Right hon. E.—*cont.*
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [190] 1396, 1459, 1466, 1537, 1540, 1776
Ministerial Statement, [191] 829, 1807
Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1494
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 973; *cl.* 11, 996
Supply — Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 221, 225, 226
Post Office Packet Service, [193] 840, 844

HOTHAM, Lord, *Yorkshire, E.R.*
Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 322
Army—Royal Gun Factory, Motion for a Committee, [193] 1259
Boundary, Comm. [192] 277
Parliament—Divisions of the House, Res. [193] 385
Parliament—Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 883; Amendt. 1797, 1811;—Standing Order 131 Repeal, [191] 145
Railways, Res. [190] 1886
Salmon Fisheries in the Solway, [190] 427

HOUGHTON, Lord
Abyssinia—Envoys, The, [193] 1814
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 29, 42
Capital Punishment within Prisons, 2R. [191] 1879
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 220
Newfoundland — Grants of Land on French Coast, [192] 696, 707
Public Schools, Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1654; Report, 1705
Railway Bills — Increase of Rates, Res. [193] 1076
South Africa, Motion for a Paper, [193] 592
Union Workhouses and Infirmaries, Motion for Papers, [190] 326
University Tests, [192] 1016

Hours of Labour Regulation Act—Newspaper Offices
Question, Mr. Lanyon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Dec* 6, [190] 652

Hudson Bay Company's Territories
Question, Sir Charles Lanyon; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 11, [192] 17

Hudson's Bay Company Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 10 (No. 244)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 13, [193] 1101; Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 16
c. Read 1° * *July* 16 [Bill 240]
Read 2° * *July* 18
Committee *—R.P. *July* 21
Committee *; Report *July* 22
Considered * *July* 23
Read 3° * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 105]

HOWARD, Right Hon. Lord E. G. F., *Arundel*
Lottery Act, [192] 387
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 1609 ; *cl.* 10, 1872, 1876, 1877 ; *cl.* 12, 1880 ; *cl.* K, 1883
Prison Ministers Act, Res. [193] 375
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 450 ; *add. cl.* 1250
Riots at Ashton, &c. [192] 1086

HOWES, Mr. E., *Norfolk, E.*
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [192] 1441
Bristol Writ, [193] 677, 1744

HUBBARD, Mr. J. G., *Buckingham*
Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1082, 1083
Church Rates Regulation, 2R. [190] 1398, 1414
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 974 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1416 ; *cl.* 4, 1418 ; Amendt. 1420, 1422 ; *cl.* 7, 1426 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1427
Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 1994
Immoral Publications and Plays, [192] 1558
Local Rating, Motion for a Committee, [192] 1494
Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. [192] 230
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1179
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [192] 201

Hudson Bay Company's Territories
Question, Sir Charles Lanyon ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 11, [192] 17

Hudson's Bay Company Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *July* 10 (No. 244)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 13, [193] 1101 ; Bill read 2ª
Committee * ; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 16
c. Read 1° * *July* 16 [Bill 240]
Read 2° * *July* 18
Committee *—R.P. *July* 21
Committee * ; Report *July* 22
Considered * *July* 23
Read 3° * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 105]

HUGHES, Mr. T., *Lambeth*
Assessed Taxes, Collection of, [193] 1367
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1646
Ireland — State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1503
Metropolis—Lambeth Workhouse, Motion for Papers, [190] 2049
Metropolitan Tramways, 2R. [190] 1112
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1865
Sunday Trading, 2R. [191] 1084
Weights and Measures, [193] 1924

HUNT, Mr. G. W. (Secretary to the Treasury, *afterwards* Chancellor of the Exchequer), *Northamptonshire, N.*
Abyssinia — Presents from King Theodore, [190] 643
Charitable Institutions, Rating of, [190] 332

HUNT, Mr. G. W.—*cont.*
Courts of Justice, The New, [190] 417, 732
Electric Telegraphs, Purchase of the, [190] 801
Income Tax, 2R. [190] 477 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 521 ; *cl.* 3, 522 ; 3R. 546
Income Tax in Dudley, [190] 177
Inland Revenue, Report on, [190] 729
Ireland—Spirit Licence Duty, [190] 433
Ireland—Registry of Deeds Office, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1078
Ireland—Shannon River, Motion for a Committee, [190] 994
Post Office—Questions, &c.
American Mails, [190] 604
Churchward, Mr., [190] 1072
Communication with the United States—The Cunard Contract, [190] 334, 418, 683, 686, 987
Postage Rates to India, [190] 167
St. Thomas, Island of, [190] 509
West India Mail Packet Station, [190] 666
Post Office—Halifax, Bermuda, and St. Thomas Mails, Res. [190] 632
Post Office—India, China, and Japan Mails, Res. [190] 450, 469, 472
Probate Duty, [190] 648, 729
Public Departments (Extra Receipts), 2R. [190] 692
Valuation of Property, [190] 602
Ways and Means—The Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 339, 348
(see also CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER)

HURST, Mr. R. H., *Horsham*
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1881
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1656
Victoria—Case of the Convict Millar, [191] 1576

HUTT, Right Hon. Sir W., *Gateshead*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1382
Railway and Joint Stock Companies Accounts, Leave, [190] 1280 ; 2R. [191] 1535
Railways, Revision of, [191] 35
Rating under the Representation of the People Act, [190] 167 ;—Personal Rating, 518

HYLTON, Lord
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 12

Inclosure Bill
(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*)
c. Ordered * *Mar* 13 ; read 1° * *Mar* 20 [Bill 73]
Read 2° * *Mar* 23
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 26
Read 3° * *Mar* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *Mar* 31 (No. 61)
Read 2ª * *April* 2
Committee * ; Report *April* 3
Read 3ª * *April* 23
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 31]

Inclosure (No. 2) Bill
(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 10 [Bill 162]
Read 2° * *June* 15
Committee * ; Report *June* 16
Read 3° * *June* 17

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Inclosure (No. 2) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *June* 18
Read 2ª* *June* 29 (No. 159)
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3ª* *July* 2
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 82]

Income Tax Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)
190] *c.* Resolution in Ways and Means [November 28] reported *Nov* 29, 448 [Bill 16]
After short debate, Bill ordered; read 1º
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *Nov* 30, 476; after short debate, Bill read 2º
190] Committee; Report *Dec* 2, 521
. Bill read 3º, after short debate *Dec* 3, 455
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Derby*) *Dec* 3
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Dec* 5, 598; after short debate, Bill read 2ª; Committee negatived
. Bill read 3ª, after short debate *Dec* 6, 635
Royal Assent *Dec* 7 [31 *Vict.* c. 2]

Income Tax Commissioners
Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, [193] 1774

INDIA
Abyssinian Expedition—East India, Troops and Vessels—Resolution in Committee—See title—*East India, Troops and Vessels*
Ancient Monuments, Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 12, [192] 114
Architectural Remains in, Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Dec* 5, [190] 631

Army
Army in India and the Colonies, Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the duties performed by the British Army in India and the Colonies, and also how far it might be desirable to employ certain portions of Her Majesty's Native Indian Army in our Colonial and Military dependencies, or to organize a force of Asiatic Troops for general service in suitable climates" (*Major Anson*) *Mar* 6, [190] 1207
And, on *Mar* 19, Committee nominated as follows:—Viscount Cranborne (Chairman), Major Anson, Mr. Childers, Sir James Fergusson, Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Hayter, Lord William Hay, Colonel Percy Herbert, Mr. Laing, Colonel North, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Sir William Russell, Sir Harry Verney, Captain Vivian, and Major Walker
Report of Select Committee *April* 3 (*Parl. P.* No. 197)
Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, Question, Mr. Neville-Grenville; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 21, [190] 1008
Bonus Committee, The—Officers of the Late Company's Army, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 26, [191] 261
Church Services for Soldiers in, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 26, [191] 262; Questions, Mr. Kinnaird, [*cont.*

INDIA—Army—*cont.*
Mr. Beresford Hope; Answers, Sir Stafford Northcote *June* 12, [192] 1474; Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *June* 18, 1757; *June* 29, [193] 306
Field Officers of the Indian Army, Retirement of, Question, Mr. Dimsdale; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 3, [191] 830
Furlough Regulations, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 30, [191] 1576; Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 21, [193] 1554
India, Invalid Officers from, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 14, [193] 1165
India, Malt Liquors for the Troops in, Questions, Mr. M. T. Bass, Mr. Greene; Answers, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 11, [192] 15
Indian Colonels, Promotion of, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 19, [190] 1887
Indian Service Medals, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 27, [193] 1822
Mutiny Medal, The, Question, Mr. Adam; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *June* 29, [193] 305
Troops, Transport of, Question, Sir George Stucley; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 4, [193] 1111

Bombay, Bank of, Question, Mr. Dyce Nicol;
190] Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 20, 987;
. *Mar* 16, 1681; Question, Sir Henry Rawlinson; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 24,
191] 147; Question, Mr. Dyce Nicol; Answer, Sir
. Stafford Northcote *Mar* 27, 426; debate thereon; Questions, Lord William Hay; An-
. swers, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 24, 1223; Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Sir Stafford
. Northcote *May* 8, 2055—*Bengal Agency*, Questions, Mr. Smollett, Mr. Dyce Nicol; Answers, Sir Stafford Northcote *June* 12, [192] 1471
Correspondence—(*Parl. P.* No. 133)
Bombay—Civilian Judges, Question, Sir Robert Collier; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 28, [191] 1460
Bombay—Educational Service, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 18, [192] 426
Bombay—Governor of, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Dec* 6, [190] 652
Bombay—Municipal Commissioners, Report of the, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *June* 18, [192] 1754
Contract Law—Reports of Indian Law Commissioners, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 24, [191] 147 (*Parl. P.* No. 239)
Currency Laws, Commission on, Question, Mr. White; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 5, [190] 1112
Fort William, Cholera at, Question, Mr. Neate; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 22, [192] 714
Girls, Sale of, Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 23, [193] 1666
[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

Hyderabad—Political Section—Administrative Report, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 23, [191] 1148

India, Survey of, Question, Mr. Akroyd; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 13, [193] 1103

Indian Budget, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 16, [190] 1680; Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 20, 1982; Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 23, [193] 1670
(See *East India Revenue Accounts*)

Indian Council, Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Dec* 6, [190] 642

Indian Navy, Officers of the late, Question, Mr. Surtees; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 20, [190] 1980

Irrigation Works in India

190] *East India Irrigation and Canal Company*, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Dec* 6, 646; Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 17, 798; Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 18, 890; Questions, Mr. Smollett, Mr. Otway, Colonel Sykes; Answers, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 20, 989; Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 18, [192] 425—(*Parl. P.* No. 415)

Irrigation, Postponement of Motion (*Mr. Kinnaird*) *Mar* 31, [191] 575

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 2, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy of any further Despatches, Telegrams, and Letters between the Secretary of State in Council and the Government of India respecting the proposed purchase of the works of the East India Irrigation Company, or the advance of funds for the works thereof since July 16, 1867" (*Mr. Bouverie*), [193] 529; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Irrigation of Public Lands, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 20, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the advance of £600,000 of public money on loan to a private company of adventurers styling themselves the Madras Irrigation Company, granted on the 15th day of May 1866 for their sole benefit, and likewise the offer of a large loan on similar terms announced by the Secretary of State on the 20th day of February last as contemplated to be given to the East India Irrigation and Canal Company, are acts of impropriety, are mischievous in policy, and should be discontinued (*Mr. Smollett*), [191] 946; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Madras Irrigation Company, Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 24, [190] 1073; Observations, Mr. Stansfeld *April* 24, [191] 1298
Irrigation—Despatch—(*Parl. P.* No. 103)

[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

Kupurthulla, Raja of, Question, Lord William Hay; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 13, [193] 1104

Lawrence's, Sir John, Circular, Question, The Duke of Argyll; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *Feb* 20, [190] 985—*British Rule in*, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 14, [190] 731—*Government of*, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 3, [193] 610—*Government, Systems of*, Observations, Lord William Hay, Mr. Smollett, Mr. Fawcett *Mar* 27, [191] 405—(*Parl. P.* No. 108)

Post Office

Penang, Postal Communication with, Question, Mr. T. Baring; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 4, [192] 1109—(*Parl. P.* No. 414)—*with the East—The Brindisi Route*, Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 15, 1561

Sindh Railway, Question, Viscount Cranborne; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 20, [190] 1981
(See title—*Post Office*)

Telegraphic Communication with India

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 26, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Correspondence which may have passed between the Secretary of State for India and the local authorities relative to the proposed Deep Sea Telegraphic Line from Bombay to Kurrachee, and the sanctioned lines from Gwadur to Jask, and from Jask to Bushire" (*Lord William Hay*), [193] 155; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Direct Telegraphic Communication, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 21, [190] 1008; Question, Mr. Dyce Nicol; Answer, Mr. Corry *April* 28, [191] 1458

Indo-European Telegraph Lines, Question, Mr. Finlay; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Dec* 2, [190] 520

Suez and India Submarine Telegraph, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Dec* 2, [190] 509
(*Parl. P.* No. 61)

Parl. Papers—

Persian Telegraph	343
Papers respecting	Nos. 269, 334
Letter of Baron Baude . . .	[3971]

(See Titles—*East India Civil Service, Resolution—East India, Troops and Vessels*)

Indian Railway Companies Bill

(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 9 [Bill 55]
Read 2° * *Mar* 23
Committee *; Report *Mar* 24
Read 3° * *Mar* 26

[*cont.*

Indian Railway Companies Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *Mar* 27 (No. 57)
Read 2ª * *Mar* 30
Committee * *Mar* 31 (No. 63)
Report * *April* 2
Read 3ª * *April* 3
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 26]

Indorsing of Warrants Bill
(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 1 [Bill 208]
Read 2° * *July* 3
Committee * ; Report *July* 6
Read 3° * *July* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 10 (No. 240)
Read 2ª * *July* 14
Committee * ; Report *July* 16
Read 3ª * *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 107]

Industrial Schools Act (1866) Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *June* 15 (No. 151)
Bill withdrawn * *July* 6

Industrial Schools (Ireland) Bill
(*The O'Conor Don, Mr. Monsell, Mr. Leader*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Nov* 25 [Bill 6]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 18, [190] 930 ; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*The O'Conor Don*) *Mar* 25, [191] 217
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Vance*) ; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c. ;" A. 82, N. 46 ; M. 36 ; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to ; Committee—R.P.
Committee * ; Report *April* 1
Considered * *April* 2
Read 3° * *April* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *April* 23
Read 2ª * *May* 7 (No. 69)
Committee * ; Report *May* 12
Read 3ª * *May* 14
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 25]

Industrial Schools (*Ireland*) [*Expenses*]
c. Considered in Committee ; Resolution *Mar* 27
Report *Mar* 30

Infectious Diseases
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to cause such inquiry to be instituted into the spread of disease by infection (distinguished from contagion) as may tend to check legislation and action in cases unsupported by the evidence, which in times of excitement saves a people from the commission of great crimes or great follies" (*Sir Jervoise Clarke Jervoise*), [191] 2005 ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
(See title—*Contagious Diseases,* 1866, *Act*)

INGESTRE, Viscount, *Stamford*
Established Church (Ireland), Leave, [192] 320

Inland Revenue Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Bill ordered * *June* 30
Read 1° * *July* 1 [Bill 207]
Read 2° * *July* 9
Committee *—R.P. *July* 13
Committee * ; Report *July* 20
Considered * *July* 21
Read 3° * *July* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 23
Read 2ª * *July* 24 (No. 279)
Committee * ; Report *July* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 29
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 124]

Inland Revenue Commissioners, Report of
Question, Mr. Crawford ; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 14, [190] 729

INNES, Mr. A. C., *Newry*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1611

Investment of Trust Funds Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Bill ordered * *Mar* 24
Read 1° * *May* 13 [Bill 116]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 29

Investment of Trust Funds Supplemental Bill (*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 10 [Bill 164]
Read 2° * *July* 3
Committee negatived * ; Bill put off *July* 15

IRELAND
Arbour Hill Garrison Chapel, Question, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart ; Answer, Sir J. Pakington *May* 21, [192] 651
Ardfert Tower—Kerry Grand Jury, Question, The O'Donoghue ; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 25, [191] 208

Army
Distribution of Troops in the North, Question, Sir Hervey Bruce ; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 16, [193] 1287
Military Stores and Barracks, Erection of, Question, Colonel Greville-Nugent ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 29, [193] 312
Mullingar, Barracks at, Question, Mr. Maguire ; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 16, [193] 1290

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Bankruptcy (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Serjeant Armstrong; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 3, [191] 830

Cardinal Cullen, Questions, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answers, Mr. Disraeli, The Earl of Mayo *May* 11, [192] 16

Cattle Plague, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *May* 5, [191] 1784

Compulsory Presentments, Question, Colonel French; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 7, [193] 827

Cork Harbour—Daunt's Rock, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Feb* 17, [190] 794

Curragh, Ranger of the, Question, Captain Pack-Beresford; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *June* 18, [192] 1754
Report of Commission—(*Parl. P.* No. 329)

Customs Department, Board of Trade—Legal Department, Question, Mr. G. Morris; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 18, [192] 426

Customs Officers, Dublin, Question, Mr. Stock; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 14, [192] 247

Education

Banagher, Royal School of, Question, Mr. G. Morris; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *June* 26, [193] 102

National Board, Observations, Sir John Gray; Reply, The Earl of Mayo *July* 16, [193] 1276

Primary Education, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 9, [193] 913

Roman Catholic University, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Nov* 22,
190] 142; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer,
The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 12, 1456; Question,
Mr. Lowe; Answer, The Earl of Mayo
Mar 19, 1891; Question, Sir Colman
O'Loghlen; Answer, The Earl of Mayo
192] *May* 12, 112; Question, Sir George
Grey; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *May* 22,
714; Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, The
Earl of Mayo *May* 28, 955; Question, Sir
John Gray; Answer, The Earl of Mayo
June 12, 1472; *June* 29, [193] 313
Correspondence—(*Parl. P.* Nos. 288, 380)

University Education in Ireland, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 10, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, Catholics, Presbyterians, and other inhabitants of Ireland, will not be placed in a position of equality, in reference to University education in that country, with those who are members of the Established Church, until all religious disabilities are removed from the fellowships, scholarships, and other honours and emoluments of Trinity College, Dublin" (*Mr. Fawcett*), [193] 1054; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

University Education, Trinity College, Dublin, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 29, [192] 1041

Established Church (*Ireland*)

Irish Church Commissioners' Report, Question, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Answer, Earl Stanhope *Mar* 17, 1795; Question, Lord Dufferin; Answer, Earl Stanhope *July* 10, [193] 972; Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Mr. Clive *Mar* 12, [190] 1457; Questions, Sir John Gray, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; Answers, Mr. Clive *June* 29, 323
Parl. Papers—
Copy of Commission . . . . [3956]
Report of Commissioners . . . [4082]

Irish Church Revenues, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Dec* 6, [190] 645

Presbytery of Antrim, Questions, Sir Charles Lanyon, Sir Thomas Bateson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *April* 30, [191] 1581
(See title—*Established Church, Ireland*)

Grand Jury Accounts, Auditor of, Question, Colonel French; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *June* 12, [191] 1469

Grand Jury Presentments (*Ireland*)—See that title

Law and Police

Convicts, Religion of, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *May* 18, [192] 423

County Gaols, Question, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Nov* 28, [190] 332

Dietary of County Prisons, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Feb* 28, [190] 1102

Downy, Mr. J., Arrest of, Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *April* 3, [191] 833

Featherstonhaugh, Mr., Murder of, Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *April* 28, [191] 1459

Fenian, Alleged Bribe to a, Question, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *June* 8, [192] 1229

Fenian Prisoners, Warren and Costello, Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 16, [193] 1282; Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. J. Stuart Mill *July* 21, 1556

Habeas Corpus Act—Release of Prisoners, Question, Mr. Bagwell; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *May* 5, [191] 1784

Habeas Corpus Suspension Acts—Returns—See that title

Johnston, Mr., Case of, Question, Colonel Forde; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 30, [191] 469

Mountjoy Convict Prison, Medical Officer of, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Feb* 28, [190] 1102; Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *June* 12, [192] 1470

O'Hanlon, Michael, Case of, Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 16, [193] 1280

Party Processions Act, Question, Sir Charles Lanyon; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 20, [190] 1977; Question, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *May* 25, [192] 814; Question, Lord Edwin Hill-Trevor; Answer, Sir Frederick Heygate *June* 8, 1228

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Pawnbroking, Law of, Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *June* 18, [192] 1758

Police Barracks, Question, Lord Otho Fitzgerald; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 5, [190] 1113

Prisoners Convicted of Seditious Libel—Treatment of Messrs. Sullivan and Pigott, Question, Mr. Stock; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 17, [190] 1814; Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 19, 1891; Question, Mr. Stock; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 26, [191] 259; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 27, 439; debate thereon

Prisons, Irish, Regulation of, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 9, [193] 912

Processions (Ireland), Address for Papers (*Lord Dufferin*) *Dec* 3, [190] 528; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Mr. Lanyon; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Dec* 7, 675; Questions, Colonel Stuart Knox, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answers, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 13, 1591

Quarter Sessions Courts, Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *Mar* 17, [190] 1794

Searching Suspicious Persons, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 30, [191] 468

Writs of Error in Criminal Cases, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "this House doth agree with the Resolution passed by this House on the 19th day of November 1689, and doth re-affirm that a Writ of Error for the reversal of a Judgment in Misdemeanor, Felony, or Treason is the right of the subject, and ought to be granted at his desire, and is not an act of Grace or Favour which may be denied or granted at Pleasure" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*), [193] 655; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Law of Landlord and Tenant

Land Question, Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *April* 28, [191] 1459

Land, Tenure of, Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *June* 22, [192] 1850; Question, Observations, Mr. O'Beirne; Reply, The Earl of Mayo *July* 17, [193] 1411

Leases, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 12, [190] 1452

Legislation, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Feb* 17, [190] 799

Local Government Acts, Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 26, [191] 256; *April* 28, 1457; *June* 29, [193] 309

Monaghan, Coroner's Inquest at, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 20, [193] 1482

Ordnance Map, Irish, Revision of the, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 12, [190] 1451

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Poor Law

Workhouse Dietaries in, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 10, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland should establish a minimum scale of dietary for the Paupers in the Union Workhouses not less than that now in existence in the Irish County Gaols, and which was recommended by the Commission appointed to report on the County Prison Dietaries, 'as necessary for the preservation of the health of the prisoners'" (*Mr. Blake*), [193] 1020; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 20, [193] 1482

Post Office—Officers' Salaries, Question, General Dunne; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 15, [192] 1562

Queen's Plates, Question, General Dunne; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 20, [193] 1485

Queenstown, Bible Depôt at, Question, Mr. Long; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *May* 21, [192] 655

Railways

Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 22, [192] 712; Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 8, [193] 847

Report of the Commissioners on, Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *April* 28, [191] 1463; Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 18, [192] 1752

Parl. Papers—

Report of Commissioners . . No. [4018]
Return of Expenses . . . . No. 405

Instructions to the Commissioners—See title *Railways*

Records, Public, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 29, [193] 304; Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 6, 717

Registry of Deeds Office—See that title

Regium Donum, The, Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 15, [192] 345

Roosky, Eel Weir at, Question, Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 23, [193] 1669

Royal Irish Academy, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 12, [190] 1452; Observations, Mr. Gregory; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 14, [193] 1200; Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 15, 1214

Royal Residence in, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 15, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, humbly representing to Her Majesty that it would conduce to the advantage of the Crown and the good Government of Ireland, and tend to allay jealousy and discontent in that country, if Her Majesty had a permanent residence in Ireland, and that this House, feeling deeply

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*
its importance, will cordially co-operate with Her Majesty in any steps She may be graciously pleased to take to carry out so desirable an object" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*), [192] 356 ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Seditious Speaking, Alleged—Rev. Mr. Ferrars, Questions, Mr. Cogan, Mr. Bentinck ; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 16, [190] 1681
Shannon River, Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the manner in which the drainage and navigation of the River Shannon has been carried out under the direction of Her Majesty's Government, and what steps should be taken to complete the work for which a compulsory levy of £300,000 has been made on the adjoining counties" (*Colonel French*) *Feb* 20, [190] 994 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *Mar* 17, Committee nominated as follows :—Colonel French (Chairman), Mr. Acland, Mr. Agar-Ellis, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Sir Edward Dering, General Dunne, Sir William Ormsby-Gore, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Laird, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. Sclater-Booth, and Colonel Vandeleur
Report of Select Committee *May* 18 (*Parl. P.* No. 277)
Fish Passes on, Question, Colonel French; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 27, [191] 357—*Stake Nets*, Question, Colonel French ; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *Mar* 30, 467
Small Debts Recovery, Question, Mr. Dawson ; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 16, [190] 1679
Small-pox, Deaths from—The Vaccination Act, Question, Mr. Gregory ; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *May* 5, [191] 1784
Spirit Licence Duty, Observations, Sir John Gray ; Reply, Mr. Hunt *Nov* 29, [190] 431 ; short debate thereon ; Question, General Dunne ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 23, [191] 38
Taxation, Inequality of, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 16, [193] 1283
Train, Mr. G. F., Case of, Question, Mr. Rearden ; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *July* 31, [193] 1943
University of Dublin, Returns, Question, Sir Henry Winston-Barron; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 29, [192] 1044
Valuation, Question, The O'Donoghue ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 25, [192] 2136

Ireland—State of
190] Moved, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into a Committee, with the view of taking into consideration the condition and circumstances of Ireland" (*Mr. Maguire*) *Mar* 10, 1288
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the constant recurrence of impracticable resolutions and the proposal or suggestion of extravagant and impossible remedies are the great obstacles to the restoration of peace in Ireland, and to the prosperity of the Irish people" (*Mr. Neate*), 1314 ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" Amendt. withdrawn
[*cont.*

Ireland—State of, Motion for Committee—cont.
190] Another Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "before the consideration by this House of constitutional changes in the laws and institutions of Ireland, it is both just and expedient to inquire into the causes of alleged discontent, and the best mode of remedying the same (*Sir Frederick Heygate*), 1323 ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" debate adjourned
. Debate resumed *Mar* 12, 1458 ; after long debate, Debate further adjourned
. Debate resumed *Mar* 13, 1593 ; after long debate, Debate further adjourned
. Debate resumed *Mar* 16, 1688 ; after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn
The Debate on—Wilson, The Rev. Mr., Personal Explanation, Mr. Gregory *Mar* 26, [191] 264

Italy
Naples, Consular Chaplain at, Question, Mr. Hardcastle ; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 31, [193] 1947
Papal Government and Mr. Odo Russell Question, Sir Thomas Lloyd ; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 25, [190] 162
Roman Question, The—The Proposed Conference, Question, Sir Henry Winston-Barron ; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 2, [190] 512 ; Question, Earl Russell ; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Dec* 5, 599

JACKSON, Mr. W., *Derbyshire, N.*
Colliery Accidents, Motion for a Commission, [192] 941, 944

Jamaica
Clergy Act of, Question, Mr. Candlish ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 27, [193] 1820
Ecclesiastical Establishment of, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 23, [192] 1922
(See title *Eyre—Ex-Governor*)

Japan, Outrage on our Ambassador
Question, Colonel Sykes ; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 26, [192] 922

JERVIS, Colonel H. J. W., *Harwich*
Army—Control Department, [193] 810, 811 ; Res. 922 ; Motion for Papers, 1265, 1270, 1273
Army Estimates—Administration of the Army, [193] 967
  Full and Half-Pay, [193] 1280
  Miscellaneous Services, [193] 966
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1961, 1965
Eyre, Ex-Governor, Prosecution of, [192] 717, 718, 836, 838
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1306, 1341, 1342
Supply—Portpatrick Railway Company Compensation, [193] 1211
  Registration Expenses, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1213

JERVOISE, Sir J. Clarke, *Hampshire, S.*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 673
Cattle Plague, [192] 1755, 1852
Cholera in the Mediterranean, [191] 703
Contagious Diseases Acts, [190] 1889
Egypt—Quarantine, [192] 1395
Infectious Diseases, Motion for an Address, [191] 2005; [192] 425
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1294, 1295; Preamble, 1529
Privy Council, Medical Officer of the, [190] 1812
Public Health, &c., Departments of, Res. [193] 1194
Small-pox Hospital, [192] 1561
Supply—Board of Trade, [193] 1203
  Miscellaneous Expenses, Amendt. [192] 1174
Turkey—Sanitary Regulations, [190] 1811
Vaccination—Small-pox at Woolwich, [191] 701

Judgment Debtors Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 9 (No. 32)
Read 2ª * *Mar* 23
Committee *; Report; Bill re-committed *April* 24 (No. 76)
Bill withdrawn *May* 11, [192] 5

Judgments Extension Bill [H.L.]
(*Mr. Craufurd, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. Moncreiff, Mr. Dunlop*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 18 [Bill 34]
Read 2° * *Mar* 5
Referred to Select Committee *May* 8
Moved, "That Mr. Craufurd be one Member of the said Committee" *May* 11, [192] 92
Motion, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Colonel French*), put, and negatived; original Question put, and agreed to
Moved, "That Mr. Huddleston be one other Member of the said Committee"
Motion, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir George Bowyer*), put, and negatived; original Question put, and agreed to
Mr. Craufurd (Chairman), The Lord Advocate, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Dunlop, Colonel French, Mr. Graves, Mr. Huddleston, Sir Charles Lanyon, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Moncreiff, and Mr. Murphy
Report * *June* 10 [Bill 163]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 15
Considered * *June* 16
Read 3° * *June* 17
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chelmsford*) *June* 18
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 30, [193] 367; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 160)
Committee *; Report *July* 2
Read 3ª * *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 54]

Judicial Patronage — Court of Common Pleas
Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 15, [192] 343

Juries "De Medietate Linguæ"
Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 12, [190] 1449

Juries, Special and Common
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire and take evidence as to the Law and practice relating to the summoning, attendance, and remuneration of Special and Common Juries, and to report to the House as to any alterations which ought to be made therein" (*Viscount Enfield*) *Feb* 18, [190] 924; Motion agreed to
And, on *Mar* 11, Committee nominated as follows:—Viscount Enfield (Chairman), Mr. Denman, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. Alderman Lusk, Mr. Hastings Russell, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Solicitor General, Colonel William Stuart, Mr. Turner, Mr. Whatman, and Mr. Charles Wynn
Report of Select Committee *July* 6
(*Parl. P.* No. 401)

Jurors' Affirmations (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Craufurd, Mr. Dunlop*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 110]
Read 2° * *May* 13
Committee *; Report *May* 15
Read 3° * *May* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Cranworth*) *May* 19
Read 2ª * *June* 18 (No. 104)
Committee *; Report *June* 19
Read 3ª * *June* 23
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 39]

KARSLAKE, Sir J. B., *see* Attorney General, The

KARSLAKE, Mr. E. K., *Colchester*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 10, [193] 750; *add. cl.* 1387
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [193] 1581; *cl.* 15, 1602
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1374
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 768
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1355
Nova Scotia—British North American Confederation, Motion for an Address, [192] 1694
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1654, 1657; *cl.* 5, 1924; *cl.* 6, 1930; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1933, 1939; *cl.* 16, 1940
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [192] 990
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 985

KENDALL, Mr. N., *Cornwall, E.*
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 5, [190] 1424
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1546
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1928
Grand Jury Cess, 2R. [191] 213
Ireland — State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1739
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Preamble, [193] 1520, 1781
Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1868; Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 850, 852

[*cont.*

Kendall, Mr. N.—*cont.*
  Ministerial Statement, [191] 1741 ; [192] 640
  Parliamentary Boroughs—Payment of Rates, [190] 443
  Registration, 2R. [192] 1614
  Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1736
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 477

Kennedy, Mr. T., *Louth Co.*
  Crete, Insurrection in, [191] 705
  Ejectments Suspension (Ireland), [193] 519
  Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1804

Kesteven, Lord
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 947

Killaloe, Bishop of
  Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 97

Kimberley, Earl of
  Alkali Act Continuance, 2R. [192] 510
  Burials (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1093, 1098 ; Comm. *add. cl.* 1362 ; Report, *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1473, 1475
  Clerks of the Peace (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1162
  Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Report, *cl.* 7, [193] 897
  Consecration of Churchyards Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 898
  Crete, Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 814
  Education, 2R. [191] 1310
  Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2114, 2116, 2117
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [191] 695
  Poor Relief, Comm. [191] 463 ; *cl.* 5, [192] 947 ; *cl.* 22, 948 ; *cl.* 9, 1625 ; 3R. *add. cl.* 1912
  Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy, 3R. [192] 1748
  Sea Fisheries (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 240 ; Re-comm. 917
  Tenure (Ireland), 1R. [190] 1048
  Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [193] 1549
  University Elections (Voting Papers), 2R. [193] 982
  University Tests, [192] 1012
  Vagrancy—Guildford Union, Motion for Correspondence, [192] 102
  West Indies, 2R. [193] 799

King, Hon. P. J. Locke, *Surrey, E.*
  Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, Amendt. [192] 428, 430
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1684
  Richmond Park, [190] 1680
  Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1871

Kinglake, Mr. A. W., *Bridgwater*
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [191] 297 ; *add. cl.* [193] 1441
  Mexico—Relations with, [193] 1825

Kingscote, Colonel R. N. F., *Gloucestershire, W.*
  Army—Militia Quartermasters, [192] 1756

Kingston, Earl of
  Victoria—Appropriation Act, [191] 2001

Kinnaird, Hon. A. F., *Perth*
  Army—Preaching in the, [193] 1923
  Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Consid. [191] 1567
  Austin, James, Case of, [193] 1673
  Diplomatic Service, Res. [192] 939
  Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. [192] 1885
  Income Tax, 3R. [190] 545
  India—Questions, &c.
    Bank of Bombay, [191] 430, 2060
    British Rule in, [190] 731
    Church Services, [192] 1474
    Contract Law, [191] 147
    East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [193] 1865
    Indian Service Medals, [193] 1822
    Madras Irrigation Company, [191] 1302
  India—Irrigation Works, [190] 890 ; [191] 575; Res. 967
  Lake Superior and the Pacific, &c. Motion for a Commission, [192] 1341
  Mines, Accidents in, [192] 1504
  Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Lords Amendts. [190] 660
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1423 ; *cl.* 4, 1605 ; *cl.* K, 1883
  Postal—West India Mail Packet Station, [190] 665, 731
  Prison Ministers Act, Res. [193] 382
  Probate Duty, [190] 648, 729
  Public Schools, Re-comm. [192] 1648
  Registration of Writs (Scotland), 2R. [191] 100
  Representation of the People (Scotland), [190] 1103 ; 2R. 1263 ; Comm. [191] 99 ; *cl.* 3, [192] 484 ; *add. cl.* 1244 ; Schedule A, 1252
  Scotland—Bridge at Dunkeld, [193] 1671
  Supply—Law Charges, Motion for Adjournment, [192] 494, 495

Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. E. H., *Sandwich*
  Capital Punishment within Prisons, 2R. [190] 1134
  County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), Comm. [192] 161 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 171
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 702, 728 ; Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 688 ; Amendt. 691, 692 ; [193] 732 ; *cl.* 10, 749 ; *cl.* 14, 1002 ; Consid. 1615, 1620
  Libel, Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 612
  Mines Assessment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 850 ; Consid. 1222
  Navy Estimates—Dockyards and Naval Yards, [193] 552, 555
    Salaries of Officers, [193] 538
  Navy—Sheerness Dockyard, [193] 1667
  Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1871
  Turnpike Trusts, Motion for an Address, [191] 2013
  Turnpike Trusts, [192] 956 ; 2R. 1699, 1728

- KNIGHT, Mr. F. W., *Worcestershire, W.*
  - Army Estimates—Surveys, [193] 963
  - Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1421, 1423, 1424
  - Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [193] 970
  - Turnpike Trusts, 2R. Amendt. [192] 1717

- KNIGHTLEY, Sir R., *Northamptonshire, S.*
  - Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2192; Consid. [193] 1637
  - Parliament, Dissolution of, [192] 1063
  - Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. Amendt. [192] 442, 626, 639; *add. cl.* 1247

- KNOX, Hon. Colonel W. Stuart, *Dungannon*
  - Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 97
  - Army—Militia Quartermasters, [192] 1394
  - Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 469, 627, 763, 1948
  - Established Church (Ireland), Leave, [192] 247, 248; Motion for Adjournment, 314, 315, 316, 317, 321, 322; Explanation, 341; Comm. 1196, 1203, 1204; 3R. 1697
  - Eyre, Ex-Governor, Prosecution of, [192] 717, 718, 839
  - Grand Jury Presentments (Ireland), Nomination of Committee, Amendt. [191] 101
  - Ireland—Party Processions, [190] 1591
  - Military at Elections, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [192] 1981
  - Ministerial Statement, [191] 1807
  - Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [191] 100

- KNOX, Colonel B. W., *Marlow* (*Great*)
  - Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1691
  - Established Church (Ireland), 1R. [192] 322
  - Eyre, Ex-Governor, Case of, [192] 1335, 1470, 1471
  - Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [190] 413

- LABOUCHERE, Mr. H., *Middlesex*
  - Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 674; Consid. 1568; 3R. 2061
  - Boundary, Comm. [192] 286
  - Bristol Writ, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 421
  - Consular Courts in Turkey and Egypt, [193] 1048
  - Diplomatic Service, Res. [192] 927, 932, 939
  - Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 17, [193] 1018; *cl.* 46, 1371; *add. cl.* 1445; Consid. *add. cl.* 1631, 1637, 1644, 1683, 1688
  - Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 15, [193] 1601
  - Foreign Office Agencies, [192] 1562; [193] 1712
  - Judicial Business in the House of Lords, [192] 953
  - Knights of Windsor, Motion for an Address, Amendt. [192] 1975
  - Licences, Res. [191] 152
  - London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Leave, [190] 1080; Comm. [191] 197; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 201, 202, 205
  - Metropolis—Park Lane, [193] 1711
  - Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1341, 1342

[*cont.*

- LABOUCHERE, Mr. H.—*cont.*
  - Metropolitan Police, [192] 953
  - Metropolitan Police Funds, 2R. [193] 350
  - Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, 2R. [190] 170; Comm. *cl.* 1, 412
  - Patents of Queen's Counsel and of Precedence, [193] 307
  - Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 1606
  - Public Schools, Re-comm. [192] 1640; *cl.* 3, 1654, 1656; *cl.* 14, 1938; *cl.* 16, 1939, 1940; *add. cl.* [193] 820, 826
  - Registration, 2R. [192] 1610
  - Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1847, 1850
  - Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, [191] 702; [192] 1478, 1483
  - Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 238
    - British Embassy Houses, [191] 984, 988, 995
    - Embassies and Missions Abroad, [193] 674
    - Embassy Houses Abroad, Amendt. [192] 312, 313
    - Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, [193] 673
    - Mission House, Teheran, [191] 998, 999
    - Police Courts, [192] 503
    - Public Buildings, [192] 294
    - Royal Palaces, [191] 1005, 1007; Amendt. 1008
    - Royal Parks, &c. [192] 296, 298

- LAING, Mr. S., *Wick, &c.*
  - India—East India Revenue Accounts, [193] 1852
  - India—East India, Troops and Vessels (Abyssinian Expedition), Res. [190] 396
  - Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 541; Res. 1901
  - Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1804
  - Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1736; Consid. 1784, 1788, 1791, 1792
  - Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 825; 2R. 1261; Comm. [192] 471; *cl.* 8, 883; *cl.* 10, 984, 989; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 992
  - Ways and Means—Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 350
  - Ways and Means, Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1766

- LAIRD, Mr. J., *Birkenhead*
  - Navy Estimates—Steam Machinery, [193] 1150, 1153
  - Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1125

- *Lake Superior and the Pacific, &c.*
  - Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the capability for settlement and the best means of settling Her Majesty's Territory lying between Lake Superior and the Pacific, especially as to the provision for Telegraphic and other Communication through Her Majesty's Dominions from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean" (*Sir Harry Verney*) *June* 9, [192] 1336; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Lambeth Library
Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *Dec* 5, [190] 602

LAMONT, Mr. J., *Buteshire*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm, Res. [191] 1905; Amendt. 1925
Eyre, Ex-Governor, Case of, [192] 1334, 1335, 1851
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [192] 990
Scotland—Trawling for Herrings, [191] 1882

Lancashire, Riots in—The Staffordshire Colliers
Question, The Earl of Lichfield; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *April* 24, [191] 1221

Lancaster, Duchy of—Office of Prothonotary
Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, Colonel Wilson-Patten *Dec* 6, [190] 649

Land Drainage Provisional Order Confirmation Bill (*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 223]
Read 2° * *July* 9
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Read 3° * *July* 10
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 10
Read 2ª * *July* 17 (No. 241)
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 156]

Landed Property Improvement (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Pim, Mr. O'Beirne*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Pim*) *Feb* 18, [190] 928
Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 32]

Land Writs Registration (Scotland) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy, Mr. Walpole*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *Mar* 9, [190] 1282
Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 56]
Read 2° * *Mar* 23
Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 3, [191] 830
Committee *; Report *May* 11 [Bill 111]
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 12, [192] 1525
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 29
Considered * *July* 2
Read 3° * *July* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 6
Read 2ª * *July* 9 (No. 213)
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 64]

Land Writs Registration (Scotland) [*Salaries, &c.*]
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution *Mar* 27
Report *Mar* 30

Lands Clauses Consolidation Act (1845) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Attorney General, Lord John Manners*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 17 [Bill 176]
Read 2° * *June* 22
Bill withdrawn * *July*

LANGTON, Mr. W. H. P. GORE-, *Somersetshire, W.*
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [192] 306

LANYON, Sir C., *Belfast*
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 370
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 883
Hudson's Bay Company, [192] 17
Ireland—Illegal Processions, [190] 675, 1977
Presbytery of Antrim, [191] 1581
Newspaper Offices, Hours of Labour in, [190] 651

Larceny and Embezzlement Bill
(*Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Coleridge*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 157]
Read 2° * *June* 24
Committee *; Report *July* 7
Considered * *July* 10
Read 3° * *July* 10
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chelmsford*) *July* 10
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 17, [193] 1364; Bill read 2ª (No. 245)
Committee * *July* 21
Report * *July* 23 (No. 277)
Read 3ª * *July* 24
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 116]

Latymer's Charity, Edmonton
Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 28, [192] 952

LAWRENCE, Mr. Alderman W., *London*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Consid. Schedule, [191] 1877
Assessed Taxes, [193] 1475
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [191] 1061; *cl.* 6, 1062
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 287; [193] 1281, 1665
Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1807
Life Policies Nomination, 2R. [190] 953
Local Rating, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1494
Metropolis—Parks, The, [193] 1941
Poor Law Assessment, [193] 1941
Thames Embankment, [192] 341
Metropolitan Improvements, [193] 1941
Metropolitan Police Funds, 2R. [193] 351
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [190] 110; 2R. 172; Comm. *add. cl.* 414, 416; Lords Amendts. 663
Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [191] 187, 195
Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, [192] 1483
Supply—Board of Works, [193] 1208
Post Office, [193] 834
Public Buildings, [192] 295
Royal Parks, [192] 297
Woods, Forests, &c. [193] 1209
University of London Buildings, [192] 395

Lawson, Right Hon. J. A., *Portarlington*
- Burials (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1382
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 660
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 551
- Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 738, 747, 748, 749
- Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1231
- Libel, Comm. [192] 602
- Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1492; *cl.* 32, 1497; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 1500; *cl.* 48, Amendt. 1513, 1514
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Leave, [190] 1950; Comm. [192] 1579; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1581, 1584; *cl.* 13, 1588; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1596; *add. cl.* 1803
- Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts. [192] 1861

Layard, Mr. A. H., *Southwark*
- Abyssinian Expedition, [191] 1337; [192] 716
  - Beke, Dr., and Mr. Layard, [190] 649, 650; Motion for Papers, 668, 672
  - Despatches, The, [192] 1564, 1565
- African Slave Trade—The Aberdeen Act, [192] 718
- Austria—Treaty of Commerce with, [193] 515
- Consular Courts in Turkey and Egypt, [193] 1024, 1053
- Courts of Justice, New, [192] 2131
- Crete—Condition of, [191] 1149
- Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 1253
- Disraeli's, Mr., Speech at Merchant Taylors' Hall, [192] 2155
- Egypt—Law Courts, [192] 1559
- Foreign Office, The, [190] 607, 617, 622
- India — Architectural Remains, [190] 631; [192] 114
- Metropolis—British Museum, [190] 166
  - Burlington House, [190] 1454
- Paris Exhibition, Purchases, [190] 167
- Parliament—Privilege—Production of Public Documents, [190] 667
- Patent Office, Library and Museum of the, [192] 244
- Peel Statue, The, [192] 2144
- Royal Academy, The, [191] 1580
- Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 245
  - Burlington House, [192] 398
  - National Gallery Enlargement, [192] 392
  - Palmerston Monument, [192] 404
  - Parliament, Houses of, [192] 303, 311
  - University of London Buildings, [192] 395
  - Wellington Monument, [192] 403

Leatham, Mr. E. A., *Huddersfield*
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 507
- Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. [193] 460

Leatham, Mr. W. H., *Wakefield*
- Mines, Accidents in, [192] 1508
- Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1871

Lectures on Religion
- Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 15, [192] 346

Leeman, Mr. G., *York City*
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 672; *cl.* 8, 675
- Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. [191] 1041
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 4, [190] 1420
- Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, [191] 1200
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1452; Consid. 1628; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1684, 1685; 3R. 1721
- Electric Telegraphs, 2R. Amendt. [192] 1306, 1319, 1631, 1806; Comm. [193] 1578
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1771
- Parliament—Private Bill Legislation—Standing Order 131 Repeal, [191] 141
- Registration, 2R. [192] 1614; Comm. *cl.* 29, [193] 566
- Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1735, 1736; Consid. Amendt. 1781, 1787, 1791, 1792

Lee River Conservancy Bill
(*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Hunt*)
- *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Stephen Cave*) *Feb* 20, [190] 997
- Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° * [Bill 38]
- Read 2° * *Mar* 11, and referred to a Select Committee
- And, on *Mar* 17, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Ayrton (Chairman), Mr. Benyon, Sir George Bowyer, Lord John Hay, Mr. Alderman Lawrence, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Powell, Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Henry Surtees, and Mr. Wise
- Report of Select Committee *May* 28 (*Parl. P.* Nos. 306, 307)
- Report * *May* 28 [Bill 144]
- Re-comm. *; Report *June* 4
- Considered * *June* 8
- Read 3° * *June* 9
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *June* 10
- Read 2ª * *June* 19 (No. 140)
- Committee * *July* 9
- Report * *July* 13
- Read 3ª * *July* 14 (No. 217)
- Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 154]

Lefevre, Mr. G. J. Shaw, *Reading*
- Army—Employment of Soldiers, [193] 1483
- Foreign Cattle Market, [192] 1395
- Life Policies Nomination, 2R. [190] 952, 957
- Married Women's Property, Leave, [191] 1015; 2R. [192] 1355, 1374
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1541, 1762
- Navy Estimates—Dockyards and Naval Yards, [193] 556, 560
- Neutrality Commission, [192] 1854
- Postal—Service with the United States, [190] 686
- Sea Fisheries, Comm. [190] 1274; *cl.* 27, 1277; Lords Amendts. [192] 1860, 1867
- Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2021
- Supply—Education, Public, [192] 1153
- Tancred's Charity, 2R. Amendt. [191] 229, 231
- United States—The "Alabama" Claims, Motion for an Address, [190] 1150, 1176

Lefroy, Mr. A., *Dublin University*
Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1071; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [192] 1381; *add. cl.* 1383
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 754; Res. 3, 1899
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1208
Ireland — University Education, Res. [193] 1065
Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [193] 1511

Legitimacy Declaration (Ireland) Bill
[H.L] (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 5 (No. 27)
Read 2ª* *Mar* 26
Committee*; Report *Mar* 27
Read 3ª* *Mar* 30
c. Read 1°* *April* 3 [Bill 87]
Read 2°* *April* 21
Committee*; Report *April* 22
Considered* *April* 23
Read 3°* *April* 24
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 20]

Leitrim, Earl of
Burials (Ireland), Report, *cl.* 4, [193] 1474
Registration (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1709
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1448

Lennox, Lord H. G. C. G. (Secretary to the Admiralty), *Chichester*
French Navy, Monitors in the, [193] 1481
Marine Mutiny, Comm. [191] 559; Consid. 574
Navy—Admiralty Circular on Medals, [193] 1553
Chaplains, Naval, [193] 424, 1557
Coal for the, [191] 1575
Dockyard Commission, [190] 1595
Greenwich Hospital, &c. [190] 1114
Naval Medals, [193] 668
Ropemakers in Chatham Dockyard, [193] 1478
School and Training Ships, [191] 1786
Sheerness Dockyard, [193] 1667, 1713
Turret Ships, &c., Report on, [193] 1666, 1714
Navy—Admiralty Monies and Accounts, Motion for a Committee, [190] 923
Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1127, 1135
Navy Estimates, [191] 148
Dockyards and Naval Yards, [193] 544
Naval Stores, [193] 1144, 1146, 1147
Salaries of Officers, [193] 535, 536, 538, 539
Steam Machinery, [193] 1152, 1153
Wages, [192] 79, 81
Pim, Captain—Electoral Address, [193] 1480

Leslie, Colonel C. P., *Monaghan Co.*
Army—Windsor Cavalry Barracks, [193] 718

Lewis, Mr. Harvey, *Marylebone*
Army—86th Regiment, [193] 302
Ordnance Survey Maps, [193] 1921
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [190] 1431; Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 672, 673; *add. cl.* 1064; Schedule, 1067; Consid. 1565, 1566, 1569; Schedule, 1877; 3R. 2062
Boundary, Comm. [192] 278
[*cont.*

Lewis, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1678
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 15, [193] 1601
Fenianism — Attack on Clerkenwell Prison, [190] 1215
Local Taxation, [190] 1037
Metropolis—Ornamental Water in the Regent's Park, [190] 1221; [193] 1476
Metropolitan Police, [192] 953, 1222
Metropolitan Police Funds, 2R. [193] 347
Metropolitan Tramways, 2R. Amendt. [190] 1109
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [192] 1737
New Zealand Defence Corps, [190] 1890
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 4, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1605, 1606; *cl.* 6, 1613; *cl.* 10, 1873; *cl.* K, 1884; *add. cl.* 1885
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1868, 1869
Thames Embankment, &c. Amendment, 2R. [192] 1214

Libel Bill (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Baines*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Nov* 22 [Bill 3]
Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Sir Colman O'Loghlen *Nov* 26, [190] 176
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Nov* 27, 306
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day fortnight" (*Mr. Newdegate*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; 2R. deferred
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 1, [191] 664; after debate, Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 20, [192] 592
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Newdegate*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 108, N. 38; M. 70; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," agreed to; Committee—R.P., 604
Bill withdrawn *July* 1, [193] 471

Libel (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Pim*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 29 [Bill 199]
Read 2°* *June* 30
Committee; Report *July* 1, [193] 471
Read 3°* *July* 2
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *July* 3 (No. 209)
Read 2ª* *July* 10
Committee*; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª* *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 69]

Licences
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that all Licences injuriously affecting the Industry and Commerce of the Country should be abolished" (*Mr. Marsh*) *Mar* 24, [191] 148; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Licences Duties, Post Horse and Carriage, and Hackney Carriage Duties
Moved, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Acts relating thereto" (*Mr. Alderman Lawrence*) *Mar* 24, [191] 187; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Licenser of Plays—Play of "Oliver Twist"
Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 3, [191] 834

Licensing Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Lichfield*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 19 (No. 45)

LICHFIELD, Earl of
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 514
Friendly Societies, 2R. [191] 1685, 1775; Comm. [192] 507
Riots in Lancashire, [191] 1221

LIDDELL, Hon. H. G., *Northumberland, S.*
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1969
Cattle Plague, Outbreak of, [193] 1715
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 691; *add. cl.* [193] 1452
Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1329
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 755, 761
Infectious Diseases, Motion for an Address, [191] 2008
Local Charges on Real Property, Res. [192] 147
Local Rating, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1497
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, [193] 1749
Mines Assessment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 851, 852; Consid. 1222
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1816
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [193] 542
Naval Stores, [193] 1146
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [193] 1403
Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1124, 1125
Public Schools, Re-comm. [192] 1654; *cl.* 5, 1925; *cl.* 6, 1932
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 487; *cl.* 9, 971, 972
Sewage, Disintegration of, [193] 307
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1186

Life Policies Nomination Bill
(*Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. T. Hughes*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Nov* 29 [Bill 19]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 19, [190] 952; after short debate, Bill read 2°

LIFFORD, Viscount
Contagious Diseases Act, [192] 324, 326, 330
Sea Fisheries, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 238
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1439

LINCOLN, Bishop of
Education, 2R. [191] 1320

LINDSAY, Hon. Colonel C. H., *Abingdon*
Supply—Volunteer Corps, [191] 270

LINDSAY, Colonel R. J. Loyd, *Berkshire*
Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 558
Ministerial Statement, [192] 643
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 970

Liquidation Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Westbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 26 (No. 181)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 30, [193] 366; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee*; Report *July* 3
Read 3ª* *July* 6
c. Read 1°* *July* 8 [Bill 220]
Read 2°* *July* 10
Committee*; Report *July* 14
Read 3°* *July* 15
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 68]

LLOYD, Sir T. D., *Cardiganshire*
Army—Commissions, [191] 358
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 885
Papal Government and Mr. Odo Russell, [190] 162

Local Charges on Real Property
Moved, "That, inasmuch as the Local Charges on Real Property have of late years much increased and are annually increasing, it is neither just nor politic that all these burdens should be levied exclusively from this description of property" (*Sir Massey Lopes*) *May* 12, [192] 136; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Local Government Supplemental (1868) Bill (*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 26 [Bill 77]
Read 2°* *Mar* 30
Committee*; Report *April* 2
Read 3°* *April* 3
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *April* 23
Read 2ª* *April* 28 (No. 70)
Committee*; Report *April* 30
Read 3ª* *May* 8
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 10]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill (*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 18 [Bill 120]
Read 2°* *May* 21
Committee*; Report *May* 22
Read 3°* *May* 25
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *May* 26
Read 2ª* *June* 19 (No. 119)
Committee*; Report *June* 23
Read 3ª* *June* 26
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 84]

practical questions were at issue, arising out of the doubt as to whether the restoration of the Indian finances after the Mutiny had been so complete that practically the equilibrium had been established. If the equilibrium had been established it would have been obviously right to incur a more liberal expenditure in useful and reproductive works than would otherwise be possible, and it was also clearly right not to impose an excessive amount of unpopular direct taxation to maintain an unnecessary surplus. On those questions he had taken a different view from that of the Secretary of State of that time. That controversy between Lord Canning's Government and the Home Government should guide them for the future. He most cheerfully bore testimony to the fact that the administration of the Home Indian Government under the right hon. Baronet and the Marquess of Salisbury had been of a much more liberal tone than the policy of earlier times; but he could not help thinking the right hon. Baronet had spoken too gloomily of Indian finance, and he (Mr. Laing) proposed to point out why a more cheerful view of things should be taken. During and after the time of the Mutiny, the financial condition of India was one of extreme distress—there was an accumulated deficit in the four years from 1858 to 1861 of £42,000,000, so that the average deficit for the four years was £10,500,000 per annum; and during 1860 and 1861, two years after the Mutiny, the annual deficit amounted to the formidable figure of £5,250,000. Great efforts were then made towards the establishment of an equilibrium, and since 1861 those efforts had been practically successful. During those six years they had been paying their way. For three years there had been a surplus, and for three years a deficit, but the six years together showed that the debt had slightly diminished; at the commencement it was £113,000,000; in 1867 it was £108,000,000. The interest paid in the year 1862 was £5,160,000, and in 1867 it was £4,829,000. It was true, however, that the cash balance in 1862 had amounted to £17,000,000, and that it stood in 1867 at only £11,000,000; so that to within a few pounds India was in the same position as regarded her public debt, less cash balances, now as she occupied in 1862. This, he thought, proved the soundness of the view entertained by Lord Canning's Government as to the preservation of an equilibrium in the Indian Budget. And he thought it right to observe that the equilibrium of the Indian Budget was very different from the equilibrium of any European Budget, because in the former works were charged to revenue which in the latter would be charged to capital. From 1862 to the present year the cost of the public works undertaken in India was £28,667,000; of which no less than £16,000,000 was for original works and improvements exclusive of the cost of maintaining. Just about one-half of that £16,000,000 was for new civil and military buildings, and might be regarded as adding to the value of the public estate; the other half was for strictly reproductive works; so that £8,000,000 had been charged to revenue, which he ventured to say in the Budget of any other State in the world would have been charged to capital. In India the compensation for land taken for railways was charged to revenue, though it was as strictly a charge against capital as was the cost of constructing the railways themselves. During the last six years £15,000,000, or £2,500,000 a year, had been charged to revenue in India, which, if we took the analogy of any European State or any private railway company, would have been charged to capital. During the same period, though there had been no large war, India had not been completely tranquil and some of the military operations there had been attended with considerable expense. If there had been no increase in the cost of pay and provisions there ought to have been a diminution of £1,500,000 or £2,000,000 as compared with the military establishments of 1861-2; but, instead of a decrease, there had been a small increase. He thought, however, that the expenditure under this head would not have been an increasing one, and he believed that if peace continued, it would be possible to effect a reduction. Here he would observe that his experience led him to believe that if we wanted economy in military matters we must have a civilian primarily responsible for that expenditure—a Minister for War in England and a Governor General in India. In other words, we must not allow a Commander-in-Chief to control his own Estimates. But the Estimates being under the control of a civilian, one man ought to be made responsible for carrying out all the details; and a military man thoroughly acquainted with all the practical details of his profession, was best adapted for this latter duty. He believed that in respect of this matter second thoughts in India had been the worst. In his opinion

LONDON, Bishop of
Army Chaplains, 2R. [192] 1300; Comm. 1390
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [192] 910
Charge of the Bishop of Salisbury, [190] 140
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1118; 3R. Amendt. [193] 1098
Education, 1R. [191] 137
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2122
Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 333
Universities and the Established Church, [190] 1872
University Tests, [192] 1025

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill
l. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 12, [192] 1448
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; original Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection
193] Bill read 3ª with the Amendments *June* 30, 353
Moved, "To leave out Clause 26" (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*); after short debate, on Question, resolved in the negative
On Question, "That the Bill do pass," Bill passed, and sent to the Commons
c. Lords Amendts. considered; several agreed to; and, after short debate, one disagreed to (*Mr. Watkin*) *July* 16, 1248
Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed;" Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Laing, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Watkin, and Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen
l. Observations, Lord Redesdale *July* 17, 1344
Commons Reasons for disagreeing to one of the Amendments made by the Lords considered *July* 21, 1543
Moved, "To insist upon the Amendment made by the Lords to which the Commons have disagreed" (*The Chairman of Committees*); after short debate, on Question? Cont. 11, Not-Cont. 30; M. 19; resolved in the negative

London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Lord John Manners, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Committee *Feb* 24, [190] 1079; Resolution agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1º *
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *Mar* 5, 1144; after debate, Bill read 2º [Bill 43]
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 24, [191] 196
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Candlish*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 147, N. 33; M. 114; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to

[*cont.*

London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance Bill—cont.
Committee; Report *Mar* 24
Considered *Mar* 26, 326
Read 3º * *Mar* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *Mar* 30
Read 2ª * *Mar* 31 (No. 59)
Committee *; Report *April* 2
Read 3ª * *April* 3
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 17]

LONG, Mr. R. P., *Wiltshire, N.*
Ireland—Bible Depôt at Queenstown, [192] 655

LONGFORD, Earl of (Under Secretary of State for War)
Abyssinian Expedition—Vote of Thanks, [193] 486
Army Chaplains, 2R. [192] 1298, 1300
Army—Questions, &c.
  Conveyance of Troops—The War Office and India Office, [190] 175
  Organization of the Reserved Forces, [193] 1356
  Shrapnel Shell, [190] 1148
  Volunteer Review at Windsor, [193] 992, 998
  War Office—Department of Control, [193] 1238, 1245
Established Church (Ireland), [192] 1918
Harbour and Coast Defences, [190] 792
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 683, 688
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [193] 801

LOPES, Sir M., *Westbury*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1679
Local Charges on Real Property, Res. [192] 136, 161
Local Rating, Motion for a Committee, [192] 1495

LOPES, Mr. H. C., *Launceston*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [193] 730
Married Women's Property, 2R. Amendt. [192] 1352

Lottery Act
Question, Lord Edward Howard; Answer, The Attorney General; short debate thereon *May* 15, [192] 387

LOWE, Right Hon. R., *Calne*
Boundary, Comm. [192] 282
Courts of Justice, New, Motion for a Committee, [193] 330
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 709; Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2182; *cl.* 10, [193] 755; *cl.* 37, 1174; *cl.* 41, 1175; *cl.* 43, 1177; *cl.* 45, 1180, 1182, 1183; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1369; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1382, 1441
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 728, 920
Ireland—Roman Catholic University Charter, [190] 1891

[*cont.*

Lowe, Right hon. R.—*cont.*
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1483
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1364
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 628; *cl.* 3, 1766, 1772
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1719, 1812
Parliament, Dissolution of, [192] 1129
Public Schools, Re-comm. [192] 1642; *cl.* 2, 1650; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1652, 1653; *cl.* 16, 1939; *add. cl.* [193] 817, 824
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 0, [192] 1242, 1243
Sale of Poisons, &c. Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. [193] 1215; *cl.* 17, Amendt. *ib.*, 1217; *add. cl.* 1218; Amendt. 1219
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 193, 194
British Museum, [193] 828
West Indies, Lords Amendts. [193] 1888

Lowther, Mr. J., *York City*
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [191] 1059, 1060
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 8, [193] 746; *cl.* 17, 1017, 1019; *cl.* 30, Amendt. 1172; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1369, 1371, 1456; Consid. 1629, 1648; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1677, 1680, 1681
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1771, 1772, 1777
Public Schools, Motion for a Select Committee, [190] 2052
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [192] 1651, 1653; Amendt. 1656; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1926, 1929
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1595; *add. cl.* 1788
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [192] 857; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 858, 859, 860, 875, 879; *cl.* 9, 962

Lowther, Mr. W., *Westmoreland*
Diplomatic Service, Res. [192] 931
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 21, [193] 815, 816

Lucifer Matches, Careless use of
Observations, Mr. Henniker-Major *July* 3, [193] 654

Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Accounts Audit Bill (*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 22 [Bill 184]
Read 2° * *June* 30
Committee *; Report *July* 7—(*P. P*, No. 290)
Considered * *July* 8
Read 3° * *July* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 10
Read 2ª * *July* 14 (No. 237)
Committee * *July* 16
Report * *July* 17
Read 3ª * *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 97]

Lusk, Mr. Alderman A., *Finsbury*
Alkali Act (1863) Amendment, 2R. [192] 1297
Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 321
Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2031
Army—Military Education, Res. [191] 1834
Army Estimates — Land Forces, [191] 70; Motion for Adjournment, 98
Surveys, [193] 962
Bell, James, Case of, [193] 1713
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 3, [191] 1056; *cl.* 4, 1060, 1061; *cl.* 6, 1062
Ceylon—Condition of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 975, 978
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 6, [190] 1425
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 290
Deal Boatmen, Charges by, [190] 1115
Diplomatic Service, Res. [192] 939
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [193] 1595; *cl.* 15, 1601
Garter King at Arms, [191] 39
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [193] 1867
Indian Council, The, [190] 642
Metropolitan Police Funds, 2R. [193] 349
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Leave, [190] 113; Lords Amendts. 661
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [193] 543
Greenwich Hospital, &c. [193] 1156, 1157
Naval Stores, [193] 1144, 1146
New Works, &c. [193] 1155
Salaries of Officers, Amendt. [193] 539
Wages, Motion for Adjournment, [192] 92
Navy—Dockyards, Royal, Res. [190] 2043
Greenwich Hospital, [193] 1407
Pilotage, Compulsory, Res. [191] 376
Postal—Halifax, Bermuda, and St. Thomas Mails, Res. [190] 633
Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2019
Post Horse and Carriage Licences Duties, Motion for a Committee, [191] 195
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1736; Consid. 1789
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. [193] 404
Sale of Poisons, &c. Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1218
Spain—The "Tornado" Question, [190] 1455
Supply—Board of Trade, [193] 1203
British Embassy Houses, [191] 987, 991; Amendt. 995
British Museum, [193] 830
Chapter House, Westminster, [192] 396
Common Law Courts (Ireland), [192] 1103
Compensation—Explosion at Clerkenwell, [193] 1213
County Courts, [192] 502
Customs Department, [193] 831
Education, Public, [192] 1155
Embassies and Missions Abroad, Amendt. [193] 674
Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, [193] 673
Flax, Cultivation of, (Ireland), Amendt. [192] 1175
Foreign Office, [193] 1203
Foreign Office, New, [192] 313
Furniture, Public Departments, [192] 295
Government Prisons, [192] 1106
Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1000 1001
Home Office, [193] 1202

LUSK, Mr. Alderman A.—*cont.*
- Supply—Household of the Lord Lieutenant, Amendt. [193] 1207, 1208
  - Land Registry Office, [192] 1104
  - Learned Societies, Grants to, [192] 1132
  - Lighthouses Abroad, [191] 1003
  - Metropolitan Police, [192] 503
  - Miscellaneous Expenses, [192] 1174; Report, Amendt. 1608
  - Mission House, Teheran, [191] 997
  - Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2170
  - Parliament, Houses of, [192] 306
  - Petrie's, Dr., Antiquarian Collection, [192] 1133
  - Portpatrick Railway, [193] 1212
  - Post Office, [193] 831
  - Post Office Packet Service, [193] 840
  - Prosecutions, [192] 501
  - Public Buildings, [192] 293, 294
  - Public Buildings (Ireland), [192] 404
  - Public Offices Site, [192] 392
  - Royal Palaces, [191] 1004
  - Royal Parks, &c. [192] 297, 299
  - Science and Art, [192] 1167
  - Slaves, Bounties on, [192] 2170
  - Superannuation, [192] 1173
  - Treasury, Amendt. [193] 1201, 1202
  - Volunteer Corps, [191] 272
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [191] 290, 291; Amendt. 295

LYTTELTON, Lord
- Army—Organization of the Reserved Forces, [193] 1356
- Burials (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1097
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 3R. [193] 1100
- Established Church (Ireland), [192] 1917, 1919, 1921; 2R. [193] 90, 93
- Nova Scotia—Motion for an Address, [193] 704
- Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 1627; Report, 1744; 3R. *add. cl.* 1912
- Public Schools, Address for Papers, [192] 1551
- Public Schools, 2R. [193] 1471; Comm. *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1653; *add. cl.* 1654, 1655, 1657; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1658; Report, Amendt. 1701, 1702, 1703, 1708
- Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 335
- South Africa—Motion for a Paper, [193] 593
- West Indies, Comm. Amendt. [193] 1101

LYVEDEN, Lord
- Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 592
  - Return of the Army, [192] 1814
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 32
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. [191] 1571; [193] 603
- Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland, Motion for a Committee, [191] 247, 248
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [193] 1889
- Income Tax, 3R. [190] 635
- Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Report, *add. cl.* [190] 578
- Nova Scotia, [192] 1749; Motion for an Address, [193] 702
- Parliament—Business of the House, Report of Select Committee, [191] 566
  - Notice of Questions, [191] 689, 692

[*cont.*

LYVEDEN, Lord—*cont.*
- Parliament—Public Petitions, Motion for a Select Committee, [191] 689
- Plate, River, Hostilities in the, [191] 452
- Promissory Oaths, 2R. [190] 855
- Public Schools, Report, [193] 1708
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 42, [193] 365; 3R. 809
- Victoria—Appropriation Act, Motion for an Address, [190] 1108; [191] 1682, 1963

MACEVOY, Mr. E., *Meath Co.*
- Ecclesiastical Titles, Leave, [190] 992, 1687; [192] 1181; 2R. 1696, 1856; Withdrawal of Bill, 1982
- Ireland—Irish Church, The, [192] 657

MCKENNA, Sir J. N., *Youghal*
- Ecclesiastical Titles, 2R. [192] 1697
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1678
- Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1608
- Ireland—University Education, Res. [193] 1058
- Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* K, [193] 1882

MACKINNON, Captain L. B., *Rye*
- Navy—"Achilles" and Minotaur," [193] 1477
  - Admiralty Circular on Medals, [193] 1553
  - F. G. Captains' Reserved List, [192] 1222
  - "Glatton" and "Hotspur," [192] 651
  - Iron-clad Fleet, [192] 19; [193] 1107
  - Naval Medals, [193] 667, 668
  - Old Unarmoured Ships, [193] 1818
  - Retired Officers, [191] 1693
- Navy — Wooden Ships, Motion for Returns, [190] 1952
- Sea Fisheries, Comm. [190] 1276
- Turkey—Appointment of Sir W. Wiseman, [190] 1071

MCLAGAN, Mr. P., *Linlithgowshire*
- Agriculture, Motion for a Committee, [192] 587
- Cattle Plague — Outbreak in Berwickshire, [190] 419
- Fire Protection, [190] 1687
- Petroleum, Comm. Amendt. [192] 1619
- Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. [190] 1253

MCLAREN, Mr. D., *Edinburgh*
- Army—Military Store Department, [193] 961
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Consid. [191] 1569
- Bank Holidays, 2R. [190] 951
- Canongate Annuity Tax, 2R. [191] 1087, 1096, 1104, 1106
- Capital Punishment within Prisons, 2R. [190] 1140; Comm. *cl.* 3, [191] 1056; *cl.* 4, 1059, 1061
- Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1751
- Ceylon—Condition of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 981
- Court of Session (Scotland), Leave, [190] 1091, 1093; 2R. [192] 1521
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 676; Consid. [193] 1619; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1624, 1625
- India—East India Civil Service, Res. [191] 1843

[*cont.*

McLaren, Mr. D.—*cont.*
  Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1526; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 1528
  Local Charges on Real Property, Res. [192] 145
  Lottery Act, [192] 390
  Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1767
  Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1124, 1125
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 10, [193] 1877, 1879
  Postal—India, China, and Japan Mails, Res. [190] 468
  Post Office and Circular Delivery Company, [193] 1922
  Post Office, Sunday Labour in, [192] 2165
  Registration of Voters Act, [192] 385
  Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1591
190] Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, 832; 2R. 1244
192] Comm. 459; Amendt. 464, 472; *cl.* 3, 848; *cl.* 4, 853; Amendt. 855; *cl.* 8, 892; *cl.* 9, 978; *cl.* 10, 985, 990; *cl.* 11, 1004, 1005; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1009; *add. cl.* 1235, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1247; Consid. *add. cl.* 1445, 1446; Lords Amendts. Amendt. [193] 918, 1067
  Scotland — Ministers' Stipends, Edinburgh, [190] 1889
    Public Roads, [190] 181
  Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts, [192] 1863
  Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 990
    Education, Public, [192] 1148
    Flax, Cultivation of (Ireland), [192] 1175
    Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2169
    Post Office, [193] 832
    Public Buildings, [192] 293
  Supply—Register Office (Edinburgh), Res. [192] 1176
  Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1725
  Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1188
  West Indies, Lords Amendts. [193] 1888, 1919

Maguire, Mr. J. F., *Cork City*
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 97
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 28, Proviso, [193] 1172; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1381; 3R. 1729
  Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1808
  Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 113, 125
  Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 216
  Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 809; Comm. 932, 934; 3R. 982
  Ireland—Questions, &c.
    Catholic University, [190] 142
    Daunt's Rock, Cork Harbour, [190] 794
    Mullingar, Barracks at, [193] 1290
    Roman Catholic University, [192] 715
    Spirit Licence Duty, [190] 432
    Sullivan and Pigott, Messrs., Imprisonment of, [191] 439, 442, 443
  Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1288, 1792
  Ministerial Statement—Resignation of the Earl of Derby, [190] 1098
  New South Wales—Treason Felony Act, [192] 1754
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 1612
  Postal—Cunard Contract, The, [190] 418
    Service with the United States, [190] 686
  Prison Ministers Act, Res. [193] 372, 383

[*cont.*

Maguire, Mr. J. F.—*cont.*
  Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 32, [193] 1500
  Riots at Ashton, Staleybridge, &c. [192] 817, 819, 821, 828
  River Plate, War in, [190] 652
  Roman Catholic Prisoners, [190] 547, 548

Malmesbury, Earl of (Lord Privy Seal)
  Abyssinia—Questions, &c.
    Despatches, The, [192] 693, 897, 1221
    Envoys, The, [193] 1816
    Return of the Army, [192] 1811
    Vote of Thanks, [193] 473
  Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 500, 514; Report, 712
  Boundary Commission, [190] 1795
  Burials (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1097
  Canning Statue, The, [193] 1460, 1664
  Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1145; Comm. 1571, 1574
  Cotton Statistics, Comm. [192] 918, 919
  Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 805, 816
  East London Museum Site, Report, [190] 861
  Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland, Motion for a Committee, [191] 254
  Edinburgh, Duke of, Address to Her Majesty, [191] 1304
  Egyptian Slave Trade, [192] 331
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 2R. [193] 1793; Comm. 1892
  Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1449
  Established Church (Ireland), [192] 1909; 2R. 2068, 2070, 2072
  Explosive Materials in War, [193] 1662
  France—Coasting Trade of, Address for a Paper, [193] 890
  Friendly Societies, 2R. [191] 1781; Comm. [192] 506
  Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, [190] 1053
  India—Government of, [190] 985
  Marriage Law Commission, [193] 1090
  Mazatlan—Blockade of, [193] 1361
  Metropolis—National Gallery, New, [192] 94
    Statues in Westminster Hall, [193] 979
  Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 571, 573, 576
  Ministerial Statement—Re-construction of the Ministry, [190] 1104; [191] 1686
    Resignation of the Earl of Derby, [190] 1095
  Monetary Conference (Paris), Address for Papers, [192] 110
  Navy—Royal Dockyards, Motion for a Return, [190] 1214
  Parliament—Business of the House, Report, [191] 560; Res. 690, 693, 694, 696
    Proxies, [190] 1954; [191] 570
  Parliament — Public Petitions, Motion for a Select Committee, [191] 689
  Patent Office, Library and Museum of the, [192] 244
  Plate, River, Hostilities in the, [191] 455
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 1625
  Princess of Wales, Address to the Queen, [193] 865
  Public Offices, The New, [191] 103, 104, 1684
  Public Schools, Address for Papers, [192] 1551
  Public Schools, 2R. [193] 1471

[*cont.*

MALMESBURY, Earl of—*cont.*
  Reform Act, 1867—Ratepaying Clauses, [190] 1582
  Registration (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1709; 3R. 1899
  Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [193] 368
  Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. [192] 1913; Comm. [193] 363, 903; Commons Amendts. Amendt. 974
  Riots in Lancashire, [191] 1221
  Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 332, 339, 340
  Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment, Report, *add. cl.* [192] 1630
  Sea Fisheries, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 240, 242
  Tenure (Ireland), 1R. [190] 1052, 1108; 2R. 1445, 1448
  Victoria—Appropriation Act, [191] 1682
  Whitsuntide Recess—State of Public Affairs, [192] 1025, 1034
  Windsor, Volunteer Review at, [192] 1557

Malt Tax
  Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the operation of the Malt Tax" (*Colonel Barttelot*) *Mar* 10, [190] 1397
  And, on *Mar* 16, Committee nominated as follows: — Colonel Barttelot (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Benyon, Sir Edward Manningham Buller, Mr. Stephen Cave, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. Dent, Colonel Duncombe, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Laing, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. More, The O'Conor Don, Major Parker, Mr. Arthur Peel, Mr. Read, and Mr. Henry Surtees
  Report of Select Committee *July* 13 (*Parl. P.* No. 420)

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. (Chief Commissioner of Works, &c.), *Leicestershire, N.*
  Army—Employment of old Soldiers, [193] 520
  Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *add. cl.* [191] 1065; Consid. 1566
  Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 4, [190] 1421, 1422
  Courts of Justice, New, [192] 371, 1051, 2131; Motion for a Committee, [193] 340, 1282
  East Worcestershire Election, [192] 1115
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1408, 1943
  Ireland — State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1466
  London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Leave, [190] 1079; 2R. 1144; Comm. [191] 198; *cl.* 2, 202, 203; *add. cl.* 204, 205; Consid. *add. cl.* 327
  Metropolis—Questions, &c.
    Burlington House, [190] 1455; [191] 467; [192] 1183;—The Colonnade, 1335
    Hyde Park—Ride in Rotten Row, [193] 371, 372, 716
    New Palace Yard, [190] 1150
    Park Lane, [191] 1882; [192] 2137, 2138
    Public Parks, Flowers in the, [193] 1484; —Names of, 1941
    Regent's Park—Ornamental Water, [190] 145, 1221; [193] 307, 1476
    St. Mary Somerset Church, [192] 2150
    Thoroughfares, Obstruction of, [192] 1043
    Westminster Improvements, [190] 1977
[*cont.*

MANNERS, Right hon. Lord J. J. R.—*cont.*
  Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1302, 1342; *cl.* 3, 1541, 1542
  Parliament—Questions, &c.
    Business of the House, [191] 1681
    Cartoon in Westminster Hall, [190] 1685
    Conference Room, [191] 1148
    Houses of—Frescoes, [193] 812
    Induration of Decaying Stone, [193] 1105
    Oliver Cromwell, Statue of, [190] 1450, 1451
  Parliament — House of Commons' Arrangements, [190] 509; Motion for a Committee, 984; [193] 1000
  Parliamentary Boroughs—Payment of Rates, [190] 447
  Peel Statue, The, Res. [192] 2146
  Public Departments, [193] 716
    Concentration of, [193] 1105
  Richmond Green and Hyde Park, [190] 1224
  Richmond Park, [190] 1681
  Royal Academy, The, [191] 1580
  Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1870
  Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 181
  Supply—Burlington House, [192] 399, 400
    Chapter House, Westminster, [192] 396
    Embassy Houses Abroad, [192] 312
    Foreign Office, New, [192] 313, 314
    Furniture, Public Departments, [192] 295
    National Gallery Enlargement, [192] 393, 395
    New Palace, Westminster, [192] 397
    Palmerston Monument, [192] 403
    Parliament, Houses of, [192] 306, 309
    Public Buildings, [192] 292, 293, 294, 295
    Public Offices Site, [192] 391
    Royal Palaces, [191] 1005, 1008, 1010
    Royal Parks, &c. [192] 296, 298, 300
    University of London Buildings, [192] 395
    Wellington Monument, [192] 403
  Wellington, Duke of, Monument to the, [192] 513

Marine Mutiny Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Corry, Lord Henry Lennox*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 20
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 23, [191] 99; after short debate, Bill read 2°
  Committee *Mar* 30, 559; after short debate, Report
  Considered; read 3° *Mar* 31, 573
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Longford*) *Mar* 31
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 2, 683; after short debate, Bill read 2ª; Committee negatived
  Read 3ª* *April* 3
  Royal Assent *April* 3 [31 *Vict.* c. 15]

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of (Lord President of the Council)
  Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1465
  Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [192] 912
  Baby Farming, [193] 1896
  Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 505, 508, 509; Report, 714
  Contagious Diseases Act, [192] 326
  East London Museum Site, 2R. [190] 574; Explanation, 639, 640; Report, 859, 861
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 2R. [193] 1091
[*cont.*

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of—*cont.*
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, 3R. [190] 1678
Education, Res. [190] 482 ; Previous Question moved, 493
Education, 1R. [191] 105, 138 ; 2R. 1305, 1325; Withdrawal of Bill, [192] 405, 411
Education, Technical—Whitworth Scholarships, [191] 822
Endowed Grammar Schools, [191] 1783
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 21, 23, 24, 183
Ministerial Statement—Re-construction of the Ministry, [190] 1106
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [191] 695
Public Schools, 2R. [193] 1473 ; Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1652 ; *cl.* 13, 1654, 1657, 1658 ; *cl.* 30, Amendt. 1661 ; Report, 1701, 1702
Representation of the People (Scotland), 3R. [193] 807
Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy, Comm. [192] 1555 ; 3R. 1747
Schools, Public, Address for Papers, [192] 1549

Marriage Law Commission Report

Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Dec* 2, [190] 510 ; Question, Colonel Barttelot ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 18, 886 ; Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 18, [192] 1757 ; Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde ; Answer, Lord Chelmsford *July* 13, [193] 1090
Report of Commissioners—*P. P.* No. [4059]

Marriage Law (Ireland) Amendment Bill

(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)

l. Presented ; read 1ª * *May* 5 (No 89)

Marriages (Frampton Mansel) Bill

(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 30 [Bill 79]
Read 2° * *April* 23
Committee * ; Report *April* 24
Considered * *April* 27
Read 3° * *April* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *April* 30
Read 2ª * *May* 1 (No. 85)
Committee * ; Report *May* 4
Read 3ª * *May* 5
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 23]

Marriages Validity (Blakedown) Bill [H.L.]

(*The Lord Lyttelton*)

l. Presented ; read 1ª * *July* 17 (No. 271)
Read 2ª * ; Committee negatived *July* 20
Read 3ª * *July* 21
c. Read 1° * *July* 22 [Bill 250]
Read 2° * *July* 24
Committee * ; Report *July* 25
Read 3° * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 113]

Married Women's Property Bill

(*Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Stuart Mill*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Shaw-Lefevre*) *April* 21, [191] 1015
Bill ordered ; read 1° * [Bill 89]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 10, [192] 1352
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Lopes*) ; after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 123, N. 123 ; and the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker gave his Vote with the Ayes, and stated his reasons ; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1376
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on *June* 23, Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Shaw-Lefevre (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Baggally, Mr. Baines, Mr. Beach, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Lowe, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Powell, Sir John Simeon, and Mr. Solicitor General
Special Report of Select Committee *July* 17 (*Parl P.* No. 441)
Report * *July* 17
Bill withdrawn * *July* 24

MARSH, Mr. M. H., *Salisbury*
Commissions, Permanent Expenses of, Res. [191] 1286
Devizes Gaol, [191] 1455
Licences, Res. [191] 148
Public Schools, Re-comm. [192] 1648 ; *cl.* 3, 1656 ; *cl.* 6, 1929 ; *cl.* 21, Amendt. [193] 816, 817
Registration, Comm. [193] 565

MARTIN, Mr. C. Wykeham, *Newport* (*Isle of Wight*)
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [192] 1441 ; *add. cl.* 1442
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1724

MARTIN, Mr. P. Wykeham, *Rochester*
Army—Clerks in the Engineer Department, [192] 1125
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [191] 307 ; *cl.* 5, [192] 2174 ; *cl.* 7, [193] 744 ; *add. cl.* 1457
Parliament—Divisions of the House, Res. [193] 384, 385
Post Office—Case of A. J. Duffy, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1297
Public Schools, Re-comm. *add. cl.* [193] 826
Registration, 2R. [192] 1616
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. [193] 400

Mauritius—Fever and Hurricane in the

Question, Mr. J. A. Smith ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 22, [192] 713 ; *June* 22, 1856

MAYO, Right Hon. Earl of (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *Cockermouth*
Burials (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1378
Curragh of Kildare, 2R. [192] 1620
East Worcestershire Election, [192] 1121, 1122
Education, Primary, [193] 913
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1677
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 553, 865
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 806
Fairs (Ireland), Leave, [190] 1146
Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [191] 209
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [190] 775, 785, 786 ; 2R. 808, 809 ; Comm. 933 ; *add. cl.* 938
Habeas Corpus Suspension Acts (Ireland), Motion for a Return, [190] 1939
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [190] 931 ; Comm. [191] 220 ; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 221, 222, 223
Ireland— Questions, &c.
Arrests in, [191] 833
Bribe, Alleged, to a Fenian, [192] 1229
Cattle Plague, [191] 1784
Convicts, Religion of, [192] 423
Coroner's Inquest in Monaghan, [193] 1482
County Gaols, [190] 332
Cullen, Cardinal, [192] 17
Curragh, Ranger of the, [192] 1754
Dietary of County Prisons, [190] 1102
Featherstonhaugh, Mr., Murder of, [191] 1459
Fenian Prisoners, [193] 1282
Grand Jury Accounts, Auditor of, [192] 1469
Habeas Corpus Act, [191] 1785
Illegal Processions, [190] 676, 677, 1592, 1978
Irish Church Revenues, [190] 645
Johnston, Mr., Case of, [191] 469
Land Question, [191] 1459
Land, Tenure of, [192] 1850 ; [193] 1416, 1418
Landlord and Tenant, [190] 799
Leasehold Property, [190] 1452
Local Government, [191] 1457 ; [193] 309
Medical Officer, Mountjoy Convict Prison, [190] 1103 ; [192] 1470
Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [193] 411, 416, 418
Mullingar, Barracks at, [193] 1290
National Board of Education, [193] 1277
O'Hanlon, Michael, Case of, [193] 1280
Party Processions Act, [192] 814
Pawnbroking, Law of, [192] 1758
Police Barracks, [190] 1113
Prisons, Regulation of, [193] 912
Queen's Plate, The, [193] 1485
Queenstown, Bible Depôt at, [192] 656
Railway Commission Report, [191] 1463
Roman Catholic University, [190] 142, 1456, 1891 ; [192] 112, 715, 956, 1473, 1474 ; [193] 314
Royal Irish Academy, [190] 1452
Royal School of Banagher, [193] 102
Searching Suspicious Persons, [191] 468
Shannon, River, [191] 358 ;—Stake Nets on the, 467
Small-pox, Deaths from, [191] 1784
Sullivan and Pigott, Messrs., Treatment of, [190] 1814, 1891 ; [191] 441, 445, 446
[*cont.*

MAYO, Earl of—*cont.*
Treatment of Prisoners, [191] 259
Troops in the North of Ireland, [193] 1287
Ireland—Dietary of Workhouses, Res. [193] 1022, 1482
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1353, 1396
Local Government Acts, [191] 257
Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [192] 174, 175, 1981
Registration, Leave, [192] 1404
Registration (Ireland), Leave, [193] 782 ; Comm. 1486, 1488, 1489, 1490, 1494 ; *cl.* 32, 1497, 1499, 1500 ; *cl.* 33, *ib.*, 1501 ; *cl.* 34, 1503, 1504, 1507, 1511, 1512 ; *cl.* 48, 1513
Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 730, 1205 ; Leave, 1940, 1947 ; 2R. [191] 1958, 1960
192] 922 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1582 ; *cl.* 13, 1586, 1588 ; *cl.* 18, 1593, 1595 ; *cl.* 20, 1596 ; *cl.* 26, 1597 ; *cl.* 2, 1764 ; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1765 ; *add. cl.* 1768, 1769, 1770, 1774, 1784, 1790, 1793 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1899
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Leave, [190] 927 ; 2R. 1145
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), [192] 287 ; 2R. 2019
Supply—Common Law Courts (Ireland), [192] 1103, 1104
Flax, Cultivation of (Ireland), [192] 1175
Household of the Lord Lieutenant, [193] 1208
Legal Charges (Ireland), [192] 1104
Petrie's, Dr., Antiquarian Collection, [192] 1133
Train, G. F., Case of, [193] 1943

Measor, Charles Pennel, Case of
Question, Sir John Gray ; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *July* 24, [193] 1714

Medical Practitioners (Colonies) Bill [H.L]
(*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Mar* 26 (No. 56)
Read 2ª * *April* 2
Committee * ; Report *April* 3
Committee * *April* 27 (No. 78)
Report * *May* 5
Read 3ª * *May* 7
c. Read 1° * *May* 19 [Bill 125]
Read 2° * *May* 21
Committee * ; Report *May* 22
Read 3° * *May* 25
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 29]

Medico-Legal Inquiries — Commission on Sanitary Laws
Question, Mr. Clive ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 3, [193] 609

Medway Regulation Act Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 26 [Bill 196]
Read 2° * *June* 29
Committee * ; Report *June* 30
Read 3° * *July* 1
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *July* 2
Read 2ª * *July* 6 (No. 199)
Committee * ; Report *July* 7
Read 3ª * *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 53]

Meller, Mr. W., *Stafford*
Metropolitan Tramways, 2R. [190] 1111
Registration, Comm. [193] 565
Roman Catholic Prisoners, [190] 548

Melly, Mr. G., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 533
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 3R. [191] 2061
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 667; Consid. [193] 1618, 1638; *add. cl.* 1691
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1360
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Preamble, [193] 1522
Registration, 2R. [192] 1613
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1860, 1867

Melville, Viscount
Army—Volunteer Review at Windsor, [193] 998
Napier, Sir R.—The Queen's Message, [193] 973

Mercantile Marine—Legislation
Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Dec* 3, [190] 536

Merchant Shipping Acts
Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 19, [192] 513; Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 22, 1852

Merchant Shipping Consolidation Bill
Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 2, [191] 699

Merchant Ships, Overloading of
Question, Mr. Weguelin; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 30, [193] 372

Merchant Taylors' Hall—Mr. Disraeli's Speech at
Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Mr. Disraeli; debate thereon *June* 25, [192] 2150

Metcalfe, Sir T. J., Case of
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 24, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the case of Sir Theophilus John Metcalfe, C.B., as set forth in his Petition of the 24th day of February, and printed in the Appendix to the Fifth Report on Public Petitions on the 7th day of March 1868" (*Major Anson*), [191] 1268; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Metropolis
Baby Farming in the, Question, Mr. Vanderbyl; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 12, [190] 1449
Bethnal Green Workhouse, Question, Mr. Sherriff; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 12, [190] 1453

[*cont.*

Metropolis—cont.
Burlington House — The Royal Academy, Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 12, [190] 1454; Question, Mr. Cowper; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 30, [191] 467; Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 30, 1580; Observations, Mr. Beresford Hope; Reply, Lord John Manners *June* 5, [192] 1183; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 9, 1335
Papers relating to . . . . No. 339
Memorial . . . . No. 380
(See *Courts of Justice, The New*)
Cab Fares, Question, Mr. Thomas Chambers; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 11, [190] 1398
Clerkenwell Explosion Compensations, Question, Mr. Neate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 23, [192] 1923
Devonshire Place and Wimpole Street, Iron Gates in, Question, Mr. Goldney; Answer, Mr. Tite *May* 14, [192] 243
Distress in East London, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Dec* 6, [190] 644
Finsbury Park, Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Mr. Tite *July* 6, [193] 717
Hackney Carriages Lamps Regulation, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Dec* 2, [190] 510
Hyde Park Improvements, Question, Mr. W B. Beaumont; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 6, [193] 716
Lambeth Workhouse—Removal of G. Catch, Motion for Papers (*Mr. Percy Wyndham*) *Mar* 20, [190] 2046; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Papers relating to . . No. 249

Metropolitan Board of Works
Financial Returns, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 20, [190] 1980
Parl Papers—
Report for 1866-7 . . . . . . No. 45
Financial Transactions to Dec. 1867 . . . . No. 123
Amounts borrowed and paid . . No. 360
Local Taxation, Observations, Mr. Goschen; long debate thereon *Feb* 21, [190] 1011
Main Drainage — Deptford Creek Outfalls, Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *Mar* 27, [191] 357—*Petition of Inhabitants of Barking*, Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 28, [192] 954; *June* 22, 1853
Navigation of the Thames—The Main Drainage Outfall, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Nov* 21, [190] 105; Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 9, 1220
Thames Embankment, Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 16, [190] 1686 — *Life Chains*, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Tite *May* 15, [192] 341 — *Steamboat Piers*, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Tite *April* 27, [191] 1332
Report of Mr. Pennethorne—(*P. P.* No. 399)

[*cont.*

Metropolis—cont.

Thames, Obstructions in the, Questions, Mr. Hardcastle, Lord Otho Fitzgerald; Answers, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 30, [191] 1577 (*Parl. P.* No. 24)

Westminster Improvements — Great George Street, Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 20, [190] 1977

Metropolitan Police

Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 21, [190] 1004; Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Mr. Gathorne
192] Hardy *May* 26, 925; Questions, Mr. Harvey Lewis, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 28, 953; Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 8, 1222; Question, Mr. Grove; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 22, 1854

Parl. Papers—

Returns	No. 89
Accounts, 1867-8	247
Estimates	308

Special Constables, Motion for "Return of the Number of Special Constables who have respectively enrolled themselves in the different Parishes of the Metropolis after the explosion in Clerkenwell" (*The Lord Campbell*) *Mar* 19, [190] 1880; Motion agreed to

Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the causes of the dismissal of Police Sergeant Stone from the Metropolitan Police Force" (*Mr. Labouchere*), [192] 1478; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

New Houses of Parliament, The—Cartoon in Westminster Hall, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 16, [190] 1685 — *New Palace Yard, Entrance by,* Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 6, 1150

Obstruction of Thoroughfares, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 29, [192] 1042

Park Lane Improvements, Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 7, [191] 1882; Question, Viscount Hamilton; Answer, Colonel Hogg *May* 14, [192] 244; Questions, Mr. Goddard, Sir William Gallwey; Answers, Lord John Manners *June* 25, 2137; Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. Tite *July* 16, [193] 1283; Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Colonel Hogg *July* 24, 1711

Parks, The, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 31, [193] 1941; Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 31, [193] 1941

Public Parks, Flowers in the, Question, Colonel North; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 20, [193] 1484

Regent's Park—The Ornamental Water, Question, Mr. Thomas Chambers; Answer, Lord John Manners *Nov* 22, [190] 145; Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 9, 1221; Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 29, [193] 307—*Inclosure in,* Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 20, [193] 1476

Richmond Green and Hyde Park, Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Lord John Manners, *Mar* 9, [190] 1223

Richmond Park, Roehampton Gate, Question, Mr. Locke King; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 16, [190] 1680

Rotten Row, Ride in, Question, Mr. Cowper; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 30, [193] 371

St. Mary Somerset, Church of, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 25, [192] 2149

Metropolis Gas Bill— *see* **City of London Gas Bill**

Metropolis Gas Bills

Moved, "That all Bills relating to Gas Companies in the Metropolis be referred to a Select Committee of Five Members" (*Mr. Ayrton*) *Feb* 24, [190] 1080; Motion agreed to

Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Cardwell (Chairman), Mr. Greene, Mr. J. Hardy, Mr. Holland, and Mr. John Peel

Metropolis Local Management Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]

(*The Marquess Townshend*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 22 (No. 169)
Bill withdrawn * *July* 6

Metropolis Subways Bill

(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Tite, Colonel Hogg*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 20 [Bill 41]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 9, [190] 1278; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *April* 22
Read 3° * *April* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Ebury*) *April* 24, and referred to the Examiners (No. 73)
Report * *May* 28
Committee *; Report *May* 29
Read 3ª * *June* 8
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 80]

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill

(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Hunt*)

190] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Lord Robert Montagu*) *Dec* 5, 635
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° * [Bill 25]
Bill read 2°, after short debate, and committed to a Select Committee of Ten Members, Five to be nominated by the House, and Five by the Committee of Selection *Feb* 13, 690
And, on *Feb* 17, Committee nominated as follows:—Lord Robert Montagu (Chairman), Sir Andrew Agnew, Mr. Cogan, Mr. Corrance, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Locke, Mr. Lowther, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Read, Sir Matthew Ridley, and Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson
Report of Select Committee *May* 28
(*Parl P.* No. 303)

[*cont.*

Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill—cont.

Moved, "That it be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills to inquire whether the Amendments which have been introduced in the Select Committee on the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill involve any infraction of the Standing Orders"
192] (*Mr. Milner Gibson*) *June* 5, 1177; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Moved, "That Memorials complaining of non-compliance with the Standing Orders be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than Tuesday the 9th day of this instant June, and that the Examiner do give three clear days' notice of the sitting" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*), 1180; Motion withdrawn

Standing Orders Committee; Resolution reported, "That, in the case of the Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the Bill be permitted to proceed" *June* 12, 1468; Resolution read 2°

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution"

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the further consideration of the said Resolution be postponed till Monday next" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to

193] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Lord Robert Montagu*) *June* 26, 103

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the proposal to pass a permanent law, requiring that in order to prevent the introduction of the Cattle Plague into this Country from abroad, all foreign cattle and other animals imported into the Port of London shall be landed at one prescribed spot, and shall not be removed thence alive, ought not to be considered apart from the general policy of imposing legal restrictions on the foreign cattle trade in other ports of the United Kingdom" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*), 138; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *July* 3, 610; after debate, Debate further adjourned

Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 16, 1290

Debate resumed *July* 16, 1291; after long debate, main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.

Committee—R.P. *July* 20, 1514 [Bill 139]

Question, Mr. Milner Gibson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 23, 1672; Questions, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Liddell; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 24, 1748

Committee—R.P. *July* 24, 1756

Question, Mr. Henniker-Major; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 24, 1773

Bill withdrawn *July* 25, 1775

(See *Cattle Plague*)

Metropolitan Police Funds Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*, *Sir James Fergusson*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 21 [Bill 132]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 29, [193] 343
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Ayrton*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 192, N. 22; M. 170; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *July* 3
Considered * *July* 6
Read 3° * *July* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *July* 9
Read 2ª * *July* 13 (No. 230)
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 67]

Metropolitan Regulations Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 15 (No. 149)
Bill withdrawn * *July* 6

Metropolitan Roads Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 15 (No. 150)
Bill withdrawn * *June* 23

Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*, *Sir James Fergusson*)

190] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *Nov* 21, 107
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° * [Bill 2]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Nov* 25, 168; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee; Report *Nov* 28, 407
Considered * *Nov* 29
Read 3° * *Nov* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *Dec* 2 (No. 4)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Dec* 3, 528; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee; Report *Dec* 5, 575 (No. 8)
Read 3ª * *Dec* 6
c. Lords Amendts. considered *Dec* 6, 652
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "in respect of the carriage of lamps by hackney carriages" (*Mr. Ayrton*); Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to
Lords Amendts agreed to
l. Royal Assent *Dec* 7 [31 *Vict.* c. 5]

Metropolitan Tramways Bill (*by Order*)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 5, [190] 1109
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Harvey Lewis*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c." put, and negatived; Bill put off for six months

Mexico

Diplomatic Relations with, Question, Mr. Thomas Baring; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 21, [190] 1007; Question, Mr. Kinglake; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 27, [193] 1825

Mexico—cont.
Mazatlan, Blockade of, Question, The Earl of Denbigh ; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *July* 17, [193] 1359

Middlesex Registry Office
Question, Mr. Childers ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 23, [191] 1146

Military at Elections (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Serjeant Barry, Major Gavin, Mr. Esmonde*)
c. Ordered ; read 1º * *April* 27 [Bill 95]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2º" *May* 12, [192] 172
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*The Earl of Mayo*) ; Question, "That 'now,' &c."
Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Bagwell*) ; A. 37, N. 57 ; M. 20 ; Question again proposed, "That 'now,' &c."
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Patrick O'Brien*) ; Motion withdrawn ; Question again proposed, "That 'now,' &c. ;" Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *June* 23, 1980 ; after short debate, Debate further adjourned
Debate resumed *June* 30, [193] 410 ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 55, N. 96 ; M. 41 ; words added ; main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill put off for six months

Military Knights of Windsor
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, humbly representing that, in the opinion of this House, it should not be obligatory on any Naval or Military Knight of Windsor, not being a Member of the United Church of England and Ireland, to attend Divine Service in Saint George's Chapel, Windsor, daily or at all, and praying that Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to direct such alterations to be made in the Statutes regulating the Naval and Military Knights of Windsor as shall exempt from attending Divine Service in Saint George's Chapel, Windsor, all Naval and Military Knights of Windsor who shall not be members of the United Church of England and Ireland" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *June* 23, [192] 1973
Amendt. to leave out "not being a member of the United Church of England and Ireland" (*Mr. Labouchere*) ; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," negatived
Another Amendt. to leave out "who shall not be members of the United Church of England and Ireland" (*Mr. Labouchere*) ; Question, "That the words, &c.," negatived
Main Question, as amended, put : A. 39, N. 83 ; M. 44
Question, Mr. Eykyn ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 2, [193] 516

Military Reserve Funds—see *Army—Military Reserve Funds*

Militiamen—Families of
Question, Mr. Dillwyn ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 12, [192] 1475

Militia Pay Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1º * *July* 10
Read 2º * *July* 13
Committee * ; Report *July* 14
Read 3º * *July* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Longford*) *July* 16
Read 2ª * *July* 17
Committee * ; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 76]

MILL, Mr. J. Stuart, *Westminster*
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. [191] 1047
Castle, Mr., Case of, [193] 1826
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [191] 308, 702 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. [192] 685, 691, 2180
193] 734 ; *cl.* 6, 742 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 744, 746 ; *cl.* 14, 1015 ; *cl.* 17, Motion for Adjournment, 1020 ; Amendt. 1166, 1169 ; *cl.* 43, Amendt. 1176, 1177 ; *cl.* 45, Amendt. 1178 ; *cl.* 46, 1370 ; *cl.* 47, Amendt. 1373 ; *add. cl.* 1381, 1449, 1451, 1456 ; Consid. 1623 ; *add. cl.* 1639, 1640, 1643, 1646, 1647, 1650, 1676, 1678, 1685, 1691 ; 3R. 1729
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1928
Government of India Act Amendment, 2R. [192] 1599 ; Comm. 1876 ; *cl.* 2, [193] 859, 860, 861
Habeas Corpus Suspension Acts (Ireland), Motion for a Return, [190] 1939
Imprisonment for Costs on a Dismissed Charge, [193] 1553
Ireland—Convicts Warren and Costello, [193] 1556
Fenian Prisoners, [193] 1282
Ireland — State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1516
Local Charges on Real Property, Res. [192] 152
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1370
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1780
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), Leave, [191] 1859 ; 2R. [192] 1730 ; [193] 419
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1424 ; *add. cl.* 1885
Publications, Registration of, [192] 1514
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 2, [192] 1650 ; *cl.* 3, 1655 ; *cl.* 6, 1928, 1931 ; *add. cl.* [193] 823
Registration, 2R. [192] 1611
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1736, 1789
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1592
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 966, 979 ; *cl.* O, Amendt. 1241, 1242, 1243 ; Schedule A, 1252
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2021
Supply—Post Office, [193] 833
Supply—Proceedings in, Resolution, [191] 1030
United States—The "Alabama" claims, Motion for an Address, [190] 1190

Miller, Mr. W., *Leith, &c.*
Canongate Annuity Tax, 2R. [191] 1098, 1105, 1106
Cape of Good Hope — Basuto Territory, [190] 1975
Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. [193] 451
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [192] 988
Wreck Returns, [190] 1687

Mills, Mr. J. Remington, *Wycombe (Chepping)*
Metropolis Subways, 2R. [190] 1280
Sunday Trading, 2R. [191] 1085
West Indies—Ecclesiastical Establishments in the, [190] 1003

Milton, Viscount, *Yorkshire, W.R.—S.*
Circuits of the County of York, [193] 1823, 1942
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* Amendt. [193] 1452, 1453; Consid. *add. cl.* 1627, 1630, 1687
Lake Superior and the Pacific, &c., Motion for a Commission, [192] 1348
Sheriff of the County of York, [193] 609
Supply—Post Office, [193] 831
Vancouver's Island and British Columbia, [193] 1140, 1142;—Post Office, 1289

Mines, Accidents in—Report of Select Committee (1867)
Observations, Mr. Bruce; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate thereon *June* 12, [192] 1498
(See *Colliery Accidents*)

Mines Assessment Bill
(*Mr. Percy Wyndham, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Henderson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Nov* 27 [Bill 11]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 6, [191] 1864; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *May* 20 [Bill 127]
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 8, [193] 848 [Bill 221]
Moved, "That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into Consideration" *July* 15, 1220
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day fortnight" (*Sir Robert Collier*); after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," negatived; words added; main Question agreed to; Consideration deferred
Bill withdrawn* *July* 29

Minto, Earl of
Salmon Fisheries (Scotland), Comm. Amendt. [192] 1916
Scotland—County and Burgh Police, Motion for a Committee, [192] 1

Mitchell, Mr. A., *Berwick-on-Tweed*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. Amendt. [191] 296

Mitford, Mr. W. T., *Midhurst*
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Leave, [190] 996

Moffatt, Mr. G., *Southampton*
Bankruptcy Act Amendment, 2R. [192] 1908
Bankruptcy Law, [190] 988; [191] 265
Cattle Plague — Rinderpest in Austria, [193] 609
Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1755
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [193] 639, 1291; *cl.* 3, 1761
Post Office Returns, [191] 2001
Post Office Service, [192] 1476

Moncreiff, Right Hon. J., *Edinburgh*
Canongate Annuity Tax, 2R. [191] 1100
Court of Session (Scotland), Leave, [190] 1088; 2R. [192] 1519
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 525
Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1527
Ministerial Statement, [192] 650
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 827; 2R. 1256, 1265, 1890; [191] 1885
192] 18; Comm. 470; *cl.* 3, 482, 491, 841, 843, 852; *cl.* 4, 854, 855; *cl.* 5, 857; *cl.* 8, 866, 884, 889; *cl.* 9, 979, 981; *cl.* 10, 983; *cl.* 12, 1006; *cl.* 51, 1009; *add. cl.* 1235, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1239; *cl.* E, 1240; *cl.* O, 1243; Schedule A, 1251; Consid. *add. cl.* 1446

Monetary Conference, International
Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Dec* 5, [190] 601
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Proceedings of the International Monetary Conference held in Paris, June 1867" (*The Earl Fortescue*) *May* 12, [192] 107; after short debate, Motion agreed to
International Coinage Commission—Report . . . . No. [4073]

Monk, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester*
Army — Shoeburyness, Experiments at, [193] 1439
Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. Amendt. [192] 432
Boundary, Comm. [192] 270
Boundary Commissioners' Report, [190] 1397
Consecration and Ordination Fees, [191] 1332
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 1225; [193] 1747
District Church Tithes Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 1917
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, 2R. [191] 327; Comm. 1198; *cl.* 1, 1201
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 689; *cl.* 14, [193] 1006, 1010; *cl.* 45, 1184; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1376, 1387, 1451; Consid. *add. cl.* Amendt. 1686
Metropolis — Cartoon in Westminster Hall, [190] 1685

[*cont.*

Monk, Mr. C. J.—*cont.*
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1341
- Ordination, Fees on, [193] 1822
- Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, 2R. [192] 1352 ; Comm. 1533, 1538, 1565 ; [193] 389, 391, 396, 405
- Ritual Commission, Recommendations of the, [190] 164
- Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, [192] 1479
- Supply — British Embassy Houses, Amendt. [191] 983, 988, 989
  - Burlington House, [192] 397
  - Prosecutions, [192] 501
- Turkey—New Embassy House, Therapia, [192] 1752 ; [193] 1289

Monsell, Right Hon. W., *Limerick Co.*
- Army—Military Store Department, [193] 961
  - Miscellaneous Services, [193] 965
- Army—Military Education, Res. [191] 1830
- Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1067 ; Explanation, 1454 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [192] 1381, 1382, 1383 ; *add. cl.* 1384
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 14, [193] 1001, 1003 ; *cl.* 54, 1374 ; Consid. 1617
- Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 15, [193] 1603
- Ireland—Questions, &c.
  - Railway Commission Report, [191] 1463
  - Railways, [192] 712
  - Records, [193] 717
- Ireland — State of, Motion for a Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [190] 1675, 1688
- Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [192] 175
- Prison Ministers Act, Res. [193] 378
- Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [193] 1508
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 26, [192] 1597 ; *add. cl.* 1769, 1783 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1901

Montagu, Right Hon. Lord R. (Vice President of the Committee of Privy Council for Education), *Huntingdonshire*
- Art Catalogue, Publication of the, [190] 1218, 1219
- Cattle — Importation of Foreign, [190] 335 ; [191] 1149 ; [192] 18, 115, 424, 1758 ; —From Africa, [193] 909
- Cattle Plague, [190] 92, 105 ; [191] 1578 ; [192] 1755
  - Compensation for, [193] 1288
  - Outbreak in Berwickshire, [190] 419 ;—In Norfolk, 1226 ;—Abroad, [193] 1715
  - Returns, [190] 1287
- Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1753
- Contagious Diseases, [190] 1286, 1889
- Education—Report of Council, [193] 608
  - Revised Code, [192] 952
  - Technical, [190] 1813 ;—Mr. Whitworth's Endowment, [191] 700
- Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 1998
- English Porcelain at Bow, [190] 1888
- Etwall and Repton Corporation, [190] 1223
- France—Paris Exhibition Purchases, [190] 167; [191] 357
- Infectious Diseases, Motion for an Address, [191] 2010
- Latymer's Charity, Edmonton, [192] 952

[*cont.*

Montagu, Right hon. Lord R.—*cont.*
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Leave, [190] 635 ; 2R. 692 ; [192] 1178 ; Res. 1469 ; *Comm. [193] 103, 139, 145, 1297, 1298, 1331 ; Preamble, 1527 ; *cl.* 2, 1536, Amendt. 1537 ; *cl.* 3, 1538, 1539, 1540, 1749, 1762, 1771, 1775
- Parish Mortuaries, [193] 516
- Privy Council, Medical Officer of the, [190] 1812
- Sale of Poisons, &c. Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. [193] 1215 ; *cl.* 17, 1217 ; *add. cl.* 1218; Amendt. 1219
- Schools Inquiry Commission, [193] 102
- Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 177
- Scientific Instruction in Foreign Countries, [192] 1560
- Sheep, Foreign, Importation of, [193] 1287 ; —Small Pox among Sheep in Schleswig-Holstein, 1828
- Small Pox Hospital, [192] 1561
- Supply—Education, Public, [192] 1134, 1139, 1156, 1160 ; Report, 1607
  - Science and Art, [192] 1161, 1165, 1168, 1169, 1171, 1172
- Vaccination — Small-pox at Woolwich, [191] 701

Montgomery, Sir G. G. (Lord of the Treasury), *Peeblesshire*
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [192] 986

Montrose, Duke of (Postmaster General)
- Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [193] 1692, 1700 ; Comm. 1814 ; 3R. 1895
- Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 578, 579
- Postal—Communication with the East—New Contract, [190] 157

More, Mr. R. J., *Shropshire, S.*
- Local Rating, Motion for a Committee, [192] 1498
- Turnpike Tolls, [191] 1461

Morris, Mr. G., *Galway Bo.*
- Ecclesiastical Titles, 2R. [192] 1696
- Ireland—Customs Department, Board of Trade, [192] 426
- Royal School of Banagher, [193] 102
- Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1959 ; Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1589, 1590, 1591, 1594 ; *add. cl.* 1778, 1782, 1789
- Supply—Public Buildings (Ireland), [192] 404

Morrison, Mr. W., *Plymouth*
- Boundary, Comm. [192] 286
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 681, 682
- Metropolis Gas, 2R. [191] 798
- Parliament—Business of the House, [192] 1567, 1570
- Postal—Cape Mail, [192] 1180
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [192] 203

Mortgages, Taxation of
Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 31, [193] 1944

MOWBRAY, Right Hon. J. R. (Judge Advocate General), *Durham City*
County Financial Boards, 2R. Amendt. [191] 1558
Dean and Chapter of Westminster, Estates of the, [190] 641
Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Benefice of Kilpec, [191] 701
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, Comm. [191] 1196; *cl.* 1, 1201
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1512
Lambeth Library, [190] 603
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1796
Public Schools, Re-comm. [192] 1637; *cl.* 21, [193] 814

Municipal Corporations (Metropolis) Bill (*Mr. Mill, Mr. Thomas Hughes, Mr. Tomline, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Layard*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. J. Stuart Mill*) *May* 5, [191] 1859; after short debate, Bill ordered
Read 1° * *May* 7 [Bill 105]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 17, [192] 1730
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Bentinck*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *June* 30, [193] 419; after short debate, Question put, and negatived; words added; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill put off for three months

Municipal Elections (Scotland) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered * *June* 16
Read 1° * *June* 24 [Bill 189]
Read 2° * *June* 29
Committee *; Report *July* 6 [Bill 211]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 13
Considered * *July* 14
Read 3° * *July* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 16
Read 2ª * *July* 20 (No. 263)
Committee * *July* 21
Report * *July* 23 (No. 276)
Read 3ª * *July* 24
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 108]

Municipal Rate (Edinburgh) Bill (*Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Baxter*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 29 [Bill 99]
Read 2° * *June* 10
Committee *; Report *June* 17
Read 3° * *June* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Argyll*) *June* 19
Read 2ª * *June* 23 (No. 167)
Committee *; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª * *June* 26
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 42]

Murder Law Amendment Bill
Question, Mr. Ewart; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 20, [190] 989

MURPHY, Mr. N. D., *Cork City*
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 777
Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 211
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 11, [191] 222
Ireland—Catholic University, [192] 955
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1584; *cl.* 18, 1589, 1592; *cl.* 20, 1596; Consid. *add. cl.* 1906
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1145

Music, Royal Academy of, Grant to the
Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 18, [192] 1753

Mutiny Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Sir John Pakington, The Judge Advocate General*)
c. Questions, Mr. Darby Griffith, Mr. Otway, Captain Vivian, Mr. Sandford; Answers, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 17, [190] 1815
Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 24
[191] Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 25, 238
. Committee; Report *Mar* 26, 321
. Considered *Mar* 30, 556
. Read 3°, after short debate *Mar* 31, 573
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Longford*) *Mar* 31
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *April* 2
Read 3ª * *April* 3
Royal Assent *April* 3 [31 *Vict.* c. 14]

National Gallery—Appointment of Architects—See *Courts of Justice, The New*

Naturalization and Expatriation
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 16, [193] 1280

Navy -
"*Achilles*" *and* "*Minotaur,*" *The*, Question, Captain Mackinnon; Answer, Sir John Hay *July* 20, [193] 1477
Admiralty Circulars on Medals of 1847, 1848, *and* 1858, Question, Captain Mackinnon; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *July* 21, [193] 1553
Chatham Dockyard, Ropemakers in, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *July* 20, [193] 1478
"*Chichester,*" *Training Ship*, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Corry *Dec* 3, [190] 542
Coaling H. M. Ships, Question, Mr. H. Edwards, Answer, Mr. Du Cane *July* 20, [193] 1481
Dockyard Commission Report, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox; *Mar* 13, [190] 1595

[*cont.*

New Forest Deer Removal &c. Act, 1851—cont.
to Deer in the New Forest, and to give Compensation in lieu thereof; and for other Purposes relating to the said Forest" (*Viscount Eversley*) *May* 22, [192] 694; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *May* 26, Committee nominated as follows: — D. Somerset, E. Devon, E. Doncaster, E. Romney, E. Nelson, V. Eversley, L. Portman, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Belper, L. Northbrook, and L. Fitzwalter
Report of Select Committee *July* 9
(*Parl. P.* L. No. 131)

Newfoundland—Grants of Land on "The French Coast"
Petition presented (*Lord Houghton*); short debate thereon *May* 22, [192] 696

New Peers
New Peers Introduced
May 5—The Right Hon. Sir John Trollope, Baronet, Baron Kesteven of Casewick in the County of Lincoln
Sir Brook William Bridges, Baronet, Baron Fitzwalter of Woodham Walter in the County of Essex
May 15—Sir John Benn Walsh, Baronet, Baron Ormathwaite of Ormathwaite in the County of Cumberland
June 16—William O'Neill, Clerk, Baron O'Neill of Shanes Castle in the County of Antrim
June 26—William Lord Brougham and Vaux (special Limitation) sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Brother
July 14—Alexander Nelson Baron Bridport, Viscount Bridport
July 27—Sir Robert Cornelis Napier, Baron Napier of Magdala in Abyssinia and of Caryngton in the County Palatine of Chester

Nov 19, 1867 — Thomas Legh Lord Bishop of Rochester
June 8, 1868—George Augustus Lord Bishop of Lichfield

Sat First
Nov 19, 1867—The Lord Colchester, after the Death of his Father
Nov 22—The Lord Fitzhardinge, after the Death of his Father
Feb 13, 1868—The Marquess of Lansdowne, after the Death of his Father
The Lord Wrottesley, after the Death of his Father
Mar 5—The Lord Aveland, after the Death of his Father
April 2—The Lord Carington, after the Death of his Father
April 27—The Duke of Northumberland, after the Death of his Cousin
May 7—The Marquess of Salisbury, after the Death of his Father
May 8—The Earl of Ellesmere, after the Death of his Father
June 8—The Lord Calthorpe, after the Death of his Father
[*cont.*

New Peers—cont.
June 22—The Earl of Craven, after the Death of his Father
June 25—The Earl of Shrewsbury, after the Death of his Father

Dec 3—The Lord Elphinstone, a Representative Peer for Scotland, in the room of the late Lord Polwarth
Feb 14—The Lord Dunboyne, a Representative Peer for Ireland, in the room of the late Earl of Rosse
May 7—The Earl Annesley, a Representative Peer for Ireland, in the room of the late Earl of Mayo

Feb 14—Hamilton Lord Bishop of Kilmore Elphin and Ardagh
Mar 31—Samuel Lord Bishop of Meath

New South Wales—Treason Felony Act
Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 18, [192] 1754

New Writs
Issued during the Recess
Nov 19, 1867—*For* Galway County, *v.* Lord Dunkellin, deceased
For Bradford, *v.* Henry Wickham Martin, esq., deceased
For Rutland, *v.* Hon. Gilbert Henry Heathcote, called up to the House of Peers
For Leicester County (Southern Division), *v.* Charles William Packe, esq., deceased
For Manchester, *v.* Edward James, esq., deceased
Ordered
Nov 25, 1867—*For* Thetford, *v.* The Hon. Alexander Hugh Baring, Chiltern Hundreds
Feb 13, 1868 — *For* Westmorland, *v.* Hon. Henry Cecil Lowther, deceased
For Kirkcudbright, *v.* James Mackie, esq., deceased
For Stoke-upon-Trent, *v.* Alexander James Beresford Beresford Hope, esq., Manor of Northstead
For Cambridge University, *v.* Sir Charles Jasper Selwyn, knight, one of the Judges of the Court of Appeal in Chancery
For Helston, *v.* William Baliol Brett, esq., Solicitor General
Feb 21—*For* Argyllshire, *v.* Alexander Struthers Finlay, esq., Chiltern Hundreds
Feb 28—*For* Northampton County (Northern Division), *v.* George Ward Hunt, esq., Chancellor of the Exchequer
Mar 12—*For* Huddersfield, *v.* Lieutenant-Colonel Thomas Pearson Crosland, deceased
Mar 19—*For* Coventry, *v.* Henry Mather Jackson, esq., void Election
April 3—*For* Launceston, *v.* Alexander Henry Campbell, Esq., Manor of Northstead
For Chipping Wycombe, *v.* Hon. Charles Robert Carington, now Lord Carington
[*cont.*

New Writs—Ordered—cont.
April 20—*For* Cockermouth, *v.* John Steel, esq., deceased
For The Parts of Kesteven and Holland, in the County of Lincoln, *v.* Sir John Trollope, baronet, called up to the House of Peers
For Kent (Eastern Division), *v.* Sir Brook William Bridges, baronet, called up to the House of Peers
For Radnorshire, *v.* Sir John Benn Walsh, baronet, called up to the House of Peers
For Leominster, *v.* Hon. Arthur Walsh, Manor of Northstead
April 21—*For* Grantham, *v.* William Earle Welby, esq., Chiltern Hundreds
April 22—*For* Bristol, *v.* Sir Samuel Morton Peto, baronet, Manor of Northstead
For Stirling District of Burghs, *v.* Lawrence Oliphant, esq., Chiltern Hundreds
April 29—*For* Stamford, *v.* Viscount Cranborne, now Marquess of Salisbury
May 18—*For* Worcester County (Eastern Division), *v.* Hon. Frederick Henry William Gough Calthorpe, now Baron Calthorpe
May 26—*For* Dublin City, *v.* Sir Benjamin Lee Guinness, baronet, deceased
June 18—*For* Stamford, *v.* Viscount Ingestre, now Earl of Shrewsbury
July 8—*For* Clitheroe, *v.* Richard Fort, esq., deceased

New Members Sworn
Nov 19, 1867 — Viscount Burke, *Galway County*
Nov 20—Mathew William Thompson, esq., *Bradford*
Nov 29—Jacob Bright, esq., *Manchester* [Affirmation]
Dec 2—Thomas Tertius Paget, esq., *Leicester County* (*Southern Division*)
Dec 3—Right Hon. Edward Strathearn Gordon, *Thetford*
Feb 13, 1868—Henry Finch, esq., *Rutlandshire*
William Lowther, esq., *Westmoreland*
Feb 18—Wellwood Herries Maxwell, esq., *Kirkcudbrightshire*
Feb 21—Right Hon. Robert Richard Warren, *The College of the Holy Trinity, Dublin*
William Baliol Brett, esq., *Helston*
Feb 24—George Melly, esq., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
Feb 25—Alexander James Beresford Beresford Hope, esq., *Cambridge University*
Mar 5—The Marquess of Lorne, *Argyllshire*
Mar 9—Right Hon. George Ward Hunt, *Northampton County* (*Northern Division*)
Mar 23—Edward Aldam Leatham, esq., *Huddersfield*
Mar 27—Samuel Carter, esq., *Coventry*
April 20—Hon. William Henry Peregrine Carington, *Chipping Wycombe*
Henry Charles Lopes, esq., *Launceston*
April 28—Andrew Green Thompson, esq., *Cockermouth*
Viscount Mahon, *Leominster*

New Members Sworn—cont.
April 30—William Earle Welby, esq., *Parts of Kesteven and Holland, in the County of Lincoln*
Edmund Turnor, esq., *Grantham*
Hon. Arthur Walsh, *Radnorshire*
John William Miles, esq., *Bristol*
May 4—John Ramsay, esq., *Stirling District of Burghs*
Viscount Ingestre, *Stamford*
Edward Leigh Pemberton the Younger, esq., *Kent* (*Eastern Division*)
June 4—Hon. Charles George Lyttelton, *Worcester County* (*Eastern Division*)
June 8—Sir Arthur Edward Guinness, baronet, *City of Dublin*
June 25—William Unwin Heygate, esq., *Stamford*
July 16—Ralph Assheton, esq., *Clitheroe*

New Zealand
Alleged Cruelties in, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 13, [193] 1103
British Regiments in, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 20, [190] 1979; Observations, Viscount Enfield; Reply, Mr. Disraeli *July* 3, [193] 640; short debate thereon
Defence Corps — Grants of Land, Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 19, [190] 1890
New Zealand Medal, Observations, Sir John Pakington *July* 6, [193] 760

New Zealand Assembly's Powers Bill
(*Mr. Adderley, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 7 [Bill 216]
Read 2°* *July* 9
Committee*; Report *July* 10
Read 3°* *July* 13
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*) *July* 13 (No. 247)
Read 2ª* *July* 17
Committee*; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª* *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 92]

New Zealand Company Bill
(*Mr. Adderley, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 8 [Bill 156]
Read 2°* *June* 10
Committee*; Report *June* 12
Read 3°* *June* 15
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*) *June* 16 (No. 154)
Read 2ª* *July* 20
Committee*; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª* *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 93]

New Zealand (Legislative Council) Bill
(*Mr. Adderley, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 23 [Bill 185]
Read 2°* *June* 25
Committee*; Report *June* 29
Read 3°* *June* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*) *July* 2 (No. 197)
Read 2ª* *July* 7
Committee*; Report *July* 9
Read 3ª* *July* 10
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 57]

New Forest Deer Removal &c. Act, 1851—cont.
to Deer in the New Forest, and to give Compensation in lieu thereof; and for other Purposes relating to the said Forest" (*Viscount Eversley*) *May* 22, [192] 694; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *May* 26, Committee nominated as follows: — D. Somerset, E. Devon, E. Doncaster, E. Romney, E. Nelson, V. Eversley, L. Portman, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Belper, L. Northbrook, and L. Fitzwalter
Report of Select Committee *July* 9
(*Parl. P.* L. No. 131)

Newfoundland—Grants of Land on "The French Coast"
Petition presented (*Lord Houghton*); short debate thereon *May* 22, [192] 696

New Peers
New Peers Introduced
May 5—The Right Hon. Sir John Trollope, Baronet, Baron Kesteven of Casewick in the County of Lincoln
Sir Brook William Bridges, Baronet, Baron Fitzwalter of Woodham Walter in the County of Essex
May 15—Sir John Benn Walsh, Baronet, Baron Ormathwaite of Ormathwaite in the County of Cumberland
June 16—William O'Neill, Clerk, Baron O'Neill of Shanes Castle in the County of Antrim
June 26—William Lord Brougham and Vaux (special Limitation) sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Brother
July 14—Alexander Nelson Baron Bridport, Viscount Bridport
July 27—Sir Robert Cornelis Napier, Baron Napier of Magdala in Abyssinia and of Caryngton in the County Palatine of Chester

Nov 19, 1867 — Thomas Legh Lord Bishop of Rochester
June 8, 1868—George Augustus Lord Bishop of Lichfield

Sat First
Nov 19, 1867—The Lord Colchester, after the Death of his Father
Nov 22—The Lord Fitzhardinge, after the Death of his Father
Feb 13, 1868—The Marquess of Lansdowne, after the Death of his Father
The Lord Wrottesley, after the Death of his Father
Mar 5—The Lord Aveland, after the Death of his Father
April 2—The Lord Carington, after the Death of his Father
April 27—The Duke of Northumberland, after the Death of his Cousin
May 7—The Marquess of Salisbury, after the Death of his Father
May 8—The Earl of Ellesmere, after the Death of his Father
June 8—The Lord Calthorpe, after the Death of his Father

[*cont.*

New Peers—cont.
June 22—The Earl of Craven, after the Death of his Father
June 25—The Earl of Shrewsbury, after the Death of his Father

Dec 3—The Lord Elphinstone, a Representative Peer for Scotland, in the room of the late Lord Polwarth
Feb 14—The Lord Dunboyne, a Representative Peer for Ireland, in the room of the late Earl of Rosse
May 7—The Earl Annesley, a Representative Peer for Ireland, in the room of the late Earl of Mayo

Feb 14—Hamilton Lord Bishop of Kilmore Elphin and Ardagh
Mar 31—Samuel Lord Bishop of Meath

New South Wales—Treason Felony Act
Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 18, [192] 1754

New Writs
Issued during the Recess
Nov 19, 1867—*For* Galway County, *v.* Lord Dunkellin, deceased
For Bradford, *v.* Henry Wickham Martin, esq., deceased
For Rutland, *v.* Hon. Gilbert Henry Heathcote, called up to the House of Peers
For Leicester County (Southern Division), *v.* Charles William Packe, esq., deceased
For Manchester, *v.* Edward James, esq., deceased
Ordered
Nov 25, 1867—*For* Thetford, *v.* The Hon. Alexander Hugh Baring, Chiltern Hundreds
Feb 13, 1868 — *For* Westmorland, *v.* Hon. Henry Cecil Lowther, deceased
For Kirkcudbright, *v.* James Mackie, esq., deceased
For Stoke-upon-Trent, *v.* Alexander James Beresford Beresford Hope, esq., Manor of Northstead
For Cambridge University, *v.* Sir Charles Jasper Selwyn, knight, one of the Judges of the Court of Appeal in Chancery
For Helston, *v.* William Baliol Brett, esq., Solicitor General
Feb 21—*For* Argyllshire, *v.* Alexander Struthers Finlay, esq., Chiltern Hundreds
Feb 28—*For* Northampton County (Northern Division), *v.* George Ward Hunt, esq., Chancellor of the Exchequer
Mar 12—*For* Huddersfield, *v.* Lieutenant-Colonel Thomas Pearson Crosland, deceased
Mar 19—*For* Coventry, *v.* Henry Mather Jackson, esq., void Election
April 3—*For* Launceston, *v.* Alexander Henry Campbell, Esq., Manor of Northstead
For Chipping Wycombe, *v.* Hon. Charles Robert Carington, now Lord Carington

[*cont.*

practical questions were at issue, arising out of the doubt as to whether the restoration of the Indian finances after the Mutiny had been so complete that practically the equilibrium had been established. If the equilibrium had been established it would have been obviously right to incur a more liberal expenditure in useful and reproductive works than would otherwise be possible, and it was also clearly right not to impose an excessive amount of unpopular direct taxation to maintain an unnecessary surplus. On those questions he had taken a different view from that of the Secretary of State of that time. That controversy between Lord Canning's Government and the Home Government should guide them for the future. He most cheerfully bore testimony to the fact that the administration of the Home Indian Government under the right hon. Baronet and the Marquess of Salisbury had been of a much more liberal tone than the policy of earlier times; but he could not help thinking the right hon. Baronet had spoken too gloomily of Indian finance, and he (Mr. Laing) proposed to point out why a more cheerful view of things should be taken. During and after the time of the Mutiny, the financial condition of India was one of extreme distress—there was an accumulated deficit in the four years from 1858 to 1861 of £42,000,000, so that the average deficit for the four years was £10,500,000 per annum; and during 1860 and 1861, two years after the Mutiny, the annual deficit amounted to the formidable figure of £5,250,000. Great efforts were then made towards the establishment of an equilibrium, and since 1861 those efforts had been practically successful. During those six years they had been paying their way. For three years there had been a surplus, and for three years a deficit, but the six years together showed that the debt had slightly diminished; at the commencement it was £113,000,000; in 1867 it was £108,000,000. The interest paid in the year 1862 was £5,160,000, and in 1867 it was £4,829,000. It was true, however, that the cash balance in 1862 had amounted to £17,000,000, and that it stood in 1867 at only £11,000,000; so that to within a few pounds India was in the same position as regarded her public debt, less cash balances, now as she occupied in 1862. This, he thought, proved the soundness of the view entertained by Lord Canning's Government as to the preservation of an equilibrium in the Indian Budget. And he thought it right to observe that the equilibrium of the Indian Budget was very different from the equilibrium of any European Budget, because in the former works were charged to revenue which in the latter would be charged to capital. From 1862 to the present year the cost of the public works undertaken in India was £28,667,000; of which no less than £16,000,000 was for original works and improvements exclusive of the cost of maintaining. Just about one-half of that £16,000,000 was for new civil and military buildings, and might be regarded as adding to the value of the public estate; the other half was for strictly reproductive works; so that £8,000,000 had been charged to revenue, which he ventured to say in the Budget of any other State in the world would have been charged to capital. In India the compensation for land taken for railways was charged to revenue, though it was as strictly a charge against capital as was the cost of constructing the railways themselves. During the last six years £15,000,000, or £2,500,000 a year, had been charged to revenue in India, which, if we took the analogy of any European State or any private railway company, would have been charged to capital. During the same period, though there had been no large war, India had not been completely tranquil and some of the military operations there had been attended with considerable expense. If there had been no increase in the cost of pay and provisions there ought to have been a diminution of £1,500,000 or £2,000,000 as compared with the military establishments of 1861-2; but, instead of a decrease, there had been a small increase. He thought, however, that the expenditure under this head would not have been an increasing one, and he believed that if peace continued, it would be possible to effect a reduction. Here he would observe that his experience led him to believe that if we wanted economy in military matters we must have a civilian primarily responsible for that expenditure—a Minister for War in England and a Governor General in India. In other words, we must not allow a Commander-in-Chief to control his own Estimates. But the Estimates being under the control of a civilian, one man ought to be made responsible for carrying out all the details; and a military man thoroughly acquainted with all the practical details of his profession, was best adapted for this latter duty. He believed that in respect of this matter second thoughts in India had been the worst. In his opinion

Nicol, Mr. J. Dyce, *Kincardineshire*
  India—Bank of Bombay, [190] 987, 1681; [191] 426, 2057; [192] 1471
    Telegraphic Communication, [191] 1458
  Scotland—Law Procedure, [190] 797

Noel, Hon. G. J. (Lord of the Treasury), *Rutlandshire*
  Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1343

Non-Traders Bankruptcy (Ireland) Bill
[H.L.] (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)
l. Presented; read 1^{a} * *Mar* 10 (No. 38)
  Read 2^{a} * *Mar* 23
  Committee *; Report *Mar* 26
  Read 3^{a} * *Mar* 30
c. Read 1^{o} * *April* 28 [Bill 98]
  Bill withdrawn * *July* 14

Normanby, Marquess of
  Nova Scotia—Motion for an Address, [193] 701

North, Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 75
  Army—Fortifications, [190] 1937
    Mauritius, Fever at, [191] 1883
    Superannuation Allowances, [192] 2133
  Army—Controller-in-Chief, Res. [193] 928, 943
  Army—Military Education, Res. [191] 1832
  Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 544, 545, 547
  Army—Soldiers' Orphans, Motion for an Address, [193] 1261, 1264
  Army—Warlike Stores, Res. [193] 772
  Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1968
  Knights of Windsor, Motion for an Address, [192] 1976
  Metropolis—Public Parks, Flowers in the, [193] 1484
  Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Preamble, [193] 1524, 1525, 1778
  Mutiny, Consid. [191] 558
  New Zealand—Forces in, [193] 642
  Norfolk, Cattle Plague in, [190] 1226
  Sheep, Small Pox in — Schleswig-Holstein, [193] 1828
  Supply—British Museum, [193] 830
    Prosecutions, [192] 499
    Works, Buildings, &c., [191] 290

Northbrook, Lord
  Army — War Office—Department of Control, [193] 1243

Northcote, Right Hon. Sir S. H. (Secretary of State for India), *Devonshire, N.*
  Abyssinia—Questions, &c.
    Army, Batta to the, [192] 1756
    Correspondence, [190] 1005
    Despatches, The, [192] 716, 717, 1565
    Estimates, [191] 703, 1148, 1338
    European Subaltern Officers, [190] 178
    Foreign Office, [190] 629
    Krapf, Rev. Mr., [190] 180
    Mule Drivers, Alleged Flogging of, [191] 834

[*cont.*

Northcote, Rt. hon. Sir S. H.—*cont.*
    Route for the Expedition, [190] 336
    Telegraphic Communication, [190] 106; [192] 718
    Volunteers, Bounty to, [190] 677
    Water Supply, [190] 541, 887, 889
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 68
  Army—Malt Liquors for Troops in India, [192] 15, 16
  Army—Military Education, Res. [191] 1834
  Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. Instruction, [192] 1011
  Bristol Writ, [193] 422
  Church Rates Regulation, 2R. [190] 1400
  Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 2, [190] 1416; *cl.* 4, 1418, 1419, 1420; *cl.* 5, 1424
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [191] 304; *cl.* 1, [192] 663, 667, 679; *cl.* 5, 2187; *cl.* 10, [193] 749
  Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1324
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 786; Res. 1933
  Government of India Act Amendment, Leave, [191] 1201; [192] 1567; 2R. 1600; Comm. 1879; *cl.* 1, 1888, 1890, 1891, 1892; [193] 610; *cl.* 2, 858, 860, 862; Withdrawal of Bill, 1870
  Governor General of India, [192] 1567; 2R. 1602
  India—Questions, &c.
    Architectural Remains, [190] 631; [192] 114
    Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, [190] 1008
    Bombay, Bank of, [190] 987, 1681; [191] 147, 432, 1223, 1224, 2057; — Bengal Agency, [192] 1471
    Bombay, Educational Service in, [192] 426
    Bombay, Governor of, [190] 652
    Bombay, Municipal Commissioners, [192] 1755
    Bonus Committee, The, [191] 261
    British Rule in, [190] 731
    Budget, The, [190] 1680; [193] 1670
    Church Services, [192] 1474, 1475
    Civilian Judges (Bombay), [191] 1460
    Contract Law, [191] 147
    Currency Laws, Commission on the, [190] 1112, 1113
    East India Irrigation and Canal Company, [190] 989, 990; [192] 425
    East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [193] 1837, 1867
    Finance, [190] 1982
    Fort William, Cholera at, [192] 714
    Furlough Regulations, [191] 1576; [193] 1554
    Girls, Sale of, [193] 1666
    Hyderabad, [191] 1148
    Indian Army, Retirement of Field Officers of the, [191] 830
    Indian Council, [190] 642
    Indian Navy, Officers of the late, [190] 1981
    Indian Service Medals, [193] 1822, 1823
    Indo-European Telegraph, [190] 520, 521
    Irrigation Works, [190] 646, 799, 890; [191] 958; Motion for Papers, [193] 533
    Kupurthulla, Raja of, [193] 1104
    Madras Irrigation Company, [190] 1073
    Mutiny Medal, [193] 305
    Religious Provision for Soldiers in India, [191] 263; [192] 1757; [193] 306

[*cont.*

Northcote, Right hon. Sir S. H.—*cont.*
- Sindh Railway, The, [190] 1981
  - Survey of, [193] 1103
- India—East India Civil Service, Res. [191] 1852
- India—East India—Troops and Vessels (Abyssinian Expedition), Res. [190] 359, 366, 380, 391
- India—Irrigation of Public Lands, Res. [191] 958
- India—Metcalfe, Sir T. J., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1274
- India—Telegraphic Communication, [190] 1009; Motion for Papers, [193] 158, 165
- Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1663
- Ministerial Statement, [191] 1801
- Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), 2R. [192] 1740; [193] 419
- Parliament—Business of the House, [191] 1681
  - Public Business, [193] 1420
- Public Schools, 2R. [190] 770; Re-comm. [192] 1644; *cl.* 3, 1653, 1655, 1656; *cl.* 5, 1657; *cl.* 6, 1929; *cl.* 7, 1933; *cl.* 14, 1938; *cl.* 16, 1939; *cl.* 20, [193] 813; *cl.* 21, 814, 817; *add. cl.* 827; Lords Amendts. Amendt. 1904
- "St. Abbe," Survivors of the, [191] 260
- Suez and India Submarine Telegraph, [190] 510
- Supply — Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 198, 225, 226, 279, 282, 298, 305
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1185

Norwood, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
- Admiralty Jurisdiction, [190] 175
- Cattle, Foreign, Importation of, [193] 1284, 1285, 1286
- Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1750
- County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), Comm. [192] 168, 169; *cl.* 4, 171
- Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [192] 1808; Comm. [193] 1588; *cl.* 15, 1601
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 149, 1338, 1777
- Postal—India, China, and Japan Mails, Res. [190] 458
- Regulation of Railways, Consid. [193] 1785
- Wreck Registers, [190] 507

Nova Scotia—British North American Confederation
- Moved, "That this House is informed, by a Petition presented on the 15th day of May last, signed by 36 out of 38 Members of the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, and by 16 out of 19 Members elected by that Colony to the House of Commons at Ottawa, that great dissatisfaction prevails in Nova Scotia with the Act passed in the last Session of Parliament, intituled 'An Act for the Union of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick:' And that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to appoint a Commission or Commissioners to proceed to Nova Scotia for the purpose of examining into the causes of the alleged discontent, with a view to their consideration and removal" (*Mr. Bright*) *June* 16, [192] 1658; after debate, Question put; A. 87, N. 183; M. 96

[*cont.*

Nova Scotia—cont.
- *Petition*, Postponement of Motion (*Lord Campbell*); short debate thereon *June* 18, [192] 1749
  - Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to appoint a Commission to proceed to Nova Scotia for the Purpose of examining the Causes of the alleged Dissatisfaction, with a View to their Removal" (*The Lord Campbell*) *July* 6, [193] 679; after debate, Motion withdrawn
  - Parl. P.—
    - Despatches forwarding Representation against the Union . . No. [4036]

Oath of Roman Catholic Members
- Moved, "That the Oath taken by Roman Catholic Members previous to the alteration of the Oath on the 30th of April, 1866, be read by the Clerk at the Table" (*Mr. Freville-Surtees*) *April* 30, [191] 1582; after short Debate, Question put, and negatived

Oaths Commission—Legislation
- Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 17, [190] 800—*Report of Commissioners*, Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Nov* 28, 333

O'Beirne, Mr. J. L., *Cashel*
- Army—Questions, &c.
  - Malta and Gibraltar Shields, [190] 729
  - Medical Department, [193] 1821
  - Plymouth Breakwater Fort, [190] 990
  - Shoeburyness, Experiments at, [193] 1426, 1427, 1434
- Army—Control Department, Motion for Papers, [193] 1273, 1274
- Army—Fortifications, [191] 1456; Res. 2021, 2027, 2042, 2043, 2049, 2053; [192] 112, 113
- Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1077
- Cattle, Importation of Foreign, [192] 424
- Customs Department, Clerks in the, [193] 303
- Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1233
- Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 213
- Ireland—Questions, &c.
  - Education, Primary, [193] 913
  - Landlord and Tenant, [190] 799
  - Records, [193] 304
  - Tenure of Land, [193] 1411
  - Taxation, Inequality of, [193] 1283
- Ireland—Dietary of Workhouses, Res. [193] 1022
- Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1342
- Ireland—Writs of Error in Criminal Cases, Res. [193] 662, 664
- Merchant Shipping Acts, [192] 513
- Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [193] 415, 416
- Navy—Captains on the Reserved List, [193] 521
- Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1123
- Navy Estimates — Steam Machinery, [193] 1154
- Postal Service with the United States, [190] 683

[*cont.*

O'Beirne, Mr. J. L.—*cont.*
- Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 34, [193] 1513
- Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 1206; Leave, 1948; 2R. [191] 1958; Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1585; *cl.* 18, 1591; Consid. 1893
- Riots at Ashton, &c. [192] 1096
- Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [193] 845

O'Brien, Sir P., *King's Co.*
- Abyssinia—Krapf, Rev. Mr., [190] 180
  - Rassam, Mr., Mission of, [190] 678
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 85
- Army—Questions, &c.
  - Expenditure, [190] 1687
  - Promotions in the Coldstream Guards, [191] 1579, 1883, 1884; [193] 921
  - Shields for Malta and Gibraltar, [190] 537, 540
  - Staff Appointments, [190] 106, 1223
- Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1080
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1370
- Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 115
- Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1231
- Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 215
- Ireland—Questions, &c.
  - Illegal Processions, [190] 677
  - Irish Church Revenues, [190] 645
  - Royal Irish Institute, [193] 1214
  - Spirit Licence Duty, [190] 433
  - Sullivan and Pigott, Messrs., Imprisonment of, [191] 447
- Mercantile Marine, [190] 536
- Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [192] 175; [193] 416
- Ministerial Statement, [191] 1741
- Post Office—Case of A. J. Duffy, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1296, 1297
- Prison Ministers Act, Res. [193] 383
- Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 1495; *cl.* 32, 1498; *cl.* 34, 1509
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [192] 1904
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 491
- Suez and India Submarine Telegraph, [190] 509
- Supply—Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1002
  - Lighthouses Abroad, [191] 1004
  - Report, [193] 1367
  - Royal Parks, &c. [192] 297
  - Science and Art, [192] 1166

O'Conor Don, The, *Roscommon Co.*
- Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1230
- Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 210
- Grand Jury Presentments (Ireland), Nomination of Committee, [191] 101; Motion for Adjournment, 102, 238
- Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [190] 930, 931; Comm. [191] 218; *cl.* 11, 221, 223
- Ireland—Spirit Licence Duty, [190] 432
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1780
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Leave, [190] 927
- Supply—Household of the Lord Lieutenant, [193] 1207

O'Donoghue, The, *Tralee*
- Ecclesiastical Titles, 2R. [192] 1697
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1383
- Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1612, 1620
- Ireland—Tower of Ardfert — Kerry Grand Jury, [191] 208
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for Adjournment, [192] 1804, 1805
- Valuation (Ireland), [192] 2136

Ogilvy, Sir J., *Dundee*
- Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 23, [192] 1529
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 825; Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 484; Consid. *add. cl.* 1446

" *Oliver Twist," Play of—The Lord Chamberlain*
- Question, Mr. Brady; Anwer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 3, [191] 834

O'Loghlen, Sir C. M., *Clare Co.*
- Bank Holidays, 2R. [190] 941, 952
- Bristol Writ, [193] 421
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [193] 737; *cl.* 54, 1374; *add. cl.* 1455; Consid. 1617; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1677
- Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 15, [193] 1602
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1590
- Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 120
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 808; Comm. *add. cl.* 938
- Ireland—Questions, &c.
  - Catholic University, [192] 112
  - Land, Tenure of, [192] 1850
  - Railways, [193] 847
  - Spirit Licence Duty, [190] 432
- Ireland—Royal Residence in, Motion for an Address, [192] 346, 358
- Ireland—Writs of Error in Criminal Cases, Res. [193] 655, 659, 666
- Knights of Windsor, Motion for an Address, [192] 1973, 1977
- Libel, [190] 178; 2R. 306, 313; [191] 664, 671; Comm. [192] 592, 604; *cl.* 1, 05, 606; *cl.* 3, 610, 617; [193] 471
- Libel (Ireland), Comm. [193] 471, 472
- Marriage Law Commission, [192] 1757
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1770
- Parliament—Adjournment, Motion for, [193] 1743
- Parliament — Divisions of the House, Res. [193] 383, 386
- Peerage (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1559, 1564
- Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1487, 1490; *cl.* 22, 1497; *cl.* 25, *ib.*; *cl.* 32, *ib.*; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 1501; *cl.* 34, *ib.*, 1503, 1512; *add. cl.* 1514
- Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1737; Consid. *add. cl.* 1786, 1787, 1791
- Representation of the People (Ireland), [192] 922; *add. cl.* 1779, 1780; Consid. 1895; *add. cl.* 1903

[*cont.*

O'Loghlen, Sir C. M.—*cont.*
Supply—Chapter House, Westminster, [192] 396
County Courts, [192] 502; Motion for Adjournment, 503, 504
New Palace, Westminster, [192] 397
Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2167
Post Office Packet Service, [193] 845
Public Buildings, [192] 292
Royal Parks, &c. [192] 296; Motion for Adjournment, 311
Sheriff Court Houses (Scotland), [192] 400
Ulster Canal, [192] 404
University of Glasgow, Motion for Adjournment, [192] 401
University of London Buildings, [192] 396
Transubstantiation, Declaration against, Motion for a Paper, [192] 1098, 1100, 1103

O'Neill, Mr. E., *Antrim Co.*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 513

Onslow, Mr. G. J. H., *Guildford*
Surrey Constabulary, Dismissal of an Inspector of the, [191] 571

O'Reilly, Mr. M. W., *Longford Co.*
Army—Military Uniform, [192] 712
Queen's Regulations, 1868, [193] 306
Army—Military Education, Res. [191] 1832
Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 540
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 73
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 629
Expatriation, Law of, [190] 2003
India — Religious Provision for Soldiers in, [191] 262; [192] 1757; [193] 306
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 11, [191] 222
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [190] 1938
Poor Law — Gravesend Board of Guardians, [191] 704
Public Accounts, Res. [192] 131
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1595; *add. cl.* 1796
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1144

Osborne, Mr. R. B., *Nottingham*
Abyssinia—Foreign Office, The, [190] 607, 609, 610, 622, 625
Army—March of Troops from Aldershot to Sandhurst, [193] 1828
Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2032, 2041
Boundary, Comm. [192] 276; Preamble, 1290; *cl.* 4, 1430, 1435, 1436
Brougham, Lord, The late, [193] 1831
China—Embassy, The, [190] 1224
Treaty of Tien-tsin, [190] 1149
East India, Troops and Vessels (Abyssinian Expedition), Res. [190] 401, 403
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 14, [193] 1008; Consid. 1634, 1643
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 634, 771
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1805, 1807; [192] 648
Peel Statue, The, Res. [192] 2148

[*cont.*

Osborne, Mr. R. B.—*cont.*
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1795, 1796
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 964; *add. cl.* 1803
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1864
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 239, 282
Houses of Parliament, [192] 301, 304, 305, 309; Amendt. 311, 312
Ways and Means [Income Tax], Res. [190] 448

Otway, Mr. A. J., *Chatham*
Abyssinian Expedition—Questions, &c.
Egypt, [190] 1003
Stores, [190] 513
Telegraphic Communication with, [192] 718
Abyssinian Expedition—Foreign Office, The, [190] 614; Motion for Papers, 673, 889
Army—Questions, &c.
Conveyance of Troops—War Department and India Office, [190] 337
Hale's Rockets, [190] 514; [193] 1106
Household Brigade, [193] 1944
Mortality in the 86th Regiment, Mauritius, [191] 37, 360
Prussian and Austrian Armies, Reports of Officers with the, [193] 912, 1000
Storks, Sir H., Appointment of, [190] 985
36th Regiment, March of the, [193] 1555
Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 562
Army—Warlike Stores, Res. [193] 777, 779
Army Estimates, [190] 1938
Land Forces, Amendt. [191] 82, 98; [193] 968
Disfranchised Boroughs—Totnes, &c. [190] 434
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2192
France, Belgium, and Holland, [193] 1940
Government of India, [193] 610; Comm. *cl.* 2, 860; Amendt. 861
India—Questions, &c.
Bombay, Governor of, [190] 652
East India Canal Company, [190] 990
Irrigation, [190] 646
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 99; Comm. Amendt. 559; Consid. 574
Metropolis — Obstruction of Thoroughfares, [192] 1042
Music, Royal Academy of, [192] 1753
Mutiny, [190] 1815; Comm. *cl.* 22, Amendt. [191] 321; Preamble, Amendt. 326
Navy — Ropemakers in Chatham Dockyard, [193] 1478
Navy Estimates — Coast Guard Service, [193] 543
Dockyards and Naval Yards, [193] 560
Men and Boys, [190] 1939
Parliament—Business of the House, [192] 1570
Dissolution of, [192] 1064
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, 2R. [192] 1352; Comm. 1537; [193] 404
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 990, 993, 996
Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, [193] 670
Royal Palaces, [191] 1007
Volunteer Corps, [191] 272
Works, Buildings, &c. [191] 288
Totnes, &c. Writs, 3R. [190] 546
Turkey—Embassy House, Constantinople, [192] 1753

Outlawries Bill
c. Read 1° * *Nov* 19

OVERSTONE, Lord
Army—Organization of the Reserved Forces, [193] 1358
Bankruptcy Act Amendment, 2R. [193] 867
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1843
Electric Telegraphs, 2R. [193] 1700
Metropolis – National Gallery, [192] 95
Monetary Conference (Paris), Address for Papers, [192] 109
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 22, [192] 949
Public Schools, Comm. *cl.* 13, [193] 1657; Report, 1701, 1705
Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 337, 340
Vagrancy—Guildford Union, Motion for Correspondence, [192] 98

Oxford and Cambridge Universities Bill
(*Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Grant Duff*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1° *Feb* 18, [190] 926
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 13, [192] 209
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Walpole*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *July* 1, [193] 426; after long debate, Question put, A. 198, N. 140; M. 58; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° [Bill 30]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

OXFORD, Bishop of
Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1388, 1393, 1467
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1134; Comm. [193] 604; Report, *cl.* 7, Amendt. 896; *cl.* 8, 898, 901, 902
Consecration of Churchyards Act Amendment, 2R. [192] 507, 509; Comm. *cl.* 1, 898
District Church Tithes Act Amendment, Comm. [193] 1163
Established Church (Ireland), [192] 1921; 2R. [193] 192, 193
South Africa—Motion for a Paper, [193] 593

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Bill
(*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Stephen Cave*) *Mar* 9, [190] 1280
Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 54]
Read 2° * *Mar* 16
Committee *; Report *Mar* 23
Read 3° * *Mar* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *Mar* 27
Read 2ª * *April* 24 (No. 58)
Committee *; Report *April* 30
Read 3ª * *May* 1
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 9]

PAGET, Mr. T. T., *Leicestershire, S.*
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1555
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1296
Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 184
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1722

PAKINGTON, Right Hon. Sir J. S. (Secretary of State for War), *Droitwich*
Abyssinian Expedition—Questions, &c.
Cameron, Consul, [190] 104
Contract with Messrs. Wetherell, [190] 336
Mules, Purchase of, in Abyssinia, [190] 1223
Stores, [190] 513
Army—Questions, &c.
Ammunition, Storing of, [193] 1106
Artillery, Colonels in the, [193] 1922
Artillery Officers, Retirement of, [190] 1215; [193] 1821
Artillery Practice at Portsmouth, &c. [193] 518, 720, 910, 1668
Ball Cartridges, [191] 2002;—Manufacture of, [193] 1668
Breech - Loading Rifles, [190] 143, 144, 1225
Brooke, Captain, Case of, [192] 1855, 1856, 2131
Cavalry Enlistment, [190] 1453
Cavalry Uniforms, [192] 1111
Clothing, Tenders for, [190] 990
Commissions, [191] 358
Conversion of Guns, [190] 430
Conveyance of Troops — War Department and India Office, [190] 337, 339, 421, 511
Cooking Apparatus, [191] 257, 468
Curragh Camp, [190] 163
Daily Payment of Men, [191] 263
Defective Ammunition, [192] 654
Depôts, Officers in Command of, [192] 1180; [193] 313
Distinguished Service Majors, [190] 733, 798
Employment of Soldiers, [193] 1483
Engineer Department, Clerks in the, [192] 1125
Floating Obstruction Committee, [192] 1222
Fortifications, [190] 1933, 1937;—at Chatham, 1222; [191] 1456, 1457; [192] 113; [193] 1817
Gibraltar and Malta Shields, [190] 164, 538, 540, 729, 1457
Gunnery Experiments, [192] 1477
Hale's Rockets, [190] 514; [193] 1107
Household Brigade, [193] 1944
India, Transport of Troops to, [192] 111
Invalid Officers from India, [193] 1165
Knapsacks for the Troops, [193] 1827
Majors in Cavalry Regiments, [190] 648
March of Troops from Aldershot to Sandhurst, [193] 1828, 1902, 1903
Mauritius, Fever at, [190] 798, 1006;—Mortality in the 86th Regiment, [191 37, 360, 1461, 1883; [193] 302
Medical Department, [193] 1822
Military Expenditure, [193] 909, 910;—Increase of, 954
Military Prisons, [191] 39
Military Uniform, [192] 712

[*cont.*

practical questions were at issue, arising out of the doubt as to whether the restoration of the Indian finances after the Mutiny had been so complete that practically the equilibrium had been established. If the equilibrium had been established it would have been obviously right to incur a more liberal expenditure in useful and reproductive works than would otherwise be possible, and it was also clearly right not to impose an excessive amount of unpopular direct taxation to maintain an unnecessary surplus. On those questions he had taken a different view from that of the Secretary of State of that time. That controversy between Lord Canning's Government and the Home Government should guide them for the future. He most cheerfully bore testimony to the fact that the administration of the Home Indian Government under the right hon. Baronet and the Marquess of Salisbury had been of a much more liberal tone than the policy of earlier times; but he could not help thinking the right hon. Baronet had spoken too gloomily of Indian finance, and he (Mr. Laing) proposed to point out why a more cheerful view of things should be taken. During and after the time of the Mutiny, the financial condition of India was one of extreme distress—there was an accumulated deficit in the four years from 1858 to 1861 of £42,000,000, so that the average deficit for the four years was £10,500,000 per annum; and during 1860 and 1861, two years after the Mutiny, the annual deficit amounted to the formidable figure of £5,250,000. Great efforts were then made towards the establishment of an equilibrium, and since 1861 those efforts had been practically successful. During those six years they had been paying their way. For three years there had been a surplus, and for three years a deficit, but the six years together showed that the debt had slightly diminished; at the commencement it was £113,000,000; in 1867 it was £108,000,000. The interest paid in the year 1862 was £5,160,000, and in 1867 it was £4,829,000. It was true, however, that the cash balance in 1862 had amounted to £17,000,000, and that it stood in 1867 at only £11,000,000; so that to within a few pounds India was in the same position as regarded her public debt, less cash balances, now as she occupied in 1862. This, he thought, proved the soundness of the view entertained by Lord Canning's Government as to the preservation of an equilibrium in the Indian Budget. And he thought it right to observe that the equilibrium of the Indian Budget was very different from the equilibrium of any European Budget, because in the former works were charged to revenue which in the latter would be charged to capital. From 1862 to the present year the cost of the public works undertaken in India was £28,667,000; of which no less than £16,000,000 was for original works and improvements exclusive of the cost of maintaining. Just about one-half of that £16,000,000 was for new civil and military buildings, and might be regarded as adding to the value of the public estate; the other half was for strictly reproductive works; so that £8,000,000 had been charged to revenue, which he ventured to say in the Budget of any other State in the world would have been charged to capital. In India the compensation for land taken for railways was charged to revenue, though it was as strictly a charge against capital as was the cost of constructing the railways themselves. During the last six years £15,000,000, or £2,500,000 a year, had been charged to revenue in India, which, if we took the analogy of any European State or any private railway company, would have been charged to capital. During the same period, though there had been no large war, India had not been completely tranquil and some of the military operations there had been attended with considerable expense. If there had been no increase in the cost of pay and provisions there ought to have been a diminution of £1,500,000 or £2,000,000 as compared with the military establishments of 1861-2; but, instead of a decrease, there had been a small increase. He thought, however, that the expenditure under this head would not have been an increasing one, and he believed that if peace continued, it would be possible to effect a reduction. Here he would observe that his experience led him to believe that if we wanted economy in military matters we must have a civilian primarily responsible for that expenditure—a Minister for War in England and a Governor General in India. In other words, we must not allow a Commander-in-Chief to control his own Estimates. But the Estimates being under the control of a civilian, one man ought to be made responsible for carrying out all the details; and a military man thoroughly acquainted with all the practical details of his profession, was best adapted for this latter duty. He believed that in respect of this matter second thoughts in India had been the worst. In his opinion

Parish Mortuaries
Question, Mr. Goddard; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 2, [193] 516

Paris Universal Exhibition, 1867—*Purchases for Schools and Science and Art*
Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Nov* 25, [190] 167

PARKER, Major Windsor, *Suffolk, W.*
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1555
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1621
Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 1994
Parliament — Adjournment, Motion for, [193] 1743

Parliament, Meeting of the
The Session of Parliament opened by COMMISSION *Nov* 19, [190] 1; The LORD CHANCELLOR delivered

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech
LORDS—
ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY ON THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS' SPEECH moved by The Earl BROWNLOW (the Motion being seconded by The Lord HYLTON), and, after long debate, agreed to, *Nemine Dissentiente*, *Nov* 19, [190] 6

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Nov* 21, [190] 103

Chairman of Committees—The Lord Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Nov* 19
Appeal Committee—appointed *Nov* 19
Committee for Privileges—appointed *Nov* 19
Sub-Committee for the Journals — appointed *Nov* 19

Adjournment for the Christmas Recess, Statement, The Earl of Derby *Dec* 3, [190] 527
Easter Recess—House adjourned to Thursday, 23rd April, *April* 3
Whitsuntide Recess—House adjourned to Monday, 8th June, *May* 29, [192] 1025

Resignation of the Earl of Derby, Ministerial Statement, The Earl of Malmesbury *Feb* 25, [190] 1095; Question, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *Feb* 27, 1099
Re-construction of the Ministry—Ministerial Statement, The Earl of Malmesbury; debate thereon *Mar* 5, [190] 1104

Business of the House
Report of Select Committee, appointed *June* 21, 1867, [188] 262;—Report *July* 25 (*Parl. P.* No. 259); Moved, "To agree to the Report of the Select Committee on Business of the House" (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *Mar* 31, [191] 560; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Proxies, Use of, Question, Earl Stanhope; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *Mar* 20, [190] 1954

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*
Proxies—Resolution, That the following Order be added to the Roll of Standing Orders:
"Standing Order XXXII*a*. Ordered, That the Practice of calling for Proxies on a Division shall be discontinued, and that Two Days' Notice be given of any Motion for the Suspension of this Standing Order" *Mar* 31
191] *Public Petitions—Printing Petitions*, After debate, Resolved, That a Select Committee be appointed to whom all Petitions presented to this House, other than Petitions relating to Private Bills, shall be referred, with Instructions to the said Committee to direct the printing for the Use of the House of such Petitions as they shall think fit (*The Earl Russell*) *April* 2, 688
And, on *April* 24, The Lords following were named of the Committee:—M. Bath, E. Devon, E. Stanhope, E. Carnarvon, E. Morley, E. Russell, E. Kimberley, V. Eversley, V. Halifax, L. Clinton, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Silchester, L. Lyveden, and L. Taunton
Ordered, That the Name of the Lord presenting a Petition shall be written thereon *May* 1, 1685
Questions, Notice of, Moved, "That it is expedient that Notice of an Intention to ask a Question should be given in the Minutes, except in Cases which admit of no Delay" (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *April* 2, 690; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Moved, "That it is desirable where it is intended to make a Statement or raise a Discussion on asking a Question that Notice of the Question should be given in the Orders of the Day and Notices" (*The Lord Chancellor*), 693; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Committees, Moved, "That the Committee of Selection are desired to exercise their Discretion in calling for the Service of Lords absent from the House" (*The Lord Privy Seal*)
Amendt. to leave out from ("Selection") and insert ("should in the Exercise of their Discretion call more frequently than at present for the Service of Lords absent from the House") (*Lord Chelmsford*); Amendt. withdrawn
Moved, "That the Absence of any Lord from this House, except for sufficient Reason, ought not to prevent the Committee of Selection from calling for his Services" (*The Viscount Halifax*); Motion agreed to
Reports of Bills, Resolved, That in entering in the Journals the Reports of Bills amended in Committees of the Whole House, the only Name entered therewith shall be that of the Lord who moves the Reception of the Report and takes Charge of the Bill in that Stage (*The Lord Privy Seal*)

Public Business—Ministerial Explanation, The Earl of Malmesbury; debate thereon *July* 3, [193] 571
Ordered, That for the Remainder of the Session the Bill or Bills which are entered for Consideration on the Minutes of the Day shall have the same Precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays *July* 20, [193] 1475

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

Construction of the House, Moved, "That the Select Committee appointed on 28th June 1867, to consider whether any and what Arrangements can be made to remedy the present defective Construction of the House in reference to Hearing, be re-appointed" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *May* 19, [192] 510; Motion agreed to

And, on *May* 19, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—M. Salisbury, E. Carnarvon, E. Romney, E. De Grey, E. Kimberley, V. Eversley, L. Redesdale, and L. Somerhill

Report of Select Committee *July* 10 (*Parl. P.* No. 136)

Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod—Select Committee on, appointed and nominated; List of the Committee *Mar* 17, [190] 1796

Private Bills

Ordered, That this House will not receive any Petition for a Private Bill after Monday the 23rd of March [and other Orders] *Feb* 13, [190] 689

Opposed Private Bills, Committee appointed and nominated; List of the Committee *Feb* 24, [190] 1070

Standing Order Committee on, appointed and nominated; List of the Committee *Feb* 24, [190] 1070

All Petitions relating to Standing Orders which shall be presented during the present Session referred to the Standing Order Committee unless otherwise ordered *Feb* 24, 1070

On Motion of the Chairman of Committees, Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a Second Time after Friday the 12th Day of June next [and other Orders] *April* 27, [191] 1303

The Easter Recess, Standing Order No. 179. Sect. 1. suspended; Time for Petitions extended to the First Day on which the House shall sit after the Recess at Easter *April* 2, [191] 682

Railway Bills—Increase of Rates, Moved to resolve, That no Railway Bill that proposes to increase the Rates now payable on the Conveyance of Goods or Passengers shall be read a Second Time until a special Report from the Board of Trade on the Subject shall have been laid upon the Table of the House" (*The Lord Taunton*) *July* 13, [193] 1067; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Standing Order No. 179. amended

Section 4. That no Bill which proposes to increase the Rates now payable on the Conveyance of Goods or Passengers on any Railway shall be read a Second Time until a Report from the Board of Trade on the Subject, made after the Bill has been read a First Time in this House, shall have been laid upon the Table of the House *July* 15, [193] 1226

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

The Statues in Westminster Hall, Question, Viscount Hardinge; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury; short debate thereon *July* 10, [193] 978

The Canning Statue, Question, Lord Campbell; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *July* 20, [193] 1460; *July* 23, 1664

The Parliament Prorogued, by Commission, to Thursday the 8th November next, *July* 31

COMMONS—

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT *Nov* 19

THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS' SPEECH reported; Resolution for an humble ADDRESS thereon moved by Mr. HART DYKE (the Motion being seconded by Colonel HOGG) *Nov* 19, [190] 91; after long debate, Motion agreed to; and a Committee appointed to draw up the said Address

Report of Address brought up, and read; after short debate, agreed to; to be presented by Privy Councillors *Nov* 20, [190] 93

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Nov* 21, 129

Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons)—Standing Committee appointed and nominated *Nov* 20, [190] 103

Report of Select Committee *July* 8 (*Parl. P.* No. 409)

Controverted Elections, General Committee of Elections appointed *Nov* 25, [190] 173—

Trial of Election Petitions—Letter of the Judges, Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 14, 728

Printing—Select Committee appointed *Nov* 21, [190] 129

Public Accounts—Committee of Public Accounts nominated; List of the Committee *Feb* 14, [190] 787

Public Petitions—Select Committee appointed and nominated *Nov* 22, [190] 153

Business of the House

Order of Business, Statement, Lord Stanley *Dec* 3, [190] 545

Easter Vacation, Question, Mr. Whitbread; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 19, [190] 1892

Arrangement of Business, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 26, [191] 263

Easter Recess, Moved, "That the House upon its rising do adjourn until Monday, 20th April;" Ministerial Statement (*Mr. Disraeli*) *April* 3, [191] 826; after short debate, Motion agreed to; House, at rising, to adjourn till Monday, 20th April

Progress of Business, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 18, [192] 494

Derby Day—House adjourned till Thursday (*Mr. Disraeli*) *May* 26, [192] 925

Whitsuntide Recess—Question, Mr. Bouverie; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 26, [192] 927

House adjourned till Thursday *May* 29, 1045

Public Business, Question, Mr. Torrens; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 4, [192] 1130; Observations, Mr. Dillwyn; Reply, Mr. Disraeli; short debate threon *July* 17, [193] 1419

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*
Business of the House, Question, Mr. Morrison; Answer, Mr. Disraeli; short debate thereon *June* 15, [192] 1567
Morning Sittings—Resolved, That this House do meet To-morrow at Two of the clock, subject to the Resolutions of the 27th day of May 1867 (*Mr. Disraeli*) *June* 15, [192] 1571
Resolutions (*Mr. Disraeli*) *June* 18, [192] 1758

Dissolution of Parliament—General Election, Question, Mr. Sandford; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 26, [192] 924; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Disraeli; debate thereon *May* 29, 1053

Orders and Forms of the House
Proceedings in Committee of Supply, Resolution [9th February 1858] relative to Proceedings in Committee of Supply read, as followeth:—
"That when it has been proposed to omit or reduce items in a Vote, the Question shall be afterwards put upon the original Vote or upon the reduced Vote, as the case may be, without amendment" *April* 21, [191] 1025
Moved, "That the said Resolution be rescinded" (*Mr. Ayrton*); after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *April* 28, 1464; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
1. Resolved, That when it has been proposed to omit or reduce items in a Vote, the Question shall be afterwards put upon the original Vote or upon the reduced Vote, as the case may be
2. Resolved, That after a Question has been proposed from the Chair for a reduction of the whole Vote, no Motion shall be made for omitting or reducing any item (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
Judicial Business in the House of Lords, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 28, [192] 953
Members' Seats in this House, Observations, Colonel Greville-Nugent; Reply, Colonel Sykes *April* 2, [191] 697
Orders of the Day on Tuesdays—Resolved, That upon Tuesday the 7th day of July next, and every succeeding Tuesday during the present Session, Orders of the Day have precedence of Notices of Motions, the right being reserved to Her Majesty's Ministers of placing Government Orders at the head of the List (*Mr. Disraeli*) *June* 15, [192] 1570
Standing Orders, Select Committee on, nominated; List of the Committee *Feb* 17, [190] 850
Privilege—Public Petitions—Special Report of the Committee [28th May] read (*Mr. Charles Forster*) *June* 18, [192] 1750
Order, That in the case of the Petitions to which the Report refers, they do lie upon the Table, read, and discharged

Privilege and Order
Committee for Privileges—appointed *Nov* 19
Production of Public Documents—Observations, Mr. Darby Griffith; Reply, Mr. Layard *Dec* 6, [190] 666

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*
Interference of Peers at Elections—Cambridge University Election, Question, Mr. Whitbread; Answer, Sir W. Stirling-Maxwell *Feb* 17, [190] 801; Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 20, 1975
Forms of the House, Observations, Mr. Darby Griffith *May* 22, [192] 719
Point of Order—Committees, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Speaker *May* 11, [192] 15
Rules of the House—Allusion to Debates in the other House, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 29, To leave out from "That," and add "the rule of this House, 'that no Member may allude to any Debate in the other House of Parliament,' be rescinded" (*Mr. Darby Griffith*), [192] 1077; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Speaker *May* 5, [191] 1786

Private Bills
Board of Trade Reports, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 3, [191] 831
Committee of Selection, nominated; List of the Committee *Feb* 21, [190] 1011
Private Bill Legislation—Standing Orders—Moved, "That the Committee of Selection may, if they think fit, refer any Private Bills to the Referees, instead of to a Committee of the House, with power to the Referees to inquire into the whole subject matter of such Bills, and to report them, with or without Amendments, to the House" (*Mr. Dodson*) *Feb* 18, [190] 862; after debate, Debate adjourned till Tuesday, 3rd March
Debate resumed *Mar* 17, 1797; Question again proposed; Amendt. to leave out from the word "may" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "refer any opposed Private Bill, or any Group of such Bills, to a Committee consisting of Four Members, and a Referee" (*Lord Hotham*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Moved, "That the Committee of Selection may refer any opposed Private Bill, or any Group of such Bills, to a Committee consisting of Four Members and a Referee" (*Lord Hotham*); Amendt. to leave out "Four," and insert "Three" (*Mr. Milner Gibson*); Question, "That the word 'Four,' &c."; A. 162, N. 159; M. 3; main Question put, and agreed to
Standing Orders 93, 95, 96, and 97 repealed *Mar* 17, 1811
Standing Order 131; Consideration deferred till Tuesday next
Moved, "That Standing Order 131 (Competition to be a ground of locus standi) be repealed" (*Mr. Dodson*) *Mar* 24, [190] 139; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Personal Explanation, Mr. Stephen Cave, Sir John Hanmer *Mar* 27, 351

Resignation of the Earl of Derby—Ministerial Statement, Lord Stanley *Feb* 25, [190] 1097
Re-construction of the Ministry—Ministerial Statement, Lord Stanley *Feb* 28, [190] 1100; Ministerial Statement, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 5, 1116

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Palace of Westminster

Cartoons in Westminster Hall, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 16, [190] 1685

Conference Room, The, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 23, [191] 1148

Frescoes in the Houses of Parliament, Question, Mr. Cowper; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 7, [193] 812

New Palace Yard, Entrance by, Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 6, [190] 1150

New Palace Yard—The Peel Statue, Amendt on Committee of Supply *June* 25, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the Peel Statue ought to be removed from its present site in New Palace Yard" (*Lord Elcho*), [192] 2138; after short debate, Question, "That the words &c.;" A. 71, N. 182; M. 111; words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Preservation of the Stone-work, Question, Mr. Cowper; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 13, [193] 1105

Statue to Oliver Cromwell, Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 12, [190] 1450

The Statues in Westminster Hall, Question, Viscount Hardinge; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury; short debate thereon *July* 10, [193] 978

The Canning Statue, Question Lord Campbell; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *July* 20, [193] 1460; *July* 23, 1664

The Parliament Prorogued, by Commission, to Thursday, the 8th November next, *July* 31

Parliament—Divisions of the House

Moved, "That if any Member shall, by mistake, go out with the Ayes or the Noes (as the case may be) having intended to vote on the other side, he shall wait until the other Members in the same Lobby shall have passed out, and, on presenting himself to the Tellers, he shall desire that he may not be counted with them, he having entered the Lobby by mistake; and the Tellers shall thereupon come with such Member to the Table, and inform the House of the circumstance, and the Speaker or Chairman (as the case may be), shall thereupon ask such Member whether he was in the House when the Question was put, and, if he shall answer in the affirmative, the Speaker or Chairman (as the case may be), shall then ask such Member whether he desires to vote Aye or No on such Question, and the vote of such Member as then declared by him shall be taken by the Tellers in the House, and reported by them accordingly" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *June* 30, [193] 383; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Parliament—House of Commons' Arrangements Committee

Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Mr. Headlam *Dec* 2, [190] 509

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "To consider whether any alteration can be made in the arrangements of the House of Commons, so as to enable a greater number of Members to hear and take part in the proceedings; and to consider the arrangement of the several rooms and offices attached to the House, and the means of access to the same, with a view to the greater convenience of Members in the discharge of their duties, and how better accommodation can be provided within the precincts of the House for the transaction of Departmental Business, during the Sittings of the House, by Members holding Offices in the Government" (*Mr. Headlam*) *Feb* 19, [190] 983; after short debate, Motion agreed to

And, on *Mar* 10, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Headlam (Chairman), Mr. Bazley, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Mr. William Cowper, Viscount Cranborne, Lord Elcho, Mr. Darby Griffith, Mr. Hankey, Sir Frederick Heygate, Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir Charles Lanyon, Lord John Manners, Mr. Tite; *Mar* 10, Mr. John Bright disch., Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie added

Report of Select Committee *May* 12 (*Parl. P.* No. 265)

Question, Mr. Headlam; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 10, [193] 1000

PARRY, Mr. T., *Boston*

Public Departments, [193] 716

Partition Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)

l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 3 (No. 67)
Read 2ª* *April* 27
Committee*; Report *April* 28 (No. 116)
Read 3ª* *April* 30
c. Read 1°* *May* 7 [Bill 107]
Read 2°* *May* 14
Committee*; Report *May* 20
Considered* *May* 22
Read 3°* *May* 25
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 40]

Passenger Steamers, Overloading of

Question, Mr. Sinclair Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 27, [191] 450

Patent Office Inquiry

Patent Office, Library and Museum, Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 14, [192] 244

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Copy of all the Proceedings and Evidence in the Information in Chancery, Attorney General *v.* Edmunds; together with the Papers relating to the Patent Office Inquiry" (*Mr. Bentinck*) *July* 29, [193] 1929; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Patten, Right Hon. Colonel J. W. (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster), *Lancashire, N.*
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1960
Duchy of Lancaster, [190] 649
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1441
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [191] 324
Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1798, 1810
Regulation of Railways, Consid. [193] 1790

Paull, Mr. H., *St. Ives*
Boundary, Comm. Preamble, [192] 1288, 1292
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 688, 2182, 2195; *cl.* 45, [193] 1183
Metropolis Subways, 2R. [190] 1278
Mines Assessment, Consid. [193] 1224
Parliament, Dissolution of, [192] 1072
Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1808
Riots at Ashton, Staleybridge, &c. [192] 832

Pease, Mr. J. W., *Durham, S.*
Boundary, Comm. [192] 277, 284
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 1428
Courts of Justice, Designs for the New, [192] 653
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1483
London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. [191] 197
Metropolitan Tramways, 2R. [190] 1112
Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1867
Pilotage, Compulsory, Res. [191] 379
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 891
Spirit, Wine, and Beer Licences, [190] 331
Supply—Courts of Justice, New, [192] 291
  Royal Parks, &c. [192] 298

Peel, Right Hon. Sir R., *Tamworth*
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1954
Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 548
Scotland—Established Church, [191] 1884

Peel, Right Hon. Gen. J., *Huntingdon*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 65
  Military Store Department, [193] 961
Army—Military Expenditure, Increase of, [193] 952
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 721, 1388
Supply—Civil Service Estimates, [193] 1187
Ways and Means, Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1764

Peel, Mr. A. W., *Warwick*
Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 430
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 1436; Amendt. 1440
India—Case of Sir T. J. Metcalfe, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1271

Peel, Mr. J., *Tamworth*
Consular Courts in Turkey and Egypt, [193] 1053
India—Bank of Bombay, [191] 1224

Peerage (Ireland) Bill (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Monsell, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 2 [Bill 83]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 29, [191] 1559
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Colonel French*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Pemberton, Mr. E. L., *Kent, E.*
Navy Estimates—Dockyards and Naval Yards, [193] 551, 555
Navy—Old Ships and Sheerness Dockyard, [193] 1713

Penrhyn, Lord
Established Church (Ireland), [192] 1909

Perth and Brechin Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 23 [Bill 74]
Read 2°* *Mar* 26
Committee*; Report *Mar* 30
Read 3°* *Mar* 31
l. Read 1a* (*The Lord Clinton*) *April* 2 (No. 64)
Read 2a* *April* 30
Committee*; Report *May* 8
Read 3a* *May* 11
Royal Assent *May* 29

Petit Juries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, The Earl of Mayo*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 19 [Bill 70]
Question, Mr. Esmonde; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 26, [191] 263
Read 2°*, and referred to a Select Committee *May* 28
And, on *June* 23, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Attorney General for Ireland (Chairman), Mr. Cogan, Mr. Cooper, General Dunne, Mr. Garth, Lord Claud Hamilton, Mr. Headlam, Sir Frederick Heygate, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Monsell, The O'Conor Don, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. O'Reilly, and Mr. Pim
Special Report of Select Committee *July* 3 (*Parl. P.* No. 390)
Report* *July* 3 [Bill 209]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 6
Read 3°* *July* 7
l. Read 1a* (*The Earl of Longford*) *July* 9 (No. 231)
Read 2a* *July* 14
Committee*; Report *July* 16
Read 3a* *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 75]

Petroleum Act Amendment Bill
Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 23 [Bill 93]
Read 2° * *April* 27
Committee * ; Report *May* 28 [Bill 141]
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read ; Moved, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair " *June* 15, [192] 1618
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add " the Bill be committed to a Select Committee " (*Mr. M'Lagan*) ; after short debate, Question, " That the words, &c.," agreed to ; main Question agreed to ; Report [Bill 171]
Considered * *June* 22
Read 3° * *June* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *July* 3 (No. 178)
Committee * ; Report *July* 9
Read 3ª * *July* 10
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 56]

Petty Sessions and Lock-up Houses, &c. Bill (*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 23 [Bill 75]
Read 2° * *April* 2
Committee * ; Report *April* 20
Read 3° * *April* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *April* 23
Read 2ª * *April* 30 (No. 71)
Committee * ; Report *May* 1
Read 3ª * *May* 4
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 22]

Philips, Mr. R. N., *Bury*
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [193] 1595

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered * *May* 15
Read 1° * *May* 18 [Bill 118]
Read 2° * *May* 21
Committee * ; Report *May* 22
Read 3° * *May* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *May* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 8 (No. 120)
Committee * ; Report *June* 22
Read 3ª * *June* 23
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 46]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Resolution in Committee ; Bill ordered ; read 1° * *May* 29 [Bill 148]
Read 2° * *June* 4
Committee * ; Report *June* 8
Read 3° * *June* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *June* 11
Read 2ª * *June* 12 (No. 139)
Committee * ; Report *June* 19
Read 3ª * *June* 23
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 47]

Pilotage, Compulsory—see *Board of Trade, Compulsory Pilotage*

Pim, Mr. J., *Dublin City*
Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1073
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1924
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 939
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. [191] 220
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Land Question, [191] 1459
Local Government, [191] 1457 ; [193] 309
Mountjoy Convict Prison, [192] 1470
Pawnbroking, Law of, [192] 1758
Ireland—Royal Residence in, Motion for an Address, [192] 351
Landed Property Improvement (Ireland), Leave, [190] 928
Local Government Acts, [191] 256
Record Publications, Res. [193] 165
Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R [191] 1954 ; Comm. [192] 1537 ; *cl.* 18, 1590, 1595 ; *cl.* 10, 1765 ; *add. cl.* 1784
Consid. *add. cl.* 1901, 1907
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 469 ; *cl.* 10, 990
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Leave [190] 927

Plate River, War in the
Question, Mr. Maguire ; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 6, [190] 652 ; Observations, Lord Lyveden ; Reply, The Earl of Malmesbury *Mar* 30, [191] 452

Police
Special Constables, Motion for " Return of the Number of Special Constables who have respectively enrolled themselves in the different Parishes of the Metropolis after the explosion in Clerkenwell" (*The Lord Campbell*) *Mar* 19, [190] 1880 ; Motion agreed to
Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, Question, Mr. Labouchere ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 2, [191] 702
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 12, To leave out from " That," and add " a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the causes of the dismissal of Police Sergeant Stone from the Metropolitan Police Force " (*Mr. Labouchere*), [192] 1478 ; Question, " That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Surgeon-in-Chief of the Police Force, Question, Viscount Enfield ; Answer, Sir George Grey *June* 29, [193] 311
Surrey Constabulary—Dismissal of Inspector Miller, Question, Mr. Onslow ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 31, [191] 571

Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. W., *Westmeath Co.*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 516
Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 210
Ireland—Arbour Hill Garrison Chapel, [192] 651
Licences, Res. [191] 155
Married Women's Property, 2R. [192] 1360
Public Accounts, Res. [192] 123
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 14, [192] 1938
Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [192] 196

Poor Law

Austin, James, Case of, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 23, [193] 1673

Bethnal Green Workhouse, Question, Mr. Sherriff; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 12, [190] 1453

Casual and Vagrant Poor, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Dec* 6, [190] 651; Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 12, 1450

Clifton and Bedminster Workhouse Infirmaries, Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Nov* 25, [190] 165

East London, Distress in, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Dec* 6, [190] 644

Gravesend Board of Guardians, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 2, [191] 704

Guildford Union — Vagrants, Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Copy of Correspondence which has recently passed between the Poor Law Board and the Guildford Board of Guardians in reference to the relief of Vagrants" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *May* 12, [192] 95; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to

Ordered, "That there be laid before this House, Copy of Correspondence which has recently taken place with the Poor Law Board in reference to the Relief of Vagrants in the Guildford Union" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*)

Lambeth Workhouse—Mr. G. Catch, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 20, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House, Copies of the Evidence taken by Mr. Farnell at the inquiry held at St. Mary's, Newington, in the spring of 1866, and of the Correspondence between the Newington Board and the Poor Law Board which led to the removal of G. Catch from the office he then held" (*Mr. Percy Wyndham*), [190] 2046; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Pauper Idiots and Lunatics, Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 19, [190] 1887

Poor Law, Consolidation of the, Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Nov* 25, [190] 164

St. Luke's Parish, Guardians of, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Dec* 6, [190] 650

Schools and Charities, Exemption of, Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Nov* 28, [190] 331; Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 29, [193] 313

Scotland, Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, The Lord Advocate *June* 16, [192] 1631

Strand Union, Medical Officer of—Dr. Rogers, Question, Sir John Simeon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 26, [191] 261

Union Workhouses and Infirmaries, Motion for Papers (*The Earl of Devon*) *Nov* 28, [190] 315; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Vagrancy, Question, Mr. Floyer; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 13, [193] 1102

Walsall Workhouse, Question, Mr. C. Forster; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Dec* 5, [190] 631

Poor Law and Medical Inspectors (Ireland) Bill (*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)

c. Ordered * *June* 10
Read 1° * *June* 22 [Bill 183]
Read 2° * *July* 2
Committee *; Report *July* 3
Read 3° * *July* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 7
Read 2ª * *July* 14 (No. 222)
Committee *; Report *July* 16
Read 3ª * *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 74]

Poor Law Board Provisional Order Confirmation Bill (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Sir James Fergusson*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 13 [Bill 231]
Read 2° * *July* 15
Committee *; Report *July* 16
Read 3° * *July* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 17
Read 2ª * *July* 24 (No. 266)
Committee *; Report *July* 27
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 150]

Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Serjeant Barry, Major Gavin*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 4 [Bill 103]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 14

Poor Law—Law for Relief of the Poor

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to request that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the Operation and Administration of the Laws for the Relief of the Poor in England and Wales" (*The Marquess Townshend*) *June* 12, [192] 1462; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Poor Rates Assessment, &c.

Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the assessment and collection of Poor Rates and other local Rates and Taxes in England and Wales" (*Mr. Ayrton*) *Mar* 10, [190] 1396

And, on *Mar* 16, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Ayrton (Chairman), Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Bright, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Edward Hamilton, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Hodgkinson, Colonel Hogg, Mr. Kekewich, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. Paull, Mr. Powell, Mr. St. Aubyn, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Villiers, and Mr. Woodd

Report of Select Committee *June* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 342)

Poor Rates Assessment, Question, Mr. White; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 10, [193] 999; Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 31, 1941

Poor Relief Assessment Returns, Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 12, [192] 1470

Poor Relief Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Devon*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 13 (No. 39)
191] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 24, 138; Bill read 2ª
. Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee" *Mar* 30, 457; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill referred to a Select Committee
And, on *April* 2, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Abp. York, D. Richmond, M. Salisbury, E. Devon, E. Denbigh, E. Hardwicke, E. Carnarvon, E. Grey, E. Ducie, E. Ellenborough, E. Kimberley, V. Eversley, L. Clinton, L. Egerton, and L. Northbrook
Report of Select Committee *May* 22 (No. 110)
192] Committee—R.P. *May* 28, 946 (No. 111)
. Committee *June* 16, 1621 (No. 132)
. Report *June* 18, 1743 (No. 155)
. Read 3ª *June* 23, 1910 (No. 162)
c. Read 1° * *June* 23 [Bill 186]
Read 2° * *June* 29
Committee *—R.P. *July* 14
193] Committee—R.P. *July* 17, 1421
. Committee—R.P. *July* 21, 1605
. Committee; Report *July* 27, 1871
. Considered *July* 28, 1908; after short debate, Bill read 3°
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 122]

Portland Convict Prison
Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *Nov* 26, [190] 179

PORTMAN, Lord
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [192] 907, 911; Motion for a Committee, 916; Explanation, 946; Report, [193] 987
Charge of the Bishop of Salisbury, [190] 130, 132, 137, 140
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 9, Amendt. [192] 1621, 1627

Portpatrick and Belfast and County Down Railway Companies Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Resolution in Committee *June* 26
Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 29 [Bill 201]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 6, [193] 781; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *July* 8
Considered * *July* 9
Read 3° * *July* 9
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Richmond*) *July* 10 (No. 238)
Read 2ª* *July* 16
Committee *; Report *July* 17
Read 3ª* *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 81]

Portugal, Commercial Treaty with
Question, Colonel Barttelot; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 28, [190] 331

Post Office
Abyssinia, Postage from, Question, Mr. Butler; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 5, [190] 1115
American Mail Subsidies, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 5, [192] 342
Annual Reports, 1866 *and* 1867, Question, Mr. Moffatt; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 8, [191] 2001; Questions, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Crawford; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 12, [192] 1476
Australia—Postal Communication with, Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 20, [190] 1979; Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 12, [192] 1472
Cape Mail Contract, Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 26, [192] 923; Question, Mr. Morrison; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 5, 1180
Circular Delivery Companies, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 29, [193] 1922

East India Mail Services
East Indies, Postal Communication with the—The Brindisi Route, Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 15, [192] 1561
India, China, and Japan Mails—Contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, Question, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Answer, The Duke of Montrose *Nov* 25, [190] 157
Moved, "That the Contract for the Conveyance of Mails between this Country, India, China, and Japan, with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company be approved" (*Mr. Hunt*) *Nov* 29, [190] 450; after long debate, Question put; A. 55, N. 13; M. 42
Mail Services Estimates, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 26, [191] 258
Penang, Postal Communication with, Question, Mr. T. Baring; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 4, [192] 1109
Postage Rates to India, Question, Sir Henry Rawlinson; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Nov* 25, [190] 167

Electric Telegraphs, Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 15, [192] 1564
French Mails, Contract for—Mr. Churchward, Question, Mr. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 24, [190] 1072
London Letter Carriers, Question, Mr. Bathurst; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 22, [192] 1853
Malta, Communication with, Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Feb* 17, [190] 801; *Feb* 28, 1102; Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 9, 1226
Money Orders and Stamped Receipts, Question, Mr. Carnegie; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 25, [192] 2134
Postal Communication with Ireland—Queenstown, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr Hunt *Nov* 29, [190] 418

[*cont.*

Post Office—cont.

Postal Services—Proportionate Contributions, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 25, [192] 817

Postal Subsidies, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 20, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, no Postal Subsidies in the form of a fixed payment, and not dependent on the number of letters and newspapers carried, should be granted where ordinary traffic supports several lines of passenger steamers as is the case between this country and the United States of America" (*Mr. Baxter*), [190] 2010; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Post Office, General, Case of A. J. Duffy, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 24, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the circumstances connected with the removal of Anthony J. Duffy from his appointment of permanent clerk in the Circulation department of the General Post Office" (*Sir Patrick O'Brien*), [191] 1296; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Post Office (Ireland)—Officers' Salaries, Question, General Dunne; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 15, [192] 1562

Southern District Post Office, Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 27, [191] 358

Sunday Labour in the, Observations, Mr. M'Laren; Reply, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 25, [192] 2161

United States, Postal Communication with the

Cunard Contract, The Question, Mr. Graham; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Nov* 28, [190] 333

National Steam Ship Company, The Mails to New York, Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Dec* 5, [190] 604

Postal Convention, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 25, [192] 2132

Postal Convention with, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 20, [190] 987

Postal Service with, Observations Mr. Ayrton; short debate thereon *Dec* 7, [190] 678

United States Mails, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 16, [190] 1685

Vancouver's Island, Postal Communication with, Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 16, [193] 1289

West India Mail Service

Halifax, Bermuda, and St. Thomas Mails, Moved, "That the Contract entered into with Mr. W. Cunard for the conveyance of Mails between Halifax, Bermuda, and St. Thomas, be approved" (*Mr. Hunt*) *Dec* 5, [190] 632; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Question, Mr. Bouverie; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 23, [193] 1669

St. Thomas—Island of, Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Dec* 2, [190] 508; Questions, Mr. Gilpin, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Dec* 6, 665; Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Feb* 14, 731; Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 25, [192] 815

[*cont.*

Post Office—cont.

West India and Pacific Company, Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 2, [193] 519

West India Mail Contracts, Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 24, [191] 1222

POTTER, Mr. E., *Carlisle*
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [193] 1591; *cl.* 15, 1603
Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 2007
Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 169
Supply—Education, Public, Report, [192] 1607

POTTER, Mr. T. Bayley, *Rochdale*
Army—Perth Barracks, [190] 329
Diplomatic Service, Res. [192] 931
Foreign Office—Diplomatic Agents, [190] 542, 986
France—Paris Exhibition, [191] 356
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 974

POWELL, Mr. F. S., *Cambridge*
Army Estimates—Surveys, [193] 964
Army—Shoeburyness Experiments, [190] 1813
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [190] 1431; Comm. *cl.* 24, Amendt. [191] 676; *cl.* 27, Amendt. *ib.*, 677; *cl.* 28, Amendt. *ib.*; *add. cl.* 1064, 1065, 1066; Consid. 1566
Boundary, Comm. [192] 284; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1440
Bristol, Representation of, [191] 359
Colliery Accidents, Motion for a Commission, [192] 944
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 4, [190] 1417
Courts of Justice, New, Motion for a Committee, [193] 336
Crete—Disturbances in, [190] 165
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, [191] 1198; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1201
Education—Report of Council, [193] 608
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [193] 742, 743; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 746; *cl.* 45, Amendt. 1178; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1184; *cl.* 47, 1372; Consid. 1637; *add. cl.* 1647, 1649
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1937
Lee River Conservancy, Leave, [190] 999
Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. [192] 232; [193] 426
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 9, Amendt. [193] 1614; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1871, 1872, 1875, 1879; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1880; Lords Amendts. 1906
Public Schools, Re-comm. [192] 1641; *cl.* 5, 1924; *cl.* 16, 1946; *cl.* 21, Amendt. [193] 817
Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 570
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 484; *cl.* 7, 858; *cl.* 8, 884
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1860
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 987
    Education, Public, [192] 1148; Report, Amendt. 1607
    Public Buildings, [192] 292
    Science and Art, [192] 1166

[*cont.*

POWELL, Mr. F. S.—*cont.*
West Indies, Lords Amendts. Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1888
Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 232
Workshop Regulation Act, [193] 517

POWIS, Earl of
Cotton Statistics, 2R. [192] 709

PRICE, Mr. W. P., *Gloucester*
Boundary, Comm. [192] 277

Princess of Wales, H.R.H.—Birth of a Princess

LORDS—
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to congratulate Her Majesty on The Princess of Wales having happily given birth to a Princess, and to assure Her Majesty of the deep Interest felt by the House of Lords in all that concerns the domestic Happiness of Her Majesty and Her Family" (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 9, [193] 865; after short debate, agreed to, *Nemine Dissentiente*
The Queen's Answer to the Address reported *July* 13, 1090

COMMONS—
Address to the Queen (*Mr. Disraeli*) *July* 9, [193] 913
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to congratulate Her Majesty on the Princess of Wales having happily given birth to a Princess, and to assure Her Majesty of our feelings of devoted loyalty and attachment to Her Majesty's Person and Family" (*Mr. Disraeli*); Resolution agreed to, *Nemine Contradicente*
Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *July* 13, 1140

Prison Ministers Act
Moved, "That, in consequence of the persistent refusal or neglect of the authorities having control over certain of the county and borough Prisons of Great Britain to put in operation the powers given to them by the Prison Ministers Act, it is necessary they should be compelled by Law to make adequate provision for the religious instruction and Divine Worship of Catholic Prisoners" (*Mr. Maguire*) *June* 30, [193] 372; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Prisons (Compensation to Officers) Bill
(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 30 [Bill 80]
Read 2°* *April* 2
Committee*; Report *April* 20
Read 3 * *April* 21
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *April* 23
Read 2ª* *April* 27 (No. 72)
Committee*; Report *April* 28
Read 3ª* *April* 30
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 21]

Prisons (Ireland) Bill (*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 27 [Bill 256]

Prisons (Scotland) Administration Acts Amendment Bill
(*Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Dalglish*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 8 [Bill 155]
Read 2°*, and referred to a Select Committee
Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Edward Colebrooke (Chairman), Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Capper, Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Mr. Graham, Sir Edmund Lechmere, Sir Thomas Lloyd, Mr. Merry, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Vance, and Mr. Welby *June* 22
Report* *June* 26
Committee* (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 29
Committee*; Report *June* 30 [Bill 197]
Considered* *July* 1
Read 3°* *July* 1
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Home*) *July* 2
Read 2ª* *July* 7 (No. 202)
Committee*; Report *July* 9
Read 3ª* *July* 10
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 50]

Private Bills—see *Parliament*

Privy Council—Medical Officer of the—Report
Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 17, [190] 1812

Probate Duty on Leasehold Property
Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Dec* 6, [190] 648; *Feb* 14, 729

Probate of Wills, &c. (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Serjeant Barry*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 20 [Bill 129]
Read 2°* *June* 17
Bill withdrawn* *July* 18

Promissory Oaths Bill
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *Feb* 13, [190] 689 (No. 10)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Feb* 18, 851; after short debate, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee
And, on *Feb* 20, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—D. Richmond, E. Devon, L. Bp. Oxford, L. Lyveden, L. Westbury; *Feb* 21, Earl Russell added
Report of Select Committee *Mar* 23 (No. 51)
Committee* *April* 24
Report* *April* 27 (No. 52)
Read 3ª* *April* 28
c. Read 1°* *May* 12 [Bill 113]
Read 2°* *May* 29
Committee; Report *July* 8, [193] 853
Considered* *July* 9
Read 3°* *July* 10
l. Commons Amendts. considered *July* 15, 1227; after debate, agreed to (No. 243)
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 72]

Public Accounts
Committee nominated *Feb* 14, as follows:—Mr. Childers (Chairman), Mr. Algernon Egerton, Mr. Hankey, Mr. Howes, Mr. Laing, Mr. Liddell, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. Sclater-Booth, and Mr. Seely
Moved, "That those who conduct the audit of Public Accounts on behalf of the House of Commons ought to be independent of the Executive Government and directly responsible to this House; and that, inasmuch as the appointment, salaries, and pensions of the officers entrusted with the conduct of such audit are more or less under the control of the Treasury, the present system is one which imperatively calls for revision" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *May* 12, [192] 116; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Report of Select Committee *July* 21 (*Parl. P.* No. 452)

Publications, Registration of
Observations, Mr. Ayrton; Reply, The Attorney General; short debate thereon *June* 12, [192] 1509
Exemption of Small Pamphlets from Security, Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 20, [190] 1974

Publications—Sale of Illegal
Question, Mr. Percy Wyndham; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 19, [192] 512
Immoral Publications and Plays, Question, Mr. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 15, [192] 1558

Public Departments, Concentration of
Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 13, [193] 1105

Public Departments (Extra Receipts) Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Dec* 7 [Bill 26]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 13, [190] 692; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *Feb* 17
Read 3° * *Feb* 24
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *Feb* 24
Read 2ª * *Mar* 5 (No. 25)
Committee *; Report *Mar* 9
Read 3ª * *Mar* 10
Royal Assent *Mar* 30 [31 *Vict.* c. 9]

Public Departments Payments Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 6 [Bill 212]
Read 2° * *July* 10
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Considered * *July* 15
Read 3° * *July* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 16
Read 2ª * *July* 20 (No. 264)
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 90]

Public Departments—Report of the Commissioners
Question, Mr. Parry; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 6, [193] 716

Public Health, Departments of
Moved, "That it is expedient that the Departments of Public Health, Cattle Plague, and Quarantine should cease to exist as Establishments, due regard being had to all personal interests and to all individual claims" (*Sir J. Clarke Jervoise*) *July* 14, [193] 1194; after short debate, Motion negatived

Public Offices, The New—The India and Foreign Offices
Question, Lord Redesdale; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *Mar* 24, [191] 102; *May* 1, 1683; short debate thereon

Public Schools
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of any Petitions or Memorials on the Subject of Public Schools which have been received by Her Majesty's Government since the 1st of July, 1866" (*The Earl Stanhope*) *June* 15, [192] 1538; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Public Schools Bill
(*Mr. Walpole, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
190] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Mr. Walpole*) *Dec* 5, 634
Bill ordered, after short debate; read 1° *
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 14, 742; after long debate, Bill read 2° [Bill 24]
Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 24, 1073; Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 28, 1101; Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 20, 1982
Committee *Mar* 20, 2032 [Bill 47]
Moved, "That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Walpole*); after short debate, Bill committed to a Select Committee
And, on *Mar* 26, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Walpole (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Benyon, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Clement, Mr. Grant Duff, Viscount Enfield, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Darby Griffith, Sir William Heathcote, Mr. Howes, Mr. Mowbray, Mr. Neate, Mr. Neville-Grenville, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Powell, and Mr. Stone
Report * *May* 22 [Bill 135]
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 16, [192] 1631
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be referred back to the Select Committee, in order that Clauses may be inserted in it giving power to the new governing bodies and the Commissioners to be appointed by the Bill to deal with the constitution and revenues of Eton and Winchester Colleges" (*Mr. Neate*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.

[*cont.*

Public Schools Bill—cont.
Committee—R.P. *June* 23, 1924
193] Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 7, 812
Considered * *July* 14
Read 3º * *July* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Derby*) *July* 16
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 20, 1461; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 262)
Committee *July* 23, 1651
Report *July* 24, 1701 (No. 285)
Read 3ª * *July* 27 (No. 288)
c. Lords Amendts. considered *July* 28, 1903
Page 9, line 10, Amendment read 2º [Bill 254]
Moved, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*); after short debate, A. 28, N. 18; M. 10; other Amendments disagreed to; subsequent Amendments agreed to
Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons, &c."
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 118]

PUGH, Mr. D., *Carmarthenshire*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 72
Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1871
Registration, 2R. [192] 1611

Queen Anne's Bounty Board
Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the management and constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board" (*Mr. Bouverie*) *May* 19, [192] 591
And, on *May* 28, Committee nominated as follows:— Mr. Bouverie (Chairman), Mr. Akroyd, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Lord Charles Bruce, Mr. Feilden, Mr. Greville-Nugent, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Howard, Mr. Howes, Mr. Monk, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Pease, Mr. John Peel, Mr. Powell, and Mr. Schreiber
Report of Select Committee *July* 17 (*Parl. P.* No. 439)
Accounts 1866-7-8 . . Nos. 110, 326

Queen's Counsel and of Precedence, Patents of
Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 29, [193] 307

Queensland—Labourers from the South Sea Islands
Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 13, [190] 1590; *May* 7, [191] 1882; *May* 25, [192] 816; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 17, [193] 1365

Railway and Gas Shares Bill
(*Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Graham*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie*) *Dec* 3, [190] 572
Bill ordered, after short debate; read 1º *
Bill withdrawn * *Mar* 5 [Bill 23]

Railway Companies Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Richmond*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 7 (No. 226)
Read 2ª * *July* 9
Committee *; Report *July* 13
Read 3ª * *July* 14
c. Read 1º * *July* 14 [Bill 237]
Read 2º * *July* 16
Committee *; Report *July* 17
Read 3º * *July* 18
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 79]

Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances Bill (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1º * *June* 17 [Bill 177]
Read 2º * *June* 25
Committee *; Report *June* 30
Read 3º * *July* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *July* 3
Read 2ª * *July* 17 (No. 205)
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 94]

Railways
Brecon and Neath Railway, Accident upon the, Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, The Duke of Richmond *May* 7, [191] 1879
Carriage of Parcels by Railway, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 27, [191] 1333; Question, Viscount Halifax; Answer, The Duke of Richmond *April* 28, 1425
Drivers and Guards, Communication between, Question, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Answer, The Duke of Richmond *Dec* 5, [190] 575
Insolvent Railway Companies, Moved, "That in case of an Insolvent Railway Company applying for an extension of time or for any other power, and where such Railway Company have applied to the Court of Chancery for a scheme of arrangement under the Railway Act of 1867, such Railway Company shall on or before the 30th of November immediately preceding the application for the Bill, deposit in the Private Bill Office a Schedule setting forth the full detailed particulars disclosing all transactions of such Company, and to answer all and every question or questions hereunder set out;" [List of Questions] (*Mr. Treeby*) *Mar* 19, [190] 1884; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Railway Engines, Fires from, Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 16, [193] 1287
Railways Bill, Revision of, Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Sir William Hutt *Mar* 23, [191] 35
Railways (Ireland), Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, A Copy of the Instructions issued to the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State and Value of the Railways of Ireland" (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *Mar* 9, [190] 1209; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Royal Commission on—Report of, Question, Mr. Horsfall; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 12, [192] 115

[*cont.*

Railways—cont.
Transfer of Debenture Stock, Stamp Duties on, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 8, [192] 1227
Trent Valley Line, Accidents on the, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Feb* 14, [190] 731
(See *Ireland*)
See title *Parliament—Private Bills—Private Bill Legislation*

Railways and Joint Stock Companies Accounts Bill
(*Sir William Hutt, Mr. Ellice*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Sir William Hutt*) *Mar* 9, [190] 1280
Bill ordered, after short debate; read 1° *
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 29, [191] 1535; after short debate, Bill read 2° [Bill 53]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 24

Railways (Extension of Time) Bill
(*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Stephen Cave*) *Feb* 20, [190] 1000
Bill ordered, after short debate; read 1° *
Read 2° * *Feb* 24 [Bill 39]
Committee *; Report *Mar* 5
Considered * *Mar* 6
Read 3° * *Mar* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *Mar* 10
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 16, 1675; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 36)
Committee * *Mar* 27
Report * *Mar* 30
Read 3ª * *Mar* 31
Royal Assent *May* 21 [31 *Vict.* c. 18]

Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication) Bill
(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Sir Patrick O'Brien*)
c. Bill ordered * *Nov* 26
Read 1° * *Mar* 18 [Bill 66]
2R. deferred, after short debate *Mar* 24, [191] 206
Read 2° * *May* 20
Bill withdrawn * *June* 17

Railways (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Serjeant Barry, Mr. Sullivan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 18 [Bill 123]
Read 2° * *June* 23
Committee *; Report *June* 24
Read 3° * *June* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Granard*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *July* 10 (No. 177)
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 70]

RAMSAY, Mr. J., *Stirling, &c.*
Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 2011
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* K., [193] 1885
Scotland—Middle Class Schools, [193] 653
Supply—Post Office, [193] 833

Rating of Charitable Institutions
Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Nov* 28, [190] 331; Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 4, [191] 1693; Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 29, [193] 313

RAVENSWORTH, Lord
Boundary, Report, Amendt. [193] 710
Capital Punishment within Prisons, 3R. *add. cl.* [192] 14
Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 580

RAWLINSON, Sir H. C., *Frome*
East India, Troops and Vessels (Abyssinian Expedition), Res. [190] 383
Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. [192] 1878; *cl.* 1, 1889; *cl.* 2, [193] 860
India—Bank of Bombay, [191] 147, 427
Postage Rates to India, [190] 167
India—Telegraphic Communication, Motion for Papers, [193] 164
Russia and Bokhara, [192] 955

READ, Mr. C. S., *Norfolk, E.*
Agriculture, Motion for a Committee, [192] 584
Cattle Plague, [190] 92; [191] 1578;—Compensation for, [193] 1288
Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1751
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 1429
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1552
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 3R. [193] 1729
Fires from Railway Engines, [193] 1287
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 636; *cl.* 2, 1536, 1775
Mines Assessment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 851
Poor Relief, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1885
Supply—Board of Trade, [193] 1204, 1206
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1726

REARDEN, Mr. D. J., *Athlone*
Barrett, The Convict, [191] 1579
Burials (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1083
Canada—Alleged Flogging in a Prison, [192] 1698, 1699
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1684
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1534, 1620; [192] 1203, 1204
Fenian Convicts at Manchester, [190] 122
Fines and Fees (Ireland), 2R. [190] 1230
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 937
Habeas Corpus Suspension Acts (Ireland), Motion for a Return, [190] 1939
Her Majesty The Queen, Notice, [192] 711
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. [191] 218; *cl.* 11, 223
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Arrests in, [191] 833
Political Prisoners, [190] 1891
Sullivan and Pigott, Messrs., Imprisonment of, [191] 450
Lectures on Religion, [192] 346
Libel, 2R. [191] 672
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1424; *cl.* 10, 1874

[*cont.*

Rearden, Mr. D. J.—*cont.*
Remission of Sentences, Motion for an Address, [190] 571
Repeal of the Union (Ireland), Leave, [193] 1948
Representation of the People (Ireland), Leave, [190] 1949 ; 2R. [191] 1952 ; Comm. Amendt. [192] 1571, 1572 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1585 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1586 ; *add. cl.* 1778 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1898
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 848 ; 2R. 1234, 1259, 1260 ; Comm. [192] 472, 473
Train, G. F., Case of, [193] 1943

Rebow, Mr. J. G., *Colchester*
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1551

Record Publications
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 26, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the prices of the Record Publications ought to be reduced from fifteen shillings to ten shillings, and from ten shillings to six shillings, and that the Statutes of Ireland, from the first meeting of the Irish Parliament to the Union with England, ought to be published at the national expense" (*Mr. Pim*), [193] 165 ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. and original Motion withdrawn

Redesdale, Lord (Chairman of Committees)
Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1393
Boundary, Report, [193] 712
Consecration of Churchyards Act Amendment, 2R. [192] 508 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 898
* Coronation Oath, Address for a Paper, [193] 1345
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1842
East London Museum Site, Explanation, [190] 636, 640 ; Comm. 793 ; Report, 860
Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, 3R. [190] 1677, 1678
Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland, Motion for a Committee, [191] 245
Education, Withdrawal of Bill, [192] 411
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [193] 1813 ; 3R. Amendt. 1895
Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1452 ; [192] 1919
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 16, 19
Foreshores, Motion for Papers, [193] 1552
Metropolis—Statues in Westminster Hall, [193] 979
Parliament—Business of the House, Report of Select Committee, [191] 565, 570 ; Res. 694, 695
Parliament—Public Petitions, Motion for a Select Committee, [191] 689, 690
Poor Relief, Comm. [191] 465 ; [192] 946 ; Report, 1744
Public Offices, The New, [191] 102, 104, 1683, 1684
Public Schools, Report, [193] 1708
Railway Bills—Increase of Rates, Res. [193] 1071, 1072, 1077 ; Amendt. 1226
Railways (Extension of Time), 2R. [190] 1676
[*cont.*

Redesdale, Lord—*cont.*
Regulation of Railways, 2R. [190] 1961, 1972 ; [192] 13 ; Report, *cl.* 14, 416 ; *add. cl.* 419, 421 ; 3R. Amendt. 707, 708
Representation of the People (Scotland), Report, [193] 715 ; 3R. Amendt. 803, 808
Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy, Comm. [192] 1556 ; Report, *add. cl.* 1629, 1630 ; 3R. *add. cl.* 1744, 1745, 1746, 1748
South Coast Railways, 2R. [192] 1457 ; 3R. [193] 360, 362, 1344 ; Commons Amendts. 1543, 1545
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [193] 1549, 1550
University Elections (Voting Papers), 2R. [193] 983
Vagrancy—Guildford Union, Motion for Correspondence, [192] 99

Reformatory Schools (Ireland) Bill
(*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 17 [Bill 65]
Read 2° * *Mar* 30
Committee * ; Report *May* 21
Considered * *May* 22
Read 3° * *May* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *May* 26
Read 2ª * *July* 3 (No. 122)
Committee * ; Report *July* 7
Read 3ª * *July* 13
Royal Assent *July* 16 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 59]

Registration Bill
(*Mr. Secretary G. Hardy, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *June* 11, [192] 1398
After debate, Bill ordered ; read 1° * [Bill 167]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 15, 1609 ; after short debate, Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on *June* 23, Committee nominated as follows : — Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Bouverie, Sir George Bowyer, Sir Robert Collier, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Garth, Mr. Graves, Sir George Grey, Mr. Hibbert, Sir Rainald Knightley, Mr. Leeman, Sir Charles Russell, The Solicitor General, and Captain Surtees
Report * *June* 25 [Bill 190]
Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 2, [193] 561 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Committee ; Report
Considered * *July* 3
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 6, 720 ; after short debate, Bill read 3°
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 6
Read 2ª, after debate *July* 7, 803 (No. 218)
Committee * ; Report *July* 9
Read 3ª * *July* 13
Royal Assent *July* 16 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 58]

Registration (Ireland) Bill
(*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Earl of Mayo*) *July* 6, [193] 782
Bill ordered ; read 1° * [Bill 213]
Read 2° * *July* 9
[*cont.*

Registration (Ireland) Bill—cont.
Committee; Report *July* 20, 1486 [Bill 248]
Considered * *July* 22
Read 3° * *July* 22
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 23
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 24, 1709; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *July* 27 (No. 281)
Read 3ª, after short debate *July* 28, 1897
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 112]

Registration of Writs (Scotland) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Colonsay*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Feb* 17 (No. 15)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 6, [190] 1147; Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *Mar* 9
Read 3ª * *Mar* 10
c. Read 1° * *Mar* 13 [Bill 62]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*The Lord Advocate*) *Mar* 23, [191] 100; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *May* 18
Considered * *May* 28
Read 3° * *May* 29
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 34]

Registry of Deeds Office (Ireland)
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the legal application of the surplus fines in the Office of the Registry of Deeds, Ireland" (*General Dunne*) *Feb* 24, [190] 1077; after short debate, Question put, and negatived

Regulation of Railways Bill [H.L.] (*The Duke of Richmond*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 9 (No. 34)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 20, [190] 1955; after debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *May* 11, [192] 6 (No. 88)
Report *May* 18, 412 (No. 95)
Read 3ª *May* 22, 707; after short debate, Bill passed (No. 101)
c. Read 1° * *May* 28 [Bill 142]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Stephen Cave*) *June* 8, 1294; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee *—R.P. *June* 29
Committee; Report *July* 24, [193] 1733
Considered *July* 25, 1781; after debate, Bill read 3°
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 119]

Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites) Bill (*Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Akroyd*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Nov* 29 [Bill 18]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 1, [191] 662; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *April* 21
Considered * *April* 22
Read 3° * *April* 24

Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Cranworth*) *April* 27
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 14, [192] 233; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 77)
Committee *; Report *May* 26
Re-comm. *June* 18, 1741 (No. 128)
Report * *June* 19 (No. 161)
Read 3ª * *June* 25
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 44]

Renewable Leasehold Conversion (Ireland) Act Extension Bill (*Mr. Gregory, Mr. George Morris*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 12 [Bill 61]
Read 2° * *April* 2
Committee *; Report *June* 22
Re-comm. *; Report *June* 25 [Bill 182]
Read 3° * *June* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *June* 29 (No. 184)
Read 2ª * *July* 7
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Read 3ª * *July* 14
Royal Assent *July* 16 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 62]

Repeal of the Union with Ireland Bill
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Rearden*) *July* 31, [193] 1948
[The Motion found no Seconder, and was therefore not put from the Chair]

Representation of the People (1867) *England Act*
Amended Boundary Plans, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 8, [192] 1230
Assistant Boundary Commissioners, Questions, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answers, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 24, [191] 146; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 9, [192] 1335
192] *Boundaries of Boroughs*—Orders of the Day postponed (*Mr. Disraeli*) *May* 18, 426
After short debate, Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Boundaries of the following Boroughs, as laid down by the Boundary Commissioners, and to report what, if any, alterations should be made therein [List of the Boroughs], 430
Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Austin Bruce, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, Mr. Walpole, and Mr. Whitbread
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on Boundaries of Boroughs that they have power to consider the Petitions presented to this House on the subject of the places of nomination for County Elections; that the Petitions from South Molton, Barnstaple, Torrington, and Ilfracombe, relative to the place of nomination for the Northern Division of the county of Devon, be referred to the Committee" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) *May* 28, 1011; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Report of the Select Committee, Observations, Mr. Walpole *May* 29, 1044 (*Parl. P.* No. 311)

[*cont.*

Representation of the People (1867) *England Act* —cont.

Boundary Commissioners' Report, Question, Mr. Beaumont; Answer, Mr. Gathorne
190] Hardy *Feb* 14, 733; Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy
. *Mar* 9, 1218; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer,
. Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 11, 1397; Question, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Answer,
. The Earl of Malmesbury *Mar* 17, 1795; Question, Mr. Stopford; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 5, [192] 1181

Compound Householders—Personal Payment, Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, The Attorney General; short debate thereon
. *Nov* 20, 437; Questions, Mr. Goschen, Sir William Hutt; Answers, The Attor-
. ney General *Dec* 2, 515; Question, Mr. Sandford; Answer, The Chancellor of the
. Exchequer *Feb* 14, 730; Question, Mr. E. Hamilton; Answer, The Chancellor
. of the Exchequer *Feb* 17, 795; Question, Mr. Schreiber; Answer, The Chancellor of
. the Exchequer *Feb* 18, 886; Question, Mr. Evans; Answer, The Attorney General
. *Mar* 19, 1888; Question, Mr. Schreiber; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 5, [191] 1785; Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 14, [192] 246

Compounding for Rates, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that so much of the Reform Act of 1867 as makes occupiers liable for Poor Rates instead of owners, in respect of premises to which the system of compounding had been applied, ought to be repealed; that the name of every occupier ought to be put on the rate book, and that payment of rates by the owner, under the compounding system, ought to be deemed payment by the occupier and entitle him to the franchise" (*Mr. James White*), [190] 1893; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Disfranchised Boroughs—Totnes, Great Yarmouth, Lancaster, and Reigate, Observations, Mr. Otway, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee *Nov* 29, [190] 434

Ratepaying Clauses, Question, Observations, The Duke of Argyll; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *Mar* 13, [190] 1550; long debate thereon

Rating—Small Tenements Act—Question, Sir William Hutt; Answer, The Attorney General *Nov* 25, [190] 167—*Morning Sittings*, Questions, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 8, [192] 1228

Registration Lists, Question, Lord Henley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 12, [192] 1477

Registration of Voters—Legislation, Question, Sir Edward Buller; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 28, [191] 1458

Registration of Voters Act—Dissolution of Parliament, Observations, Mr. Bouverie; Reply, The Solicitor General; debate thereon *May* 15, [192] 371

Registration of Voters, 1868, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *June* 8, [192] 1223

The Lodger Franchise—Stamper v. *the Overseers of Sunderland*, Observations, Mr. Candlish; short debate thereon *July* 9, [193] 904

Representation of the People (Ireland) Bill (*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)

c. Motion for Leave (*The Earl of Mayo*) *Mar* 19, [190] 1940
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Colonel French*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill ordered; read 1° *
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 7, [191] 1949; after debate, Bill read 2°
192] Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *May* 26, 922
. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 15, 1571; Motion agreed to [Bill 71]
. Committee, after short debate—R.P. 1581
. Committee *June* 18, 1762; after long debate, Bill reported [Bill 179]
. Considered *June* 22, 1892
Read 3° * *June* 25
l. Read 1^{a} * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 26
193] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}" *June* 30, 368; after short debate, Bill read 2^{a}
. Committee; Report, after short debate *July* 7, 800 (No. 176)
. Read 3^{a} * *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 49]

Representation of the People—Scotland and Ireland—Bills

Questions, Mr. Baxter, Sir Henry Winston-Barron; Answers, The Chancellor of the
190] Exchequer *Feb* 13, 690; Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Earl of Mayo
. *Feb* 14, 730; Question, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; Answer, Mr. Disraeli; debate
. thereon *Mar* 6, 1189; Question, Colonel
. French; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 19, 1892

Poor Assessment (*Scotland*), Motion for Return of Deductions allowed [and other Particulars] (*The Earl of Airlie*) *Mar* 27, [191] 328; Motion agreed to

Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir James Fergusson*)

190] *c.* Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *Feb* 17, 811
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° * [Bill 29]
. Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 28, 1103
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 9, 1234
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Hadfield*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Bill read 2°
. Questions, Mr. Moncreiff, Mr. Bouverie; Answers, Mr. Disraeli *Mar* 19, 1890
191] Committee deferred, after short debate *Mar* 23, 99
. Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 3, 829; Questions, Mr. Moncreiff, Mr. Bouverie; Answers, Mr. Disraeli *May* 7,
. 1885; Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer,
. Mr. Disraeli *May* 8, 2004; Questions, Sir Andrew Agnew, Mr. Moncreiff; Answers,

[*cont.*

Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill—cont.

192] Mr. Disraeli *May* 11, 18; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 15, 346

. Order for Committee read *May* 18, 435

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that, instead of adding to the numbers of the House, they have power to disfranchise Boroughs in England having, by the Census returns of 1861, less than 5,000 inhabitants" (*Mr. Baxter*)

Amendt. to leave out from "Power," and add "to take one seat from Boroughs in England returning two Members, and having, by the Census returns of 1861, less than 12,000 inhabitants" (*Sir Rainald Knightley*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 217, N. 196; M. 21; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 461

Main Question put, and agreed to

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"

. Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "no arrangement respecting additional Members can be just or satisfactory which does not treat Scotland, as respects the number of its representatives in Parliament, as an integral portion of the United Kingdom, entitled to be placed on a footing of perfect equality with England and Ireland, in proportion to its present population and the Revenue which it yields to the National Exchequer, as compared with the present population and Revenue of England and Ireland; and that to establish this equality at least fifteen additional Members should now be provided for Scotland" (*Mr. M'Laren*), 466; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Motion withdrawn; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," agreed to

. Bill considered in Committee, 473; after long debate—R.P.

. Question, Mr. Dalglish; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 19, 513

. Ministerial Statement (*Mr. Disraeli*) *May* 21, 619

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Percy Wyndham*); after long debate, Motion withdrawn

. Committee R.P., after long debate *May* 25, 840

. Questions, Mr. Yorke, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, Mr. Disraeli *May* 28, 954

. Committee *May* 28, 956; after long debate—R.P.

. Committee *June* 8, 1231; after long debate, Bill reported [Bill 154]

. Considered *June* 11, 1444
Considered * *June* 18
Read 3° * *June* 18 [Bill 166]

l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 19

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 23, 1913; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 164)

193] Committee *June* 30, 362

. Report *July* 6, 715 (No. 192)

. Read 3ª *July* 7, 803 (No. 220)

[*cont.*

Representation of the People (Ireland) Bill—cont.

193] Moved, at the end of the Bill to add the following clause:—"That the Boundaries of the City of Glasgow shall, until otherwise directed by Parliament, be those specified in Schedule (K.) hereunto annexed" (*The Lord Redesdale*); after short debate, Cont. 13, Not-Cont. 53; M. 40; resolved in the negative; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 809

c. Lords Amendts. considered *July* 9, 918

Amendts. as far as the Amendt. in page 24, line 32, agreed to [Bill 215]

Page 24, line 32, the next Amendt. read 2°

Amendt. to add to the said Amendt. the words "after the expiration of the present year and" (*Mr. M'Laren*); Question, "That the words, &c.; A. 124, N. 104; M. 20; Amendt. as amended, agreed to

Several other Amendts. agreed to; one disagreed to

Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons, &c."

Reasons for disagreeing to Lords Amendt. reported, and agreed to; to be communicated to The Lords

l. Observations, The Earl of Malmesbury *July* 9, 903

Bill returned from the Commons, with several of the Amendments made by the Lords agreed to; certain Amendments agreed to, with Amendments; and One Amendment disagreed to, for which they assign a Reason; The said Reason, and Bill, with the Amendments, to be printed (No. 235)

. Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts. and Commons Reason for disagreeing to one of the Amendts. made by the Lords considered; One disagreed to *July* 10, 974

Moved, "That this House do disagree to the Amendment made by the Commons to the Amendment made by the Lords in page 24, line 32" (*The Lord Privy Seal*); after short debate, Motion agreed to

Other of the Commons Amendments agreed to; and Lords Amendment to which the Commons disagree not insisted on; and a Committee appointed, &c.

. *c.* Lords Reason for disagreeing to one of the Commons Amendments to Lords Amendments considered *July* 10, 1067

After short debate, Resolved, That this House doth not insist upon the Amendment made by this House to the Amendment made by their Lordships, to which The Lords have disagreed

Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 48]

REPTON, Mr. G. W. J., *Warwick Bo.*
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1454

Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal Bill (*Mr. Monk, Sir H. Verney, Mr. Otway*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 24 [Bill 76]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 10, [192] 1352; after short debate, Bill read 2°

[*cont.*

Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal Bill—cont.
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 12, 1533; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*); A. 36, N. 52; M. 16
Question again proposed; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Lord Edwin Hill-Trevor*); Question negatived
Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Powell*); A. 33; N. 42; M. 9
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," negatived
Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *June* 15, 1565
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 30, [193] 389
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); after debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 79, N. 47; M. 32; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee; Report
Read 3° * *July* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Abinger*) *July* 3
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 13, 1078; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 204)
Committee *; Report *July* 14 (No. 214)
Read 3ª * *July* 17
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 73]

Ribbons, Importation of Foreign
Question, Mr. Eaton; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 29, [193] 308

Richmond, Duke of (President of the Board of Trade)
Alkali Act Continuance, 2R. [192] 509, 510
Brecon and Neath Railway, Accident on the, [191] 1881
Capital Punishment within Prisons, 2R. [191] 1879; 3R. *add. cl.* [192] 14
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. [191] 1572
Cotton Statistics, 2R. [192] 710
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 213
Foreshore and Bed of the Sea, [192] 1823, 1824, 1830; Motion for Papers, [193] 1551, 1552
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 1065
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1690
Parliament—Business of the House, [190] 1099
Promissory Oaths, Commons Amendts. [193] 1227
Railway Bills—Increase of Rates, Res. [193] 1075
Railway Communication between Drivers and Guards, [190] 575
Railways (Extension of Time), 2R. [190] 1675
Railways (Ireland), Motion for an Address, [190] 1211
Railways Regulation—The Parcels Clause, [191] 1425

Richmond, Duke of—*cont.*
Regulation of Railways, 2R. [190] 1925; Comm. *cl.* 14, [192] 8; *cl.* 15, 9; *cl.* 16, 10, 11; *cl.* 17, 12; *cl.* 23, 13; Report, *cl.* 14, 412, 414, 416; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 418; *add. cl.* 420, 422; 3R. 709
Salmon Fisheries (Scotland), 2R. [192] 1628; Comm. 1916
Sea Fisheries, 2R. [191] 465, 466; Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 237, 238, 239
Sea Fisheries (Ireland), Re-comm. [192] 916, 917
South Coast Railways, 2R. [192] 1452; 3R. [193] 358; Commons Amendts. 1544

Ridley, Sir M. W., *Northumberland, N.*
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 1430

Ritual Commission—see *Church of England*

Rivers, Pollution of—Legislation on
Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 24, [190] 1072

Robertson, Mr. P. F., *Hastings*
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 471

Roebuck, Mr. J. A., *Sheffield*
Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 429, 432, 434
Boundary, Comm. [192] 271, 284
Brougham, Lord, The late, [193] 1829
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 14, [193] 1003, 1009; Amendt. 1011, 1012, 1014; Consid. 1648
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [191] 660, 710, 773, 779; Res. 1907
Libel, Comm. [192] 593, 594; *cl.* 1, 605, 606; *cl.* 3, 617
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1853, 1865, 1868, 1869, 1871; [191] 40
United States—The "Alabama" claims, Motion for an Address, [190] 1173

Roman Catholic Prisoners—Tothill Fields House of Correction
Observations, Mr. Maguire; short debate thereon *Dec* 3, [190] 547

Romilly, Lord
Bankruptcy Act Amendment, 2R. [193] 867; Comm. 1159, 1161, 1363
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, 2R. [191] 28; Comm. 1218, 1220
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 2R. [193] 1809; Comm. *cl.* 24, 1894
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 54
Foreshore and Bed of the Sea, [192] 1829
[*cont.*

ROMILLY Lord—*cont.*
Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Report, *add. cl.* [190] 577, 578
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 8
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), 2R. [192] 234; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1741
South Coast Railways, Commons Amendts. [193] 1548

Royal Academy—Burlington House
Question, Mr. Cowper; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 30, [191] 467; Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 30, 1580
(See title—*Courts of Justice, The New—Competition of Architects*)

ROYSTON, Right Hon. Viscount (Comptroller of the Household), *Cambridgeshire*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1485
Established Church (Ireland)—Reply to Address, [192] 113
Lords Commissioners' Speech—Her Majesty's Answer, [190] 129
Princess of Wales—Reply to Address, [193] 1140

Rule of the Road at Sea
Question, Mr. Holland; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 2, [191] 705; *June* 25, [192] 2136

RUSSELL, Earl
Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 589
Vote of Thanks, [193] 480
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 16, 47
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 500, 507
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1111, 1142, 1217; Comm. 1570; [193] 594; Report, 900
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [191] 817
Edinburgh, Duke of, Address to Her Majesty, [191] 1304
Education, Res. [190] 478, 482, 506
Education, 1R. [191] 134
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 2R. [193] 1797, 1807, 1808
Established Church (Ireland)—The Resolutions, [191] 1435, 1437
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 2070, 2105; [193] 19, 235, 283
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 1055
Italy—The Roman Question, [190] 599, 601
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 687
Ministerial Explanation — Public Business, [193] 575, 576
Ministerial Statement — Resignation of the Earl of Derby, [190] 1096;—Re-construction of the Ministry, 1105, 1106
Napier, Sir R. — The Queen's Message, [193] 973
Nova Scotia, Motion for an Address, [193] 708
Parliament—Business of the House, Report of Select Committee, [191] 570
Parliament—Notice of Questions, Res. [191] 691

[*cont.*

RUSSELL, Earl—*cont.*
Parliament—Public Petitions, Motion for a Select Committee, [191] 688, 690
Princess of Wales, Address to the Queen, [193] 865
Promissory Oaths, 2R. [190] 857
Reform Act, 1867—Ratepaying Clauses, [190] 1574, 1587
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [193] 802
Representation of the People (Scotland), [193] 904; Commons Amendts. 975
Uniformity of Public Worship, 2R. [193] 893
United States—The "Alabama" claims, Motion for Papers, [191] 333, 350
Whitsuntide Recess—State of Public Affairs, [192] 1026, 1032, 1034

RUSSELL, Colonel Sir C., *Berkshire*
Army—Breech-Loading Rifles, [190] 1225
Distinguished-Service Majors, [190] 733
Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 214, 322
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 89
Commissionaires, Corps of, [192] 246
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1339
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [191] 324
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 488
Ways and Means, Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1766

RUSSELL, Mr. A. J. E., *Tavistock*
Customs, Appointments in the, [193] 1286

Russia and Bokhara
Question, Sir Henry Rawlinson; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 28, [192] 955

RUTLAND, Duke of
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 72
Metropolis—New National Gallery, [192] 95

"St. Abbe," Survivors of the
Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 26, [191] 260

ST. ALBANS, Duke of
Egyptian Slave Trade, [192] 330

ST. AUBYN, Mr. J., *Cornwall, W.*
Army—Shoeing Horses, M. Charlier's method of, [193] 1817
Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1867; Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 852

ST. DAVIDS, Bishop of
Charge of the Bishop of Salisbury, [190] 139

ST. LEONARDS, Lord
Court of Appeal Chancery (Despatch of Business) Amendment, 1R. [190] 1038
Tenure (Ireland), 1R. [190] 1046; 2R. 1437

Saint Mary Somerset's Church, London, Bill (*Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Alderman Lawrence*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 10 [Bill 228]
Read 2° *, and committed to a Select Committee of Eight Members:— Mr. Powell (Chairman), Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Ormsby Gore, Mr. Darby Griffith, Mr. Alderman Lawrence, Marquess of Lorne, Lord John Manners, Mr. Philip Martin, Mr. Russell, Mr. Tite, and Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie
Report * *July* 20 [Bill 247]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 21
Read 3° * *July* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl Nelson*) *July* 23
Read 2ª * *July* 27 (No. 278)
Committee *; Report *July* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 29
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 127]

St. Petersburg, British Factory at
Question, Mr. Clay; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 23, [193] 1666; *July* 27, 1824

Sale of Liquors on Sunday Bill (*Mr. J. A. Smith, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Baines*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Nov* 28 [Bill 12]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 18, [190] 1831
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Locke*); after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c." put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Moved, "That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Hibbert*); after short debate, Bill committed to a Select Committee
Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Mr. J. A. Smith *Mar* 23, [191] 40
And, on *Mar* 26, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir James Fergusson (Chairman), Mr. Baines, Mr. Berkeley, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Evans, Colonel Fane (Hants), Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Horsfall, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Locke, Mr. Malcolm, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. John Abel Smith, Mr. Frederick Stanley, and Mr. Yorke
Report of Select Committee *July* 7 (No. 402)
Report * *July* 7

Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. O'Reilly, Lord Cremorne, Mr. Pim*)

c. Motion for Leave (*The O'Conor Don*) *Feb* 18, [190] 926
Bill ordered, read 1° * [Bill 31]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 5, 1144; after short debate, Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on *Mar* 16, Committee nominated as follows:— Mr. O'Reilly (Chairman), Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Major Gavin, Lord Claud Hamilton, Mr. Leader, Earl of Mayo, Mr. Monsell, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Murphy, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. Pim, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, and Mr. Stacpoole
Report of Select Committee *May* 26 (No. 280)
Re-comm. * *May* 26 [Bill 138]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 26

Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl Granville*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 19 (No. 103)
Read 2ª * *May* 28
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee" *June* 15, [192] 1554; after short debate, House in Committee
Report *June* 16, 1629 (No. 148)
Read 3ª *June* 18, 1744
c. Read 1° * *June* 22 [Bill 181]
Read 2° * *June* 29
Committee *—R.P. *July* 10
Committee; Report *July* 15, [193] 1214
Considered * *July* 17 [Bill 238]
Considered * *July* 20
Read 3° * *July* 21
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 121]

Sales of Reversions Bill (*Sir Roundell Palmer, Sir Robert Collier*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Nov* 26 [Bill 8]
Read 2° * *Nov* 28
Committee *; Report *Nov* 29
Considered *; read 3° * *Nov* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *Dec* 2 (No. 5)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Dec* 3, [190] 527; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *Dec* 5
Read 3ª * *Dec* 6
Royal Assent *Dec* 7 [31 *Vict.* c. 4]

SALISBURY, Marquess of (see also CRANBORNE, Viscount)
Charge of the Bishop of Salisbury, [190] 132, 135
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. [193] 596
Cotton Statistics, 2R. [192] 709, 710; Comm. 918
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1834, 1847
Established Church (Ireland), [193] 79, 93
Ministerial Explanation—Public Business, [193] 579
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 22, [192] 948
Railway Bills—Increase of Rates, Res. [193] 1072
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [192] 6, 8; *cl.* 15, 9, 10; Report, *cl.* 14, 412; *add. cl.* 420; 3R. 707
Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 334
Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy Act Amendment, Report, *add. cl.* [192] 1630; 3R. 1745, 1746
South Coast Railways, Commons Amendts. [193] 1546
Uniformity of Public Worship, 2R. [193] 884
Victoria—Appropriation Act, [191] 1992, 1994
West Indies, 2R. [193] 798

Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Bill [H.L.] (*The Duke of Richmond*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 11 (No. 142)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 16, [192] 1628; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *June* 23, 1915 (No. 172)
Report * *July* 2 (No. 203)
Read 3ª * *July* 3

[*cont.*

Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Bill—cont.
c. Read 1° * *July* 3 [Bill 210]
Read 2° * *July* 13
Committee *—R.P. *July* 21
Committee *; Report *July* 24
Considered * *July* 25
Read 3° * *July* 27
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 123]

Salomons, Mr. Alderman D., *Greenwich*
- Bank Holidays, 2R. [190] 950
- London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [191] 205
- Marriage Law Commission, [190] 510
- Metropolis—Deptford Creek Outfalls, [191] 357
- Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [190] 414
- Mortgages, Taxation of, [193] 1944
- Navy Estimates—Miscellaneous Services, [193] 1156
- Supply—Treasury, [193] 1202
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1189

Samuda, Mr. J. D'A., *Tavistock*
- Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2036, 2053
- Electric Telegraphs, Consid. Amendt. [193] 1651
- London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. [191] 197; *cl.* 2, 203
- Navy—Admiralty Monies and Accounts, Motion for a Committee, [190] 921, 923
- Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, [192] 26; Res. [193] 1118
- Navy Estimates—Dockyards and Naval Yards, Amendt. [193] 557, 561
  - Steam Machinery, Amendt. [193] 1148
- Postal—India, China, and Japan Mails, Res. [190] 460
- Ways and Means, Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1763

Samuelson, Mr. B., *Banbury*
- Education, Technical, [190] 1812
- Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 1992
- Expatriation, Law of, [190] 2004
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1770
- Scientific Instruction, Motion for a Committee, [191] 160, 186
- Scientific Instruction in Foreign Countries, [192] 1561

Sandford, Mr. G. M. W., *Maldon*
- Compound Householder, The, [190] 730
- Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1917, 1920
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 709; Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2174; *cl.* 10, [193] 750; *cl.* 14, 1006; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1016, 1020; *cl.* 45, 1183
- Libel, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [192] 604
- Ministerial Statement, [191] 1798
- Mutiny, [190] 1816
- Parliament—General Election, [192] 924
- Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1572
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 867
- Supply—Royal Palaces, [191] 1013
- United States—The "Alabama" claims, Motion for an Address, [190] 1188

Sanitary Act (1866) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 222]
Read 2° * *July* 9
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Considered * *July* 13
Read 3° * *July* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 16 (No. 252)
Read 2ª * *July* 17
Committee * *July* 21
Report * *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 24
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 115]

Sanitary Act, 1866—*Sewage Utilization Act*, 1867—*Levying of Rates*
Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Sir James Fergusson *Mar* 26, [191] 258

Sat First
- *Nov* 19, 1867—The Lord Colchester, after the Death of his Father
- *Nov* 22—The Lord Fitzhardinge, after the Death of his Father
- *Feb* 13, 1868—The Marquess of Lansdowne, after the Death of his Father
  - The Lord Wrottesley, after the Death of his Father
- *Mar* 5—The Lord Aveland, after the Death of his Father
- *April* 2—The Lord Carington, after the Death of his Father
- *April* 27—The Duke of Northumberland, after the Death of his Cousin
- *May* 7—The Marquess of Salisbury, after the Death of his Father
- *May* 8—The Earl of Ellesmere, after the Death of his Father
- *June* 8—The Lord Calthorpe, after the Death of his Father
- *June* 22—The Earl of Craven, after the Death of his Father
- *June* 25—The Earl of Shrewsbury, after the Death of his Father

- *Dec* 3—The Lord Elphinstone, a Representative Peer for Scotland, in the room of the late Lord Polwarth
- *Feb* 14—The Lord Dunboyne, a Representative Peer for Ireland, in the room of the late Earl of Rosse
- *May* 7—The Earl Annesley, a Representative Peer for Ireland, in the room of the late Earl of Mayo

- *Feb* 14—Hamilton Lord Bishop of Kilmore Elphin and Ardagh
- *Mar* 31—Samuel Lord Bishop of Meath

New Peers Introduced
- *May* 5—The Right Hon. Sir John Trollope, Baronet, Baron Kesteven of Casewick in the County of Lincoln
  - Sir Brook William Bridges, Baronet, Baron Fitzwalter of Woodham Walter in the County of Essex
- *May* 15—Sir John Benn Walsh, Baronet, Baron Ormathwaite of Ormathwaite in the County of Cumberland

Sat First—New Peers Introduced—cont.
June 16—William O'Neill, Clerk, Baron O'Neill of Shanes Castle in the County of Antrim
June 26—William Lord Brougham and Vaux (special Limitation) sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Brother
July 14—Alexander Nelson Baron Bridport, Viscount Bridport
July 27—Sir Robert Cornelis Napier, Baron Napier of Magdala in Abyssinia and of Caryngton in the County Palatine of Chester

Nov 19, 1867 — Thomas Legh Lord Bishop of Rochester
June 8, 1868—George Augustus Lord Bishop of Lichfield

Saxony, Diplomatic Relations with
Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 2, [190] 519

Schools and Training Factories (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Rearden, Mr. Leader*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 18 [Bill 245]

SCHREIBER, Mr. C., *Cheltenham*
Abyssinia—Rassam, Mr., Mission of, [190] 678
The Queen's Letter to King Theodore, [190] 179
Compound Householder, The, [190] 886; [191] 1785
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 3R. Motion for Adjournment, [191] 207
Corrupt Practices at Elections, [192] 1040
Ecclesiastical Titles, Leave, [190] 994, 1686; [192] 1181; 2R. 1696
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 668, 670; *cl.* 5, Motion for Adjournment, 691; *cl.* 14, [193] 1002; *add. cl.* 1457; Consid. *add. cl.* 1649
English Porcelain at Bow, [190] 1887
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 633; Res. 1939
Income Tax, 3R. [190] 545
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 469; *cl.* 9, 963
Tancred's Charity, 2R. [191] 236

Scientific Instruction
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the provisions for giving instruction in theoretical and applied Science to the Industrial Classes" (*Mr. Samuelson*) *Mar* 24, [191] 160; after debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *Mar* 27, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Samuelson (Chairman), Mr. Acland, Mr. Akroyd, Mr. Bagnall, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Beecroft, Mr. Henry Austin Bruce, Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Graves, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Thomas Hughes, Sir Charles Lanyon, Mr. William Lowther, Mr. M'Lagan, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Edmund Potter, Mr. Powell, and Mr. Read
Report of Select Committee *July* 15 (*Parl. P.* No. 432)
(See title—*Education*)

SCLATER-BOOTH, Mr. G. († Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners, *afterwards* Secretary to the Treasury), *Hampshire, N.*
Abyssinia—Postage from, [190] 1115
Army—Fortifications, Grant for, [191] 260
Superannuation Allowances, [192] 2133
Assessed Taxes—Appeal Courts, [190] 2050; [193] 1199;—Collection of, 1367, 1475
† Casual and Vagrant Poor, [190] 651
† Clifton and Bedminster Workhouse Infirmaries, [190] 166
Coble, Mr., Case of, [191] 1457
Commissionaires, Corps of, [192] 246
Commissions, Permanent Expenses of, Res. [191] 1287
Consecration and Ordination Fees, [191] 1332
Consolidated Account, Charges on the, [190] 1221
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1397, 1563, 2130, 2131
Customs Officers, Grievances of, [191] 1455; [192] 513, 2135; [193] 1426;—Extra Clerks in the, [192] 713; [193] 304; Res. 1409
Durham County Courts, [192] 816
† East London—Distress in, [190] 644
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1453
Electric Telegraphs, [192] 1631
Garter King at Arms, [191] 39
India—Customs Department, Board of Trade, [192] 426
Postal Communication with Penang, [192] 1110
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Customs Officers, [192] 247
Duty on Spirit Licences, [191] 38
Eel Weir at Roosky, [193] 1670
Military Stores and Barracks, [193] 312
Post Office, [192] 1562
Records, [193] 304
Regium Donum, [192] 345
Taxation, Inequality of, [193] 1283
Land Writs Registration (Scotland) Fees, [191] 830
Local Charges on Real Property, Res. [192] 158
† Metropolis—Guardians of St. Luke's Parish, [190] 651
Metropolitan Board of Works, [190] 1980
Money Orders and Stamped Receipts, [192] 2134
Navy Estimates—Greenwich Hospital, &c. [193] 1157
Ordinations, Fees on, [193] 1822
† Poor Law, [190] 164;—Walsall Workhouse, 631;—Bethnal Green Workhouse, 1454
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 1606; *cl.* 13, 1880; *cl.* K, 1884
Post Office—Questions, &c.
American Mails, [190] 1685; [192] 342
Australia—Postal Communication with, [190] 1979; [192] 1472
Brindisi Route, [192] 1561
Cape Mail, [192] 923, 1180
Eastern Mail Service, [191] 258
London Letter Carriers, [192] 1853
Malta, Mails to, [190] 1226
Postal Service, [192] 817, 1476
Returns, [191] 2001
Southern District, [191] 358
Sunday Labour in the, [192] 2166
West India Mails, [191] 1222; [192] 815; [193] 519, 1669

[*cont.*

Sclater-Booth, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Post Office—Duffy, A. J., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 1298
Post Office—Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2012
Record Publications, Res. [193] 167
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [192] 1536
Slave Bounties, [192] 1131
Supply—Bounties on Slaves, [192] 2170
British Embassy Houses, [191] 992, 995, 997
Civil Service Estimates, [192] 1010; Report, [193] 1185
Convict Establishments (Colonies), [192] 504
County Courts, [192] 502
Embassy Houses Abroad, [192] 312
Foreign Office, [193] 1203
Government Prisons, [192] 1107
Harbours of Refuge, [191] 1001, 1002
Land Registry Office, [192] 1105
Learned Societies, Grants to, [192] 1132, 1133
Miscellaneous Expenses, [192] 1174; Report, 1609
National Gallery, [192] 1172
Portpatrick Railway Compensation, [193] 1211
Post Office, [193] 831
Post Office Packet Service, [193] 841, 845, 846
Prosecutions, [192] 497, 501
Public Buildings (Ireland), [192] 404
Registry House, Edinburgh, Report, [192] 1176
Salaries of Governors of Colonies, [193] 675
Sheriff Court Houses (Scotland), [192] 400
Treasury, [193] 1202
Ulster Canal, [192] 404
University of Glasgow, [192] 401
Woods, Forests, &c. [193] 1209
Turkey—Embassy House, Constantinople, [192] 1753
Embassy House, Therapia, [192] 1752; [193] 1289
United States—Library Committee, Philadelphia, [193] 1901, 1902
Postal Convention, [192] 2132
Vancouver's Island and British Columbia, [193] 1141
Witnesses, Expenses of, [193] 1819

Scotland
Agricultural Labourers' Dwellings, Question, Mr. Fordyce; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 10, [190] 1287
Burntisland and Granton Ferry, Question, Mr. Aytoun; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Feb* 21, [190] 1004
Committals (Scotland), Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, The Lord Advocate *June* 30, [193] 369
County and Burgh Police (Scotland), Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the County and Burgh Police Systems of Scotland" (*The Earl of Minto*) *May* 11, [192] 1; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *May* 18, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—E. Doncaster, E. Morton, E. Lauderdale, E. Airlie, E.

[*cont.*

Scotland—cont.
Strange, E. Minto, E. Morley, E. Camperdown, E. Innes, L. Clinton, L. Elphinstone, L. Panmure, L. Oxenfoord, L. Lyveden, L. Penrhyn, and L. Colonsay
Report of Select Committee *May* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 112)
Dunkeld, Bridge at, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 18, [190] 885; Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 23, [193] 1671
Education Bill, Question, Admiral Erskine; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 8, [191] 2001
Education — Legislation on, Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 13, [190] 1591
Established Church of—The Lord High Commissioner, Question, Sir Robert Peel; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 7, [191] 1884
Judicial Statistics, Question, Sir Edward Colebrooke; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 20, [190] 988
Judicial System—Royal Commission, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, The Lord Advocate *June* 25, [192] 2137
Law of Hypothec, Question, Mr. Fordyce; Answer, Mr. Carnegie *Mar* 6, [190] 1149
Law Procedure — Inclosure Commissioners, Question, Mr. Nicol; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 17, [190] 797
Legislation for—Progress of Scotch Bills, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 14, [192] 245
Middle Class Schools, Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, The Lord Advocate; short debate thereon *July* 3, [193] 644
Militia, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 11, [192] 17
Ministers' Stipends, Edinburgh, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 19, [190] 1889
Parochial Assessment, Question, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 20, [193] 1483
Poor Assessment, Motion for Return of Deductions allowed [and other Particulars] (*The Earl of Airlie*) *Mar* 27, [191] 328; Motion agreed to—(*Parl. P.* No. 90)
Poor Law Returns, Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, The Lord Advocate *June* 16, [192] 1631
Public Roads, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Nov* 26, [190] 181; Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 27, [191] 357
Railway Property, Assessment of, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 9, [193] 911
Representation of the People Bill, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *May* 8, [191] 2004
"*Running his Letters*," Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 14, [193] 1166
Supreme Civil Courts, The, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Dec* 3, [190] 536
Trawling for Herrings Bill, Question, Mr. Lamont; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 7, [191] 1882

Scott, Lord H. J. M. D., *Selkirkshire*
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [192] 986; *cl.* 11, 1004

Scott, Sir W., *Roxburghshire*
Representation of the People (Scotland), 2R. [190] 1235

Scourfield, Mr. J. H., *Haverfordwest*
Commissions, Permanent Expenses of, Res. [191] 1287
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 979
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1554
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1938
Local Charges on Real Property, Res. [192] 160
Ministerial Statement, [192] 650
Navy—Royal Dockyards, Res. [190] 2048
Railway and Joint Stock Companies Accounts, 2R. [191] 1541
Supply—Education, Public, [192] 1147
  Science and Art, [192] 1167
Turnpike Trusts, Motion for an Address, [191] 2018
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1722

Sea, Collisions at
Question, Mr. Holland; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Dec* 6, [190] 642

Sea Fisheries Bill
(*Mr. S. Cave, Mr. E. Egerton, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Stephen Cave*) *Feb* 24, [190] 1074
Bill ordered; after short debate, read 1° *
Read 2° * *Mar* 5 [Bill 42]
Committee *Mar* 9, 1269; after short debate R.P.
Committee *; Report *Mar* 17
Considered * *Mar* 18
Read 3° * *Mar* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *Mar* 20
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 30, [191] 465; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 46)
Committee *; Report *May* 11
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *May* 14, [192] 237 (No. 96)
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *May* 26, 916
Report * *May* 29 (No. 125)
Read 3ª * *June* 11
c. Lords Amendts. *June* 22, 1857 [Bill 170]
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 45]

Sea Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Blake, Colonel Annesley, Lord Claud John Hamilton, Mr. Kavanagh*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 30 [Bill 101]
Question, General Dunne; Answer, The Earl of Mayo *May* 14, [192] 287
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 24, 2012; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn * *July* 2

Seely, Mr. C., *Lincoln*
French Navy—Monitors in the, [193] 1481
Metropolitan Tramways, 2R. [190] 1110
Navy—Questions, &c.
  Greenwich Hospital, &c. [190] 1114; [192] 1185
  "Research" and "Enterprise"—Explanation, [193] 1673
  Turret Ships, &c., Report on, [193] 1666, 1714
Navy—Admiralty Monies and Accounts, Motion for a Committee, [190] 890, 907
Navy—Iron-clad Fleet, Res. [193] 1111, 1135
Postal—American Mails, [190] 604

Select Vestries
l. Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª * *Nov* 19

Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. H. J., *Essex, S.*
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [192] 1441
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1367
Foreign Cattle, Importation of, [190] 335
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 150; *cl.* 3, 1756

Selwyn, Sir C. J.—*see* Solicitor General, The

Sentences, Remission of
Address for "Copy of all Petitions or Memorials and of all Communications praying for or recommending the suspension, commutation, or remission of sentences of death or of penal servitude, received by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, or at the Home Office, &c." (*Mr. Newdegate*) *Dec* 3, [190] 551; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Servia, National Assembly of
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 25, [192] 2135

Sewage, Disintegration of
Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 29, [193] 307

Seymour, Rear-Admiral G. H. (Lord of the Admiralty), *Antrim Co.*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1370
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [193] 1406
  Old Unarmoured Ships, [193] 1818

Seymour, Mr. A., *Totnes*
Supply—Science and Art, [192] 1167

Seymour, Mr. H. D., *Poole*
India—Telegraphic Communication, Motion for Papers, [193] 163

SHAFTESBURY, Earl of
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [192] 907; Report, [193] 987
- Baby Farming, [193] 1896
- Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 210
- Explosive Materials in War, [193] 1661
- Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 22, [192] 948; *cl.* 9, 1625, 1626
- Promissory Oaths, Commons Amendts. [193] 1227
- Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 332, 333
- Uniformity of Public Worship, 2R. [193] 868, 895

SHERIDAN, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*
- Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 428
- Compound Householder, The, [192] 245
- Customs' Extra Clerks, [192] 713; Res. [193] 1407
- Goddard, S. A.—Petition of, [193] 1250, 1254
- Government of India, Comm. *cl.* 2, [193] 863
- Income Tax Commissioners, [193] 1774, 1775
- Income Tax in Dudley, [190] 176, 177
- Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [191] 206
- Rates, Collection and Payment of, [193] 911
- Regulation of Railways, Comm. *cl.* 17, [193] 1734; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1735, 1736; Consid. *add. cl.* 1787, 1791, 1792
- Sierra Leone—Assistant Judge of, [192] 656, 657; [193] 1818
- Supply—Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 668, 671

SHERRIFF, Mr. A. C., *Worcester City*
- Poor Law—Bethnal Green Workhouse, [190] 1453

Sierra Leone, Assistant Judge of
- Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 21, [192] 656
- *Appointment of Mr. Huggins*, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 27, [193] 1818

SIMEON, Sir J., *Isle of Wight*
- Boundaries of Boroughs, Motion for a Committee, [192] 428
- Boundary, Comm. [192] 279
- Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 4, [191] 1059
- Rogers, Dr., Medical Officer of the Strand Union, [191] 261
- Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [192] 1727

Sir Robert Napier's Annuity Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Disraeli, Sir Stafford Northcote*)
- *c.* Resolution [9th July] reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *July* 13 [Bill 230]
- Read 2°* *July* 14
- Committee; Report *July* 15, [193] 1225
- Read 3°* *July* 16
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 17
- Read 2ª* *July* 20 (No. 265)
- Committee*; Report *July* 21
- Read 3ª* *July* 23
- Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 91]

Slave Bounties
- Observations, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 4, [192] 1130

Slave Trade Papers
- Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 16, [190] 1687

Slave Trade, Zanzibar
- Question, Sir T. F. Buxton; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 30, [191] 1578

Small-pox Hospital — Report of Medical Officer of Privy Council
- Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 15, [192] 1561

SMITH, Mr. A., *Hertfordshire*
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1831, 1859, 1867, 1870

SMITH, Mr. J. A., *Chichester*
- Mauritius—Condition of, [192] 713
  - Fever in, [192] 1856
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday, [191] 40

SMITH, Mr. J. B., *Stockport*
- Cattle Trade, Foreign, [193] 1751
- Government of India Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1891
- India—Budget, The, [193] 1670
- India—Irrigation of Public Lands, Res. [191] 970
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, [193] 1290, 1307
- Postal—India, China, and Japan Mails, Res. [190] 475
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 843
- Weights and Measures (Metric System), 2R. [192] 199; Comm. [193] 425

SMOLLETT, Mr. P. B., *Dumbartonshire*
- India—Questions, &c.
  - Bank of Bombay—Bengal Agency, [192] 1471
  - East India Irrigation and Canal Company, [190] 989; [192] 425
  - Irrigation Works, [190] 798
  - Madras Irrigation Company, [190] 1072; [191] 1301
- India—Irrigation of Public Lands, Res. [191] 946, 958
- Registration, Comm. [193] 562
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 822; 2R. 1237; Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 862; *cl.* 9, 960
- Spain—Case of the "Tornado," [192] 1563
  - Systems of Government in, [191] 417

SOLICITOR GENERAL, The (Sir C. J. SELWYN), *Cambridge University*
- Companies Amendment Act, [190] 605
- Totnes, &c. Writs, 2R. [190] 546

SOLICITOR GENERAL, The (Sir W. B. BRETT) *Helston*
Boundary, Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1442
Bristol Election, [193] 1275
Bristol Writ, [193] 422
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 4, [191] 1060, 1061
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [190] 1425
County Courts (Admiralty Jurisdiction), Comm. [192] 167, 168
Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Court, 2R. [191] 1874
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 690, 2175; 193] *cl.* 6, 739, 740, 742, 743; *cl.* 7, 744; *cl.* 10, 752; *cl.* 14, 1005, 1010, 1014, 1015; *cl.* 15, 1016; *cl.* 17, 1017, 1019, 1169; *cl.* 23, 1170; *cl.* 28, 1172; *cl.* 30, 1173; *cl.* 37, *ib.*, 1174; *cl.* 41, 1175; *cl.* 43, 1177; *cl.* 45, 1178, 1180; *cl.* 46, 1369; *cl.* 47, 1372, 1373; *cl.* 48, *ib.*; *cl.* 54, Amendt. 1374; *add. cl.* 1377, 1380, 1381, 1387, 1440, 1450, 1452, 1455; Consid. 1622; *add. cl.* 1623, 1626, 1627, 1631, 1632, 1638, 1639, 1641, 1643, 1645, 1675, 1677, 1682, 1687; Amendt. 1688
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 544
Libel, Comm. [192] 603; *cl.* 3, 613
Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [193] 411
Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1872; Consid. [193] 1222
Pilotage, Compulsory, Res. [191] 382, 383
Registration, 2R. [192] 1612; Comm. *cl.* 29, [193] 566; *add. cl.* 569, 570
Registration of Voters Act, [192] 377, 379
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 20, [192] 1596; *add. cl.* 1769
Sea Fisheries, Lords Amendts. [192] 1862

Solway, Salmon Fisheries in the
Questions, Mr. P. Wyndham, Lord Hotham; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Nov* 29, [190] 427

SOMERSET, Duke of
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [192] 909
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. [191] 1573
Contagious Diseases Act, [192] 328
East London Museum Site, Report, [190] 860
Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland, Motion for a Committee, [191] 249
Education, Technical — Whitworth Scholarships, [191] 825
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. [193] 1814
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 75, 289
Foreshore and Bed of the Sea, [192] 1834
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1689
Navy—Iron Ballast in the Dockyards, [190] 1038
  Royal Dockyards—Motion for a Return, [190] 1212
New Forest Deer Removal &c. Act, Motion for a Committee, [192] 694
Parliament—Public Petitions—Motion for a Select Committee, [191] 689

South Africa—Consecration of Bishops
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of Circular Despatch of 30th January 1868 from the Secretary of State for the Colonies relative to the Consecration of a Colonial Bishop in South Africa, and of a Despatch of 31st March on the same Subject (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *July* 3, [193] 587; after short debate, Motion agreed to—*Parl. P.* [2347]

Spain
"*Mermaid,*" *Case of the*, Question, Mr. Headlam; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 28, [190] 328—*Parl. P.* . . . . . No. [3997]
"*Queen Victoria,*" *The*, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 6, [190] 641; *Feb* 21, 1002
Religious Persecution, Question, Mr. Baines; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 20, [193] 1478
Spain and Chile, Question, Mr. Weguelin; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 12, [190] 1458
"*Tornado,*" *Case of the*, Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 28, [190] 1103; Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 12, 1455; Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 15, [192] 1563; Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 27, [193] 1820
Parl. P. No. [3993]

Spain and Prussia—Treaty of Commerce
Question, Mr. Akroyd; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 23, [191] 1147—*Parl. P.* No. [4023]

SPEAKER, The (Right Hon. J. E. Denison) *Nottinghamshire, N.*
Lord Elcho said, that if hon. Members had no consideration for themselves they should at least have some consideration for the Speaker, who had, with the exception of the two hours between four and six, been practically in the Chair since twelve o'clock, and it was now twenty minutes to three. Mr. Speaker said, he felt obliged to the hon. Gentlemen who had made the appeal in his behalf; but he wished that hon. Members, without any reference to his convenience, should be guided by what they considered proper and suitable and becoming the dignity of the House.—*Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill*, [193] 1343

Adjournment—Moved that the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Monday; objected, that the Motion for Adjournment must be put before a Motion for fixing the adjournment to a particular day—Mr. Speaker said, that the Motion was in Order, though the course mentioned was the one usually pursued, [193] 1737
Amendments in Committee — Entry on the Votes—Those Amendments only, in Committee, upon which divisions take place are entered on the Votes.—*Marine Mutiny Bill*, [191] 574
Amendment — Amendment altering the Incidence of Taxation—*Election Petitions, &c. Bill*, considered as amended; The Solicitor General moved to strike out Clause 53, which

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

provided that the cost of hustings, &c. should be borne by the whole of the ratepayers. Mr. Labouchere objected that the omission of the clause would throw the burden on a limited number of persons, and that, as the Amendment altered the incidence of taxation, it could not now be proposed—Mr. Speaker said, it was quite competent for the hon. and learned Gentleman to propose the rejection of the clause, as the omission of the clause would have the effect of relieving the ratepayers of a charge which it was proposed to place upon them, [193] 1688

Amendment—Amendment reserving a charge on the Consolidated Fund—The *West Indies Bill* proposed to relieve the Consolidated Fund of a charge of £20,000 hitherto annually paid to the clergy in the West India Islands — Amendment proposed, that the annual payment of £2,000 be continued to the co-adjutor Bishop under certain circumstances. Objected, that the Amendment should have originated in Committee—Mr. Speaker said, that it appeared to him that the question raised was whether the Consolidated Fund should be relieved of £20,000 or of £18,000 only. No new charge was imposed upon the Consolidated Fund, and therefore it was a question to be decided by the House upon its merits, and not by an opinion from the Chair, [193] 1888, 1920

Amendment affecting the Incidence of Taxation—Mr. Speaker said, the Amendment, it seemed to him, had this effect—that improvements undertaken beyond the limits of the City of London would, after the alteration proposed, affect the taxation on the City of London. In that case, it would effect an alteration of taxation which should have originated in a Committee of the Whole House.—*Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Bill*, [191] 1877

Amendments—There being a Motion and an Amendment already before the House, it is not competent for an hon. Member to move a second Amendment. It is impossible to put the second Amendment until the first is disposed of, [190] 1342 ; [191] 2051 ; [193] 1256

Amendment—Mr. Speaker suggests that a new clause which had been moved could, if the House thought fit, be postponed, and brought up again as an Amendment to a clause about to be proposed.—*Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill*, [193] 1629

Amendment—Amendment which would practically defeat a Bill—*Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill*—Order for Committee read. An hon. Member asked whether it was competent to a right hon. Member to move at that stage an Amendment of which he had given notice, the effect of which, if carried, would be to defeat the measure ? —Mr. Speaker said, it was quite competent for the right hon. Member to move the Amendment, [193] 103

Amendments on Committee of Supply on Fridays—It is a rule of the House that no original Motion shall be made without due notice ; but of late years, upon the Question of going into Committee of Supply on

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Fridays, the Motions all partake of the nature of original Motions, though made in the form of Amendments to the Motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." This is a new practice, and Mr. Speaker said he should like to know if it is the opinion of the House that Notices for Friday should be given in sufficient time, and in as complete a form, as original Motions, [191] 2053

Amendment—Question proposed, "That the House resolve itself into Committee ;" an Amendment moved thereon—If the House affirm "that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," that will be decisive of the Amendment : then will come the Main Question, which will stand disembarrassed from all other words.—*Established Church (Ireland) Bill*, [191] 708

Amendment—An Amendment which in reality anticipates discussion on every clause of a Bill and of some Amendments, exceeds the limits prescribed for such Motions by the Rules of the House.—*Representation of the People (Ireland) Bill*, [192] 1571

Amendment — Relevancy of Amendment to Question—*Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill.* Motion for Committee — Mr. Rearden having moved an Amendment that the United Kingdom be divided into equal electoral districts—Mr. Speaker said, that a portion of the Resolution related to Ireland, and was not in order, [192] 472

Bills—Bills affecting the Prerogative of the Crown—According to the practice of Parliament, a measure to limit the Prerogative of the Crown cannot pass a third reading, unless the consent of the Crown has been first obtained.—*Peerage (Ireland) Bill*, [191] 1564

Bills—Reading a Bill—Motion made, that the *Established Church (Ireland) Bill* be read by the Clerk at the Table—Mr. Speaker said, that when a proposal of a similar kind was made two Sessions ago, it was agreed by the House that the reading of a Bill by the Clerk at the Table was an exploded practice, [192] 322

Bills—Relevancy of title of Bill—*Registration (Ireland) Bill*—Order for Committee read —Mr. Esmonde objected that the title of the Bill did not cover its contents, inasmuch as a Registration Bill could not be presumed to contain provisions in reference to polling places—Mr. Speaker said, that most Bills, after indicating the contents, contained the words "and for other purposes." In this instance these words did not occur ; but the objection taken by the hon. Member was a preliminary one, which ought to have been offered on the second reading, and it was now too late to make it, [193] 1486

Bills—Appointing day for the second reading —The practice is, on every occasion that a Bill is brought in, to fix the second reading after it has been read a first time.—*Established Church (Ireland) Bill*, [192] 322

Bills—The principle of a Bill is affirmed by the passing the second reading.—*Sale of Liquors on Sunday Bill*, [190] 1869

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Bill—Time for Motion—Mr. Hubbard having spoken against the second reading of the *Burials* (*Ireland*) *Bill* sat down without making his Motion "That the Bill be read a second time on this day six months." Several hon. Members having spoken, Mr. Hubbard rose to make the Motion—Mr. Speaker ruled that the hon. Member could not now do so, [191] 1083

Committees—Chairman of Committees—Order —A point of Order arising in Committee should be addressed at once to the Chairman, and cannot be questioned on a subsequent occasion.—The Chairman of Committees is the proper judge of those matters which come under his notice in Committee—Mr. Speaker said, he could not interfere with the decision of the Chairman at the suggestion of an individual Member: to authorize him to do so, the question must be brought before him by the direction of the House.—*Abyssinian Expedition*, [190] 426—*Established Church* (*Ireland*), [191] 1948

Debate—Adjournment of a debate on Wednesday. Mr. Gladstone rising to move for leave to bring in the *Established Church* (*Ireland*) *Bill*—Mr. Newdegate objected, that it was then seven minutes to six o'clock (it being a Rule of the House that on Wednesdays no opposed Business shall be proceeded with after a Quarter before Six o'clock)

Mr. Speaker said, that according to the Rule of the House if the hon. Member objected to the Motion being brought on at that hour it could not be proceeded with, [192] 232

Debate—Latitude of speaking—Bill considered as amended. On Question, "That the said clause be now read a second time"—Mr. Speaker said, that the Question being whether this particular clause should pass, a general argument could hardly be allowed.—*Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Bill*, [191] 1565

Debate—Explanation—Time for Explanation —An hon. Member desiring to explain his remarks must reserve his explanation until after the hon. Gentleman then in possession of the House has concluded his remarks, [191] 1106

It is at the option of the Member in possession of the House to give way or not to an immediate explanation, [191] 1106; [192] 749

Debate—Personal Explanation—Question relating to the Foreign Office, asked and answered. Mr. Layard (late Under Secretary of State) wished to say a word or two by way of explanation—Mr. Speaker said, the hon. Member for Southwark desires to make a personal explanation, and under these circumstances a statement is generally allowed, [190] 607

Debate—Limitation of Explanation.—It is not competent for an hon. Member, in explanation, to reply to a speech just made: he must confine himself to any point on which he may himself have been misunderstood.—*Canongate Annuity Tax Bill*, [191] 1106

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Debate—Premature Discussion of a Motion—An hon. Member having given Notice of a Motion respecting the *Declaration against Transubstantiation*, cannot, on a Motion for a Copy of the Declaration, enter at length into the subject, which stands for future consideration, [192] 1099

Debate—Premature Discussion—It is not competent to discuss the question of referring a Bill to a Select Committee on the Motion for the Second Reading: that could only be considered when the Bill had been read a second time.—*County Financial Boards Bill*, [191] 1556

Select Committees—If a Committee has not reported it is out of Order to comment in this House on the evidence taken before it.—*Navy—Iron-clad Fleet*, [193] 1124

Debate—Questions—Mr. Speaker suggests that it would not be convenient that a debate should take place on [a] subject merely on the putting of a Question.—*Abyssinia—Production of Papers*, [190] 650

Debate—Reference to a past Debate in this House is not in Order, [190] 422, 610; [191] 1302; [192] 1074

Debate—Comments on Debates in this House—An hon. Member is not in Order in introducing in this House any comments by other individuals upon the debates which have taken place in this House, [190] 422, 425; [191] 2030

Debate—Reference to Debates in the House of Lords—The rule of the House is that allusion to debates in the other House of Parliament should not be made in this; but it is scarcely possible that, under all circumstances, the rule can be construed in an absolutely literal manner. And Mr. Speaker referred to certain exceptional circumstances then existing, [191] 1786

There is no Rule in existence, forbidding reference to debates in the other House, in a shape that it can be formally rescinded—Certain Rules are to be found in a book which defines what the observances of Parliament are; but they are not in the nature of Standing Orders, [192] 1078

Debate—Relevancy of Debate, [190] 1260

Debate—Speaking twice on the same Question —Question proposed; Amendment moved, and negatived; original Question again proposed—Mr. Newdegate rose to address the House—Mr. Speaker said, that in moving the Amendment the hon. Member had spoken on the original Question, and therefore could not speak again.—*Abyssinia—Motion for Papers*, [190] 674

Order for Committee read; Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" Amendment moved, and negatived; original Question put, and negatived. The Motion, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," when made on a subsequent day, is a new Motion, and the Member moving is in order in addressing the House.—*Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal Bill*, [193] 389, 391

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

The Prime Minister having, in the course of debate, introduced a proposal of an entirely new character—namely, that the question of Boundaries of Boroughs be referred to a Select Committee—Mr. Speaker suggested that it might be the opinion of the House that other hon. Gentlemen, who might feel an interest in the matter, should also have the opportunity of speaking upon it, [192] 279

Debate — Unparliamentary Language — Mr. Rearden, having given notice to ask a Question relative to Her Majesty the Queen, and being called to Order—Mr. Speaker said, "The House has anticipated my decision by the expression—the indignant expression—of feeling with regard to the terms employed in the Notice of the hon. Member. No doubt Questions may be addressed by a Member of this House to the confidential Advisers of the Crown as to any matter relating to the discharge of public duties by the Sovereign; but these Questions must be addressed in respectful and Parliamentary terms. The Question of the hon. Member is not couched in such terms, and cannot be put, [192] 711

Debate — Unparliamentary Expressions — An hon. Member having used the expression "factious opposition to the Bill," in reference to the course pursued by a right hon. Member—Mr. Speaker said, that under the circumstances of the case, he certainly thought the expression was too strong a one.—*Motion for Adjournment,* [193] 1742

Debate—Unparliamentary Expressions—It is scarcely in order for an hon. Member to use the word "dodge" in reference to the proceedings of another Member in a Parliamentary proceeding.—*Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill,* [193] 1297

Divisions—Mr. Speaker's Vote—On Division on Motion for second reading of the *Married Women's Property Bill,* the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker declared himself with the Ayes, and stated his reasons for so doing, [192] 1378

Instructions—Time for objecting to an Instruction—The proper time for objecting to any Instruction to be given to a Committee is when the Instruction is under discussion.—*Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill,* [192] 469

Members' Seats in this House—Mr. Speaker repeats the rule, generally accepted by the House, in regard to the retention of Members' seats. Any Member who, having come down to the House in the morning in the discharge of his duty on a Committee, shall, before prayers, place his hat on a seat as an indication of his personal attendance within the precincts of the House, will be permitted to retain that seat, as though he were present in the House, [191] 698

Oaths of Roman Catholic Members—Mr. Freville-Surtees, having stated that Mr. Speaker had ruled that the Roman Catholic Members who took the Oath before the 30th April, 1866, are bound by the Oath taken by Roman Catholic Members previously to that time—Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has misconceived my meaning. I gave no such decision as he apprehends.—*Roman Catholic Oath,* [191] 1582; [192] 1208

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Order of Business on Tuesdays—It is an ancient rule of the House that on Tuesdays Notices of Motion have precedence of Orders of the Day. Mr. Bouverie complained that on the Notice Paper of Tuesday, March 31, the *Mutiny* and *Marine Mutiny Bills* were set down in precedence of the Notices of Motion—Mr. Speaker said, that there was nothing irregular or unprecedented in this proceeding; the course taken with regard to these Bills was quite in conformity with precedent, and only for the promotion of the despatch of Public Business, [191] 573

Petitions—The time for presenting Petitions is before five o'clock, and up to that hour, at any moment when there is no business before the House, a Member is perfectly in Order in presenting Petitions, [190] 1893

Questions—To whom they may be put—The rule with regard to Questions is, that Questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs, and to other Members relating to any Bill or Motion connected with the Business of the House in which such Members are concerned, [192] 717

Questions—Pertinency to Subject before the House—There being a Motion before the House upon which it is competent for any Member to address the House—to address a Question to the Government on a subject not connected with anything before the House is not pertinent to the argument, and ought not to be introduced.—*Ex-Governor Eyre,* [192] 839

Questions—Relevancy of introductory Remarks—An hon. Member does not act in accordance with the Rules of the House in not confining himself to such matter as is necessary for explaining the grounds on which he puts the Question. — *Ex-Governor Eyre,* [192] 1850

Questions—Mr. Speaker suggests that it would not be convenient that a debate should take place on [a] subject merely on the putting of a Question. — *Abyssinia — Production of Papers,* [190] 650

Select Committee—It is not competent to discuss the question of referring a Bill to a Select Committee on the Motion for the Second Reading: that could only be considered when the Bill had been read a second time.—*County Financial Boards Bill,* [191] 1556

See Committees—Chairman of Committees.

Select Committee—A Notice of the names of hon. Members to serve on a Select Committee given before the House has decided that a Bill be referred to a Select Committee, would be of no effect, [192] 15

Select Committees—An hon. Member cannot canvass the composition of a Committee until it has been agreed that a Committee shall be appointed, and the names have been put severally from the Chair.—*Boundaries of Boroughs,* [192] 427

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*
  Select Committees—Powers of a Select Committee—A Bill being referred, the powers of the Select Committee are confined to the subject-matter of the Bill: if it be desired to proceed further, and to take into consideration [a subject not within the scope of the Bill] that could not be done without a Special Instruction to the Committee. — *Sale of Liquors on Sunday Bill*, [190] 1869
  Select Committees—If a Committee has not reported, it is out of Order to comment in this House on the evidence taken before it.—*Navy—Iron-clad Fleet*, [193] 1124
  Supply—Latitude of Observation—On Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," an hon. Member having asked a Question relating to *Coal Mines*, Mr. Whalley rose to call attention to *Riots at Ashton*; objected, that the previous subject was not disposed of:—Mr. Speaker said, that the Motion being that he do leave the Chair, he had no power to prevent the hon. Member from pursuing his observations, [192] 1086

SPENCER, Earl
  Army—Volunteer Review at Windsor, [193] 988

Spirit, Wine, and Beer Licences
  Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Nov* 28, [190] 331

STACPOOLE, Mr. W., *Ennis*
  Army—Brooke, Captain, Case of, [192] 1855
  Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 209
  India—Hyderabad, [191] 1148
  Ireland—Revision of the Irish Ordnance Map, [190] 1451
  Regulation of Railways, Consid. [193] 1786, 1787, 1789
  Representation of the People (Ireland), [190] 730; 2R. [191] 1959
  Supply—Houses of Parliament, [192] 309

Staleybridge, Birmingham, &c.—Riots at Ashton—Lectures of Mr. Murphy
192] Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *May* 25, 817; Personal Explanation, Mr. Newdegate *May* 26, 927; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 29, 1042; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; debate thereon *May* 29, 1085

Stamp Duty on the Transfer of Debenture Stock
  Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 8, [192] 1227

STANHOPE, Earl
  Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1392
  Ecclesiastical Titles in Great Britain and Ireland, Motion for a Committee, [191] 239
  Ireland—Church Commission, [193] 972
    Established Church, [190] 1796
  Metropolis—Statues in Westminster Hall, [193] 979

[*cont.*

STANHOPE, Earl—*cont.*
  Parliament—Questions, &c.
    Business of the House, Report of Select Committee, [191] 566
    Proxies, [190] 1954
  Parliament—Notice of Question, Res. [191] 693, 696
  Parliament—Public Petitions, Motion for a Select Committee, [191] 689
  Public Schools, Address for Papers, [192] 1538, 1553
  Public Schools, Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 1652
  Ritual, Reports of the Commission on, [192] 336
  Uniformity of Public Worship, 2R. [193] 891

STANHOPE, Mr. J. Banks, *Lincolnshire, N.*
  Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [190] 1419, 1420

STANLEY, Right Hon. Lord (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Lynn Regis*
  Abyssinia—Questions, &c.
    Cameron, Consul, [190] 180
    Egypt, [190] 1003
    Foreign Office, [190] 606
    Mules, Purchase of, [190] 145
    Queen's, The, Letter to King Theodore, [190] 179
    Rassam, Mr., Mission of, [190] 680, 1005
  Abyssinia—Beke, Dr., and Mr. Layard, [190] 649; Motion for Papers, 670, 673
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 80; Report, 101
  Adjouri, Case of, Motion for Papers, [193] 388
  African Slave Trade—"The Aberdeen Act," [192] 718
  Andover, Late Member for, [190] 536
  Austria—Commercial Treaty with, [192] 653
  Belgium—Riots in, [191] 837
  Brazil—War in, [191] 359
  British Factory at St. Petersburg, [193] 1667, 1824
  "Bubulina," Explosion of the, [190] 519
  Cattle, Foreign, Importation of, [193] 1285
  Cattle Plague, [192] 1852
    Rinderpest in Austria, [193] 609
  China—Embassy, The, [190] 1224
    Treaty of Tien-tsin, [190] 1150; [191] 1147; [193] 1947
  Cholera in the Mediterranean, [191] 704
  Church Rates, [190] 507
  Consular Courts in Turkey and Egypt, [193] 1049
  Coolie Emigration, [192] 2133
  Crete—Condition of, [191] 1149
  Crete—Insurrection in, [190] 165; [191] 705; Motion for an Address, 1261; [193] 1747
  Diplomatic Service, Res. [192] 932, 937
  Disraeli's, Mr., Speech at Merchant Taylors' Hall, [192] 2162
  Egypt—Questions, &c.
    Claims on the Viceroy, [192] 924
    Law Courts, [192] 1560
    Quarantine at Suez, [192] 1334, 1396
    Societè d'Agricole and the Viceroy, [192] 1394
  Established Church (Ireland), [191] 356; Comm. Amendt. 495, 500, 707
  Expatriation, Law of, [190] 1996; [193] 1281

[*cont.*

Stanley, Right hon. Lord—*cont.*
- Foreign Office—Diplomatic Agents, [190] 542, 631, 986; [192] 1562; [193] 1712
- France—Arrests of Englishmen, [190] 152
  - Belgium and Holland, [193] 1940
- Honduras—Treaty of Guarantee, [190] 148
- Italy—Conference, Proposed, [190] 513
  - Consular Chaplain at Naples, [193] 1947
- Japan—Outrages in, [192] 922
- Mexico—Diplomatic Relations with, [190] 1007; [193] 1825
- Ministerial Statement — Resignation of the Earl of Derby, [190] 1097, 1098;—Re-construction of the Ministry, 1100
- Neutrality Commission, [192] 1854
- Papal Government and Mr. Odo Russell, [190] 162
- Parliament—Order of Business, [190] 545
- Plate River, War in the, [190] 652
- Portugal—Commercial Treaty with, [190] 331
- Representation of the People (Scotland), [190] 1103
- Russia and Bokhara, [192] 955
- Saxony—Diplomatic Relations with, [190] 519
- Scientific Instruction in Foreign Countries, [192] 1560
- Servia—National Assembly of, [192] 2136
- Slave Trade Papers, [190] 1687
- Slave Trade, Zanzibar, [191] 1578
- Spain and Chile, [190] 1458
- Spain and Prussia—Treaty of Commerce, [191] 1147
- Spain—Questions, &c.
  - "Mermaïd," Destruction of the, [190] 328
  - "Queen Victoria," The, [190] 641, 1003
  - Religious Persecution in, [193] 1479
  - "Tornado," Case of the, [190] 1103, 1455; [192] 1563; [193] 1820
- Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 206, 226
  - British Embassy Houses, [191] 986, 987, 989, 995, 996
  - Consular Establishments Abroad, [192] 2171, 2172
  - Embassies and Missions Abroad, [193] 674
  - Embassy Houses Abroad, [192] 312
  - Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, [193] 672, 673
  - Mission House, Teheran, [191] 998, 999
- Totnes, &c. Writs, 3R. [190] 546
- Turkey—Questions, &c.
  - Brigandage near Smyrna, [192] 1014
  - Crete—Vice Consul at, [190] 1116
  - Ottoman Empire, Maintenance of the, [190] 642
  - Railways, [193] 718
  - Sanitary Regulations, [190] 1811
  - Thessaly and Epirus, Annexation of, to Greece, [190] 328, 512
  - Wiseman, Sir W., Appointment of, [190] 1071
- United States—Questions, &c.
  - Iron-clads, [192] 655
  - "Lizzie Lina," Case of the, [190] 1219
  - Relations with the, [190] 330, 690
  - "Springbok," Case of the, [190] 1812; [191] 2002
- United States—"Alabama" claims, The, Motion for an Address, [190] 1168, 1181
- United States — Assassination of President, Lincoln, Res. [193] 1946
- Ways and Means—The Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 356

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
- Alkali Act Continuance, 2R. [192] 510
- Boundary Commission, [190] 1795
- Consecration of Churchyards Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [192] 897, 898
- Cotton Statistics, Comm. [192] 918
- East London Museum Site, Report, [190] 859, 860
- Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council, 3R. [190] 1678
- Foreshore and Bed of the Sea, [192] 1831
- Ireland—Established Church, The, [190] 1795, 1796
- London, Brighton, &c. Railway, 3R. [193] 361
- Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) Amendment, Report, *add. cl.* [190] 577
- Parliament — Business of the House, [190] 1099; Report, [191] 569
- Poor Relief, Comm. [191] 465; *cl.* 22, [192] 948
- Postal—Communication with the East—New Contract, [190] 157
- Railway Communication between Drivers and Guards, [190] 575
- Regulation of Railways, 2R. [190] 1971, 1973; Report, *cl.* 14, Amendt. [192] 412, 413, 416
- Sea Fisheries, 2R. [191] 466; Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 238, 239
- University Elections (Voting Papers), 2R. [193] 982

Stansfeld, Mr. J., *Halifax*
- Abyssinian Expedition—The Despatches, [192] 716
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 859
- India—Madras Irrigation Company, [191] 1298, 1301
- Postal Subsidies, Res. [190] 2014

Statistical Abstracts, Annual
- Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 20, [190] 1977

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir W., *Perthshire*
- Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 1011
- Cambridge University Election—Interference of Peers, [190] 801
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 445; *cl.* 11, 1001; *cl.* 12, 1008
- Scotland—Parochial Assessment, [193] 1483
- Supply—Register House (Edinburgh), Report, [192] 1176
  - Science and Art, [192] 1167
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1178

Stockbrokers (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Pim, Sir Benjamin Guinness*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 5 [Bill 104]
Read 2° * *May* 12
Committee *; Report *May* 15
Read 3° * *May* 18
l. Read 1ᵃ * (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *May* 19
Read 2ᵃ * *May* 26 (No. 105)
Committee *; Report *May* 28
Read 3ᵃ * *May* 29
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 31]

STOCK, Mr. O., *Carlow Bo.*
Ireland—Customs Officers, [192] 247
Sullivan and Pigott, Messrs., Treatment of, [190] 1814 ; [191] 259

STONE, Mr. W. H., *Portsmouth*
Boundary, Comm. [192] 275
Navy—Naval Courts Martial, [190] 1225

STOPFORD, Mr. S. G., *Northamptonshire, N.*
Boundary, Comm. Preamble, [192] 1271
Boundary Commission, Report, [192] 1181

Storm Warnings
Question, Colonel Sykes ; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Nov* 22, [190] 145

STRADBROKE, Earl of
Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1842
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 9, [192] 1624
Vagrancy—Guildford Union, Motion for Correspondence, [192] 102

STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE, Viscount
Canning Statue, The, [193] 1461
Crete—Insurrection in, [190] 314
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, 2R. [193] 1812
Public Schools, 2R. [193] 1473 ; Comm. *cl.* 6, 1652 ; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1660

STRATHNAIRN, Lord
Army—War Office—Department of Control, [193] 1245
Registration (Ireland), 3R. [193] 1897

STRONGE, Sir J. M., *Armagh Co.*
Established Church (Ireland), [192] 1210
Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1956

STUART, Colonel W., *Bedford*
Army—Daily Payment of Men, [191] 263
Army Estimates—Surveys, [193] 964
Burials (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [191] 1083
Dunstable Road, [192] 1396
Ecclesiastical Titles, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [192] 1697
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1924
London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. [191] 201
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [191] 99
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1423 ; Amendt. 1424 ; *cl.* 6, 1613 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1614
Regulation of Railways, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1736
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [192] 1804
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [192] 311
Turnpike Acts Amendment, Comm. Amendt. [193] 968

STUCLEY, Sir G. S., *Barnstaple*
Army—Cavalry Uniforms, [192] 1111
Transport of Troops to India, [192] 1111
Navy—Sheathing Iron Vessels, [190] 330

Sugar, Refining of, at Cologne
Question, Mr. Crawford ; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 29, [193] 305

SULLIVAN, Mr. Serjeant E., *Mallow*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1518
Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 215
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1585 ; *add. cl.* 1769, 1785

Sunday Trading (Metropolis) Bill
(*Mr. T. Hughes, Lord C. Hamilton, Mr. Lusk*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 20 [Bill 40]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 22, [191] 1084
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Graham*) ; Question, "That 'now,' &c ;" A. 68, N. 31 ; M. 37 ; Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn *June* 23

Supply
Proceedings in Committee of Supply, Resolution [9th February 1858] relative to Proceedings in Committee of Supply read, as followeth :—
"That when it has been proposed to omit or reduce items in a Vote, the Question shall be afterwards put upon the original Vote or upon the reduced Vote, as the case may be, without amendment" *April* 21, [191] 1025
Moved, "That the said Resolution be rescinded" (*Mr. Ayrton*) ; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *April* 28, 1464 ; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
1. Resolved, That when it has been proposed to omit or reduce items in a Vote, the Question shall be afterwards put upon the original Vote or upon the reduced Vote as the case may be
2. Resolved, That after a Question has been proposed from the Chair for a reduction of the whole Vote, no Motion shall be made for omitting or reducing any item (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

SUPPLY
ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION—
190] Estimate presented,—of the Sum required to be voted towards defraying the Expenses of the Expedition to Abyssinia beyond the ordinary Grants of Parliament [by Command]; referred to the Committee of Supply [No. 8] *Nov* 25, 173
. Supply — Vote of £2,000,000, towards defraying the Expenses of the Expedition *Nov* 26, 182 ; after long debate, Vote agreed to ; Resolution reported and agreed to *Nov* 27, 314
. *Expenditure — The Estimates*, Questions, Mr. Whalley, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 20, 988 ; Questions, Captain Vivian, Mr. Childers ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 16, 1683
East India, Troops and Vessels — see title *East India, Troops and Vessels*

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

190] Queen's Speech considered *Nov* 21; Motion, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty;" Committee thereupon to-morrow, 107

Committee on Motion, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty;" Queen's Speech referred; Motion considered; (In the Committee); Queen's Speech read; Resolved, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty" *Nov* 22; Resolution, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty," reported, and agreed to *Nem. Con. Nov* 25—Committee appointed for to-morrow; Resolution considered in Committee *Nov* 26, 181 — THE ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION—£2,000,000, towards defraying the Expenses of the Expedition to Abyssinia, beyond the ordinary Grants for 1867-8; after long debate, Motion agreed to; Resolution reported, and agreed to *Nov* 27, 314

Considered in Committee *Mar* 16, 1793—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — (1.) £79,829 2*s.* 7*d.*, Excesses on Grants for Civil Services; (2.) £8,381 1*s.* 1*d.*, Excesses on Grant for Salaries and Expenses of Inland Revenue Department; (3.) £1,089 13*s.* 8*d.*, Excesses on Grant for Post Office Packet Service; (4.) £134,000, Civil Services, Supplementary Estimate, 1867-8

Considered in Committee *Mar* 17, 1827—ARMY ESTIMATES—(1.) £48,479 8*s.* 8*d.*, Excesses of Army Expenditure; (2.) £90,619 13*s.* 9*d.*, Excess of Naval Expenditure; £6,000,000, on account of Army Services *Mar* 19, 1937; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Considered in Committee *Mar* 19, 1938—NAVY ESTIMATES—(1.) 67,120 Men and Boys, Sea and Coast Guard Services, including 14,700 Royal Marines, 1939; after short debate, Vote agreed to; (2.) £2,000,000, on account for Navy Services; agreed to

Considered in Committee *Mar* 20, 2050—ARMY ESTIMATES — £4,000,000 on account, Army Services; Vote agreed to

191] Considered in Committee *Mar* 23 — ARMY ESTIMATES—Statement of the Secretary of State for War (*Sir John Pakington*) on moving the First Resolution, 40—Resolutions reported *Mar* 24

Considered in Committee *Mar* 26, 268—ARMY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *Mar* 27

Considered in Committee *April* 2, 799—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Vote of £1,200,000 on account—Resolution reported *April* 3

Considered in Committee *April* 20—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — Class I.—Public Works and Buildings, 983 — Resolutions reported *April* 21

192] Considered in Committee *May* 11, 34—NAVY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *May* 12

Considered in Committee *May* 14, 290—NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE—ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION —£3,000,000—Class I.—Public Works and Buildings—Resolutions reported *May* 15

Considered in Committee *May* 15—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — Class I.—Public Works and Buildings, 391 — Resolutions reported *May* 18

Considered in Committee *May* 18—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class III.—Law and Justice, 494—Resolutions reported *May* 19

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

192] *Vote £1,412,000 further on Account of Civil Service Estimates*, Observations, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 28, 1010

Considered in Committee *May* 28 — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *May* 29

Considered in Committee *May* 29 — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class III.—Law and Justice, 1103

Resolutions [May 29] reported *June* 4
Resolution 7 (Register House, Edinburgh); short debate thereon *June* 4, 1175
Resolution 11 (Government Prisons and Expenses of Transportation); short debate thereon *June* 4, 1176
Resolutions agreed to

The Approaching Dissolution, Questions, Mr. Childers, Mr. Lowe; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 4, 1126

Considered in Committee *June* 4—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — Class IV.— Education, Science, and Art—Class VII.—Miscellaneous Estimates, 1132

Resolutions [June 4] reported; short debate thereon *June* 15, 1602
Vote 8 (£511,324, Public Education in Great Britain); after short debate, Resolution agreed to *June* 15, 1607
Vote 25 (£19,377, Miscellaneous Expenses); Resolution read a second time *June* 15, 1608
Amendt. to leave out "£19,337," and insert "£14,877" (*Mr. Lusk*); after short debate, Question, "That '£19,377,' stand part of the Resolution," put, and agreed to
Resolution agreed to

The Dissolution, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 8, 1223

Considered in Committee *June* 25 — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — Class VI.— Superannuation and Retired Allowances—Class V. —Colonial, Consular, and Foreign Services —POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE—Resolutions reported *June* 26

193] Considered in Committee *June* 29, 343—R.P.

Considered in Committee *July* 2, 535—NAVY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *July* 3

Considered in Committee *July* 3, 668—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *July* 6

Considered in Committee *July* 7, 827—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — BRITISH MUSEUM— CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT — INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT— POST OFFICE, &c.—Resolutions reported *July* 9

Considered in Committee *July* 9, 959—ARMY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *July* 10

Considered in Committee *July* 13, 1143—NAVY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *July* 14

Civil Service Estimates, Observations, Mr. Childers; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 14, 1185

Considered in Committee *July* 14, 1201—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — Resolutions reported *July* 15

Considered in Committee *July* 16, 1278—ARMY ESTIMATES — Resolutions reported *July* 17, 1367

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

SUPPLEMENTAL VOTES

SUPPLIES (DEFICIENCIES), 1866-7.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 17—REPORT *Mar* 18.

	Total of Vote. £	s.	d.
Navy Services	90,619	13	9
Army Services	48,479	8	8

CIVIL SERVICES—viz.:

COMMITTEE *Mar* 16—REPORT *Mar* 17.

CLASS II.	£	s.	d.
Office of Works, &c.	1,199	14	3
Inspectors of Factories, &c.	562	10	7
Quarantine Expenses	306	15	7
Printing and Stationery	16,831	2	8
CLASS III.			
Law Charges, England	2,507	7	1
Admiralty Court Registry	243	1	7
Exchequer, Scotland, Legal Branch	393	10	1
Law Charges, Ireland	9,285	10	4
Bankruptcy Court, Ireland	1,182	0	0
Maintenance of Prisoners	17,774	13	0
CLASS V.			
Pitcairn's Islanders	87	5	10
Special Missions	10,224	17	5
CLASS VI.			
Relief of Distressed British Seamen	16,942	17	7
CLASS VII.			
Ecclesiastical Commission	202	6	3
Miscellaneous Expenses formerly Civil Contingencies	241	1	0
Anglo-Chinese Flotilla	1,844	9	4
Total	£79,829	2	7

COMMITTEE *Mar* 16—REPORT *Mar* 17.

Inland Revenue Department	8,381	1	1
Post Office Packet Service	1,089	13	8

SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS 1867-8.

COMMITTEE *Nov* 26—REPORT *Nov* 27. £

Expedition to Abyssinia 1867-8 ... 2,000,000
After long debate, Vote agreed to [190] 182, 314

CIVIL SERVICES—viz.:

COMMITTEE *Mar* 16—REPORT *Mar* 17.

CLASS I.	
Landguard Point—Works	2,000
CLASS II.	
Inspectors of Factories, &c.	5,000
Quarantine Expenses	4,000

Supply—cont.

CLASS III.	Total of Vote. £
Law Charges, England	11,000
Law Charges, Ireland	36,000
Court of Chancery, Ireland	14,000
Maintenance of Prisoners	12,000
CLASS VII.	
Temporary Commissions	21,000
Local Dues under Treaties of Reciprocity	11,000
Agricultural Statistics	8,000
Cape Haytien Bombardment — Compensation	4,000
Shannon River Survey	6,000
Total	£134,000

1868-9.

COMMITTEE *May* 14—REPORT *May* 15.

Expedition to Abyssinia 1868-9 ... 3,000,000

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1868-9.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 19—REPORT *Mar* 20.

	Numbers.
67,120 Men and Boys, Sea and Coast Guard Services, including 14,700 Royal Marines ... [190] 1939	67,120

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1868-9.

Total of Vote. £

£2,000,000 on Account for Navy Services

COMMITTEE *May* 11—Report *May* 12.

Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Corry) on moving, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,036,634, &c."
Moved, "That the item of £525,725 for Wages, &c. to Marines be reduced by £60,000" (*Mr. Childers*); after debate, Question put; A. 73, N. 127; M. 54 ... [191] 79
Original Question again proposed; Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,016,634, &c." (*Colonel Sykes*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; original Question agreed to [191] 90
(1.) Wages to Seamen and Marines... 3,036,634
(2.) Victuals and Clothing for ditto... 1,335,842
After debate, Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Lusk*); Motion withdrawn; original Question agreed to [191] 92

COMMITTEE *July* 2—REPORT *July* 3.

(3.) Admiralty Office ... 182,364
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £182,364, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £176,064, &c." (*Mr. Lusk*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; original Motion agreed to [193] 535
(4.) † £163,926, Coast Guard Service, Royal Naval Coast Volunteers, and Royal Naval Reserve ... 243,926

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote. £

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £163,926, &c."

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £143,926, &c." (*Admiral Erskine*); after short debate, Question agreed to [193] 539

(5.) Scientific Branch 63,565

(6.) † £823,562, Dockyards and Naval Yards at home and abroad ... 1,223,562

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £823,562, &c."

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £823,062, &c." (*Mr. Samuda*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; original Motion agreed to [193] 543

COMMITTEE *July* 13—REPORT *July* 14.

(7.) Victualling Yards and Transport Establishments at Home and Abroad 87,179

(8.) Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad 64,824

(9.) Marine Divisions 20,709

(10.) Naval Stores for the Building, Repair, and Outfit of the Fleet and Coast Guard, Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract:

Section I. Storekeeper General of the Navy 892,908

Section II. † £742,500, Controller of the Navy ... 1,092,500

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £742,500, &c."

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £742,000, &c." (*Mr. Samuda*); after debate, A. 59, N. 92; M. 33; original Motion agreed to [193] 1148

(11.) † £564,237, New Works, Buildings, Machinery, and Repairs ... 814,237

After short debate, Vote agreed to [193] 1155

(12.) Medicines and Medical Stores ... 78,164

After short debate, Vote agreed to [193] 1155

(13.) Martial Law and Law Charges... 20,365

(14.) Miscellaneous Services ... 175,800

After short debate, Vote agreed to [193] 1156

Total for the Effective Service ... 9,332,579

(15.) † £500,166, Half Pay, Reserved Half Pay, and Retired Pay to Officers of the Navy and Royal Marines ... 700,166

(16.) Military and Civil Pensions and Allowances:

Section I. † £400,447, Military Pensions and Allowances ... 550,447

Section II. Civil Pensions and Allowances 223,498

Total for the Naval Service ...10,806,690

FOR THE SERVICE OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT. £

(17.) Army Department (Conveyance of Troops) 350,600

Grand Total, Navy Services...£11,157,290

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1868-9.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 19.

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,000,000, be granted to Her Majesty, on account, towards defraying the Army Services for the year ending 31st March, 1869" (*Sir John Pakington*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn [190] 1937

COMMITTEE *Mar* 20—REPORT *Mar* 23.

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,000,000, &c." (*Sir J. Pakington*); Vote agreed to [190] 2050

COMMITTEE *Mar* 23—REPORT *Mar* 24.

Statement of the Secretary of State for War (*Sir John Pakington*) on moving Resolution (A), "That the number of Land Forces, not exceeding 138,691 Men, &c." [191] 40

Moved, "That the number of Land Forces, not exceeding 138,691 Men, &c."

Amendt. moved, "That the number of Land Forces, not exceeding 135,933 Men, &c." (*Mr. Otway*); after long debate, Motion withdrawn; original Question put, and agreed to

NUMBERS. — *Numbers.*

(A.) General Staff, Regimental and Military Educational Establishments 138,691

(B.) Native Indian Troops 880

I.—REGULAR FORCES. — Total of Vote. £

(1.) † £4,249,200, General Staff and Regimental Pay, Allowances, and Charges 5,749,200

(2.) † £892,500, Commissariat Establishment, Services, Movement of Troops, &c. 1,292,500

COMMITTEE *Mar* 26—REPORT *Mar* 27.

(3.) † £322,900, Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies ... 496,900

(4.) † £506,300, Barrack Establishments, Services, and Supplies ... 706,300

(5.) † £26,800, Divine Service ... 42,800

(6.) † £13,000, Administration of Martial Law 23,000

(7.) † £280,800, Hospital Establishment, Services, and Supplies ... 380,800

II.—RESERVE FORCES.

(8.) † £686,800, Militia and Inspection of Reserve Forces ... 986,800

(9.) † £58,000, Yeomanry Cavalry ... 88,000

(10.) † £285,100, Volunteer Corps ... 385,100

After debate, Vote agreed to [191] 284

(11.) † £39,600, Enrolled Pensioners and Army Reserve Force [191] 284 64,600

After debate, Vote agreed to

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
III.—Stores.	
Committee *July* 9—Report *July* 10.	£
(12.) † £1,291,400, Military Store Departments for the Supply and Repair of Warlike and other Stores, including Manufacturing Departments ...	1,491,400
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,291,400, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,247,958, &c." (*Major Anson*); after short debate, A. 31, N. 100; M. 69; original Question agreed to [193] 959	
IV.—Works and Buildings.	
Committee *Mar* 26—Report *Mar* 27.	
(13.) † £768,400, Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for, Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad	968,400
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £768,400, &c."	
Amendt. moved, "That the item of £3,000 for Billiard Rooms in Barracks be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Lusk*); after debate, A. 24, N. 72; M. 48; original Question agreed to ... [191] 295	
V.—Various Services.	
Committee *July* 9—Report *July* 10.	
(14.) † £119,300, Establishments for Military Education	169,300
(15.) † £93,600, Surveys of the United Kingdom ... [193] 962	118,600
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(16.) † £102,700, Miscellaneous Services ... ... [193] 965	142,700
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(17.) † £154,600, Administration of the Army ... ... [193] 966	224,600
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
Total Effective Services	£13,331,000
VI.—Non-Effective Services.	
Committee *July* 9—Report *July* 10.	
(18.) † £13,700, Rewards for Distinguished Services, &c.	26,700
(19.) † £36,000, Pay of General Officers	72,000
(20.) † £389,800, Full pay of Reduced and Retired Officers and Half-pay ...	470,800
After short debate, Motion withdrawn [193] 967	
Committee *July* 14.	
Question again proposed; after short debate, Committee—r.p.	
Committee *July* 16—Report *July* 17.	
Question again proposed, and, after debate, agreed to ... [193] 1278	
Resolution reported *July* 17, and, after short debate, agreed to [193] 1367	
(21.) † £98,000, Widows' Pensions, &c.	157,000
(22.) † £11,800, Pensions for Wounds	23,800

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
	£
(23.) † £15,600, Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, (In-Pensions) ...	33,600
(24.) † £839,600, Out-Pensions ...	1,184,600
(25.) † £97,200, Superannuation Allowances	135,200
(26.) † £8,700, Militia, Yeomanry Cavalry, and Volunteer Corps ...	20,700
Total Non-Effective Services ...	£2,124,400

Recapitulation.

Effective Services	13,331,000
Non-Effective Services ...	2,124,400
Amount Written off as Irrecoverable	—
Total Effective and Non-Effective Services	£15,455,400

1868-9.

Committee *May* 8—Report *May* 11.	£
Exchequer Bonds	600,000

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1868-9.

⁂ The Votes marked † are "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

Committee *April* 20—Report *April* 21.	Total of Vote.
	£
(1.) † £59,920, British Embassy Houses: Constantinople, China, and Japan ... [191] 983	64,920
Moved, "That the Item of £6,000, Embassy House at Therapia, be omitted from the Vote" (*Mr. Monk*); after short debate, A. 20, N. 37; M. 17	
Moved, "That the Item of £15,000, Consular Buildings in Japan, be omitted from Vote" (*Mr. Lusk*); after short debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to	
(2.) † £8,000, Metropolitan Fire Brigade	10,000
(3.) Embassy House at Teheran ...	8,000
(4.) † £103,675, Harbours of Refuge, &c. ... [191] 1000	116,675
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(5.) † £37,310, Lighthouses Abroad	42,310
After short debate, Vote agreed to [191] 1003	
(6.) † £51,238, Royal Palaces	56,238
Moved, "That the Item of £5,636, for Palaces partly in occupation of Her Majesty, be omitted from Vote" (*Mr. Fawcett*); after debate, A. 8, N. 82; M. 74	
Moved, "That the Item of £7,313, Hampton Court Palace Stables, &c. be reduced by £5,000" (*Mr. Labouchere*); after short debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [191] 1008	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
COMMITTEE *May* 14—REPORT *May* 15.	£
(7.) † £102,905, Public Buildings	117,905
Moved, "That the Item of £1,470, Professor's Residence, Aberdeen, be omitted from Vote" (*Mr. Candlish*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [192] 292	
(8.) † £13,000, Furniture of Public Offices ... [192] 295	15,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(9.) † £122,524, Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens ... [192] 296	137,524
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(10.) † £47,936, Houses of Parliament	54,936
Moved, "That the Item of £330 for Statues in Westminster Hall, &c. be omitted from Vote" (*Mr. Osborne*); after short debate, A. 76, N. 234; M. 158; Vote agreed to [192] 311	
(11.) † £1,135, British Embassy Houses: Paris and Madrid [193] 312	2,135
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £135, &c." (*Mr. Labouchere*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	
(12.) † £19,512, New Foreign Office	22,512
COMMITTEE *May* 15—REPORT *May* 18.	
(13.) † £32,760, Public Offices Site	42,760
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 391	
(14.) † £11,764, Probate Court and Registries	13,764
(15.) † £23,000, Public Record Repository	24,000
(16.) † £44,000, National Gallery Enlargement ... [192] 392	50,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(17.) † £22,000, University of London Buildings ... [192] 395	25,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(18.) † £8,000, Chapter House, Westminster ... [192] 396	10,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(20.) † £25,400, New Palace at Westminster, Acquisition of Land	29,400
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 396	
(21.) † £51,000, Burlington House	55,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 397	
(22.) † £23,905, Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland ... [192] 400	26,905
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(23.) † £31,252, Rates for Government Property	36,252
(24.) † £77,470, Post Office and Inland Revenue Buildings	89,470
(25.) New Home and Colonial Offices	10,000
(26.) Glasgow University, New Buildings ... [192] 400	20,000
Moved, to report Progress (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	
(27.) † £3,200, Wellington Monument	4,200
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 403	
(28.) † £1,000, Palmerston Monument	2,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 403	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
	£
(29.) † £133,259, Public Buildings, Ireland [192] 404	149,259
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(30.) † £6,000, Queen's University, Ireland	7,000
(31.) † £4,300, Ulster Canal [192] 404	5,300
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(32.) † £7,500, Portland Harbour	8,500
Total Civil Services Class I. ...	£1,256,965

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

COMMITTEE *July* 14—REPORT *July* 15.	
(1.) † £35,609, Treasury ..	52,609
(2.) † £28,000, Secret Service ...	32,000
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £18,000, &c." (*Mr. Lusk*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [193] 1201	
(3.) † £56,410, Home Office, &c.	89,410
After short debate, Vote agreed to [193] 1202	
(4.) † £52,453, Foreign Office	74,453
After short debate, Vote agreed to [193] 1203	
(5.) † £19,990, Colonial Office	32,990
(6.) † £65,725, Board of Trade, &c.	97,725
After short debate, Vote agreed to [193] 1203	
(7.) † £3,176, Household of the Lord Lieutenant ... [193] 1206	6,176
Moved, "That the Item of £1,574 6*s.* 2*d.*, for Queen's Plates, be omitted from Vote" (*Mr. Lusk*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	
(8.) † £14,927, Chief Secretary, Ireland, Offices	22,927
(9.) † £12,646, Paymaster General's Office	19,646
(10.) † £4,136, Exchequer and other Offices, Scotland	6,136
(11.) † £22,700, Office of Works and Public Buildings [193] 1208	34,700
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(12.) † £17,546, Office of Public Works, Ireland	26,546
(13.) † £36,354, House of Commons, Offices	54,354
(14.) † £28,585, Privy Council Office	42,585
(15.) † £1,918, Privy Seal Office ...	2,918
(16.) † £6,407, Civil Service Commission	9,407
(17.) † £25,000, Exchequer and Audit Department	38,500
(18.) † £16,958, Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenue [193] 1209	26,958
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(19.) † £14,926, Public Record Office	21,926
(20.) † £140,183, Poor Law Commission	209,183
(21.) † £30,820, Mint, including Coinage	45,820
(22.) † £13,294, Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission	20,294
(23.) † £7,200, Inclosure and Drainage Acts; Imprest Expenses ...	11,200

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(24.) † £27,961, General Register Office	40,961
(25.) † £11,132, National Debt Office	16,132
(26.) † £3,429, Public Works Loan Commission	4,429
(27.) † £2,820, Lunacy Commission	4,820
(28.) † £1,449, Registrars of Friendly Societies	2,449
(29.) † £12,438, Charity Commission	18,438
(30.) † £19,071, Patent Office	32,071
(31.) † £215,909, Printing and Stationery	395,909
(32.) † £11,867, Poor Law Commission, Scotland	16,867
(33.) † £4,608, General Register Office, Scotland	7,608
(34.) † £3,206, Lunacy Commission, Scotland	6,206
(35.) † £9,223, Fishery Board, Scotland	13,223
(36.) † £2,296, Public Record Office, Ireland	4,296
(37.) † £63,267, Poor Law Commission, Ireland	95,267
(38.) † £14,722, General Register Office, Ireland	21,722
(39.) Boundary Survey, Ireland	250
(40.) † £1,188, Charitable Donations and Bequests, Ireland	2,188
Total Civil Services Class II.	£1,661,299
CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.	
COMMITTEE *May* 18—REPORT *May* 19.	
(1.) † £37,100, Law Charges, England [192] 494	43,100
Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Kinnaird*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	
(2.) † £163,766, Criminal Prosecutions [192] 495	188,776
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £162,776, &c." (*Mr. Fawcett*); after debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to	
(3.) † £231,000, Police, Counties and Boroughs, Great Britain	266,000
(4.) † £49,283, Common Law Courts, England	56,283
(5.) † £18,346, Miscellaneous Legal Charges, England	21,346
(6.) † £210,070, County Prisons and Reformatories, &c. Great Britain	240,070
(7.) † £433,674, County Courts	493,674
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 502	
(8.) † £28,950, Police Courts, London and Sheerness [192] 502	31,950
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(9.) † £165,524, Metropolitan Police	190,524
Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Watkin*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [192] 503	
(10.) † £130,891, Convict Establishments in the Colonies [192] 504	150,891
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
COMMITTEE *May* 29—REPORT *June* 4.	
(11.) † £66,314, Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland	106,314

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(12.) † £11,421, Common Law Courts, Ireland [192] 1104	28,421
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(13.) † £6,020, Miscellaneous Legal Charges, Ireland	9,020
(14.) † £6,000, County Prisons, Ireland	9,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 1104	
(15.) † £47,484, Criminal Proceedings, Scotland	67,484
(16.) † £33,378, Courts of Law and Justice, Scotland	49,378
(17.) † £11,909, Register House Departments, Scotland	16,909
(18.) † £8,705, Admiralty Court Registry	13,705
(19.) † £49,979, Probate Court	89,979
(20.) † £3,470, Land Registry Office	5,470
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 1105	
(21.) † £160,332, Government Prisons, England, and Transportation	296,332
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £159,932, &c." (*Mr. Candlish*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [192] 1107	
(22.) † £22,929, Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	33,929
(23.) † £16,267, Prisons, Scotland	24,267
(24.) † £23,171, Court of Chancery, Ireland	45,171
(25.) † £1,171, Registry of Judgments, Ireland	3,171
(26.) † £9,200, Registry of Deeds, Ireland	14,200
(27.) † £5,400, Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency, Ireland	8,400
(28.) † £6,272, Court of Probate, Ireland	11,272
(29.) † £3,906, Landed Estates Court, Ireland	12,906
(30.) † £50,488, Dublin Metropolitan Police, Ireland	95,488
(31.) † £573,751, Constabulary, Ireland	883,751
(32.) † £1,530, Four Courts Marshalsea, Ireland	2,530
(33.) † £32,399, Government Prisons and Reformatories, Ireland	63,399
(34.) † £2,376, Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum, Ireland	4,376
(35.) † £1,200, Admiralty Court Registry, Ireland	2,200
RESOLUTIONS reported *June* 4.	
Res. 7 (Register House, Edinburgh); short debate thereon [192] 1175	
Res. 11 (Government Prisons); short debate thereon [192] 1176	
Resolutions agreed to	
Total Civil Services Class III.	£3,579,686
CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.	
COMMITTEE *June* 4—REPORT *June* 15.	
(1.) † £7,800, Learned Societies, Great Britain [192] 1132	11,800
After short debate, Vote agreed to	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
(2.) Dr. Petrie's Collection ...	£1,580
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 1133	
(3.) † £2,265, Queen's Colleges, Ireland ...	4,265
(4.) Royal Irish Academy ...	1,784
(5.) † £1,050, Belfast Theological Professors ...	2,050
(6.) † £11,949, Universities, &c. Scotland ... [192] 1134	17,949
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(7.) † £2,200, Board of Manufactures	4,200
(8.) † £511,324, Public Education, Great Britain ... [192] 1134	781,324
After debate, Vote agreed to	
(9.) † £141,690, Science and Art Department ...	218,690
Moved, "That Item of £2,500, Universal Art Catalogue, be reduced by £1,000" (*Mr. Gregory*); A. 34, N. 54, M. 20; Vote agreed to [192] 1172	
(10.) † £6,063, University of London ...	9,063

COMMITTEE *July* 7—REPORT *July* 9.

(11.) † £67,380, British Museum ...	99,380
After short debate, Vote agreed to [193] 827	

COMMITTEE *June* 4—REPORT *June* 15.

(12.) † £10,992, National Gallery ...	15,992
Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Bentinck*); Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [192] 1172	
(13.) † £800, British Historical Portrait Gallery ...	1,800
(14.) † £235,195, Public Education, Ireland ...	360,195
(15.) Education Commissioners, Ireland	730
(16.) † £2,155, Queen's University, Ireland ...	3,155
(17.) † £1,740, National Gallery, Ireland ...	2,740

REPORT *June* 15

Vote 8 (£511,324, Public Education in Great Britain); after short debate, agreed to ... [192] 1607

Total Civil Services Class IV. ...	£1,536,697

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *June* 25—REPORT *June* 26.

(1.) £3 701, Treasury Chest ...	10,701
(2.) † £19,656, Tonnage Bounties, &c.	28,656
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 2170	
(3.) † £200, Coolie Emigration ...	1,200
(4.) † £4,360, Commissioners for Suppression of Slave Trade ...	7,360
(5.) † £126,178, Consuls Abroad ...	171,178
After short debate, Vote agreed to [192] 2171	

COMMITTEE *July* 3—REPORT *July* 6.

(6.) † £87,615, China, Japan, and Siam, Services in ...	117,615
Moved to report Progress (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn [193] 668	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
Moved, "That Item of £6,000, for Envoy and Chief Superintendent, be reduced by £2,000" (*Colonel Sykes*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn	
Moved, "That Item of £500, Salary of Vice-Consul at Taku, be omitted from Vote" (*Colonel Sykes*); Motion negatived; Vote agreed to	
(7.) † £36,314, Ministers at Foreign Courts, Extraordinary Expenses	56,314
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £33,814, &c." (*Mr. Lusk*); Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [193] 674	
(8.) † £52,950, Colonies, Grants in Aid, &c. ... [193] 675	74,950
Moved to report Progress (*Sir W. Gallwey*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	
(9.) † 3,072, Orange River Territory and St. Helena ...	4,072
(10.) † £9,231, Emigration ...	14,231
Total Civil Services Class V. ...	£486,277

CLASS VI.—SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES, AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *June* 4—REPORT *June* 15.

(1.) † £5,083, Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, Great Britain	7,083
(2.) † £34,040, Merchant Seamen's Fund, Pensions, &c. ...	51,040
(3.) † £30,400, Relief of Distressed British Seamen ...	45,400
(4.) † £145,867, Superannuation and Retired Allowances [192] 1173	255,867
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(5.) † £13,134, Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland ...	19,134
(6.) † £4,915, Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, Ireland ...	6,915

COMMITTEE *June* 25—REPORT *June* 26.

(7.) † £21,386, Nonconforming and other Ministers (Ireland) ...	41,386
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £366, &c." (*Mr. Hadfield*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [192] 2166	
Total Civil Services Class VI. ...	£426,825

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS.

COMMITTEE *June* 4—REPORT *June* 15.

(1.) † £14,000, Temporary Commissions ...	40,000
(2.) Malta and Alexandria Cable, and Balmoral Telegraphs ...	780
(3.) † £19,337, Miscellaneous Expenses	
Moved, "That Item of £11,058, for Veterinary Department, Privy Council, be omitted from Vote" (*Sir J. Clarke Jervoise*); after debate, Motion withdrawn, Vote agreed to [192] 1174	39,377

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
	£
(4.) † £31,599, Local Dues on Shipping	47,599
(5.) † £2,000, Flax Cultivation ...	4,000
After debate, Vote agreed to [192] 1175	
Committee *July* 14—Report *July* 15.	
(6.) Portpatrick Railway Company ...	20,000
Moved to report Progress (*Mr. Neate*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [193] 1210	
Vote 25 (£19,377, Miscellaneous Expenses)	
Moved to omit £19,377, and insert £14,877, instead thereof (*Mr. Lusk*); after debate, Question, "That £19,377 stand part of the Resolution," put, and agreed to [192] 1608	
Resolution reported *June* 15	
(7.) Clerkenwell Explosion [193] 1212	7,500
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(8.) Registration under Reform Acts	10,000
Total Civil Services Class VII ...	£169,256
Committee *May* 14—Report *May* 15.	£
Advances for New Courts of Justice ...	106,000

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1868-9.	
Committee *July* 7—Report *July* 9.	
Vote I. Customs (Salaries and Expenses) ... ... [193] 831	£ 1,024,653
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
Vote II. Inland Revenue (Salaries and Expenses)	1,574,210
Vote III. Post Office Services ...	2,369,235
After short debate, Vote agreed to [193] 831	
Total of Revenue Departments...	£4,968,098
POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE.	
Committee *July* 7—Report *July* 9.	
† £789,349, Post Office Packet Service ... ... [193] 835	£ 1,089,349
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
Committee *July* 13—Report *July* 14.	
† £42,079, Greenwich Hospital and School (Advances) [193] 1156	£
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
Resolution reported *July* 14, and *recomm.* ... ... [193] 1185	
Resolved, "That a sum, not exceeding £127,600, &c." ... [193] 1210	127,608

SUMMARY.

Ways and Means.

Schedule of Ways and Means referred to in Section 5 of the Consolidated Fund (Appropriation Act—viz.:

	£	s.	d.
Granted per Act 31 *Vict.* c. 1, for the Service of the Year ending 31st March 1868 ...	2,000,000	0	0
Granted per Act 31 *Vict.* c. 10, for the Service of the Years ending 31st March 1867 and 31st March 1868 ...	362,398	19	9
Granted for the Service of the Year ending 31st March 1869—viz.:			
Per Act 31 *Vict.* c. 13 ...	6,000,000	0	0
Per Act 31 *Vict.* c. 16 ...	17,000,000	0	0
Per Section 1 of this Act	22,083,532	9	5
Per Section 4 of this Act (being Surplus Ways and Means granted for the Service of preceding Years)	537,217	10	7
Total Grants of Ways and Means to meet the following Supplies:—			
1867-8 £2,362,398 19 9 1868-9 45,620,750 0 0	£47,983,148	19	9

SUMMARY.

Sums Voted in Supply, Session 1868.

		£	s.	d.
1866-7—(Deficiencies.)				
Navy Services		90,619	13	9
Army Services		48,479	8	8
Civil Services		79,829	2	7
Inland Revenue Department		8,381	1	1
Post Office Packet Service		1,089	13	8
1867-8—(Supplemental.)				
Expedition to Abyssinia ...		2,000,000	0	0
Civil Services		134,000	0	0
1868-9				
Expedition to Abyssinia ...		3,000,000	0	0
Navy Services		11,157,290	0	0
Army Services		15,455,400	0	0
Exchequer Bonds		600,000	0	0
Civil Services—viz.:	£			
I. Public Works and Buildings	1,256,965			
II. Salaries, &c. Public Departments...	1,661,299			
III. Law and Justice	3,579,686			
IV. Education, Science, and Art ...	1,536,697			
V. Colonial and Consular Services ...	486,277			
VI. Superannuation, &c.	426,825			
VII. Miscellaneous	169,256			
		9,117,005	0	0
Revenue Departments		4,968,098	0	0
Post Office Packet Service		1,089,349	0	0
Advances for New Courts of Justice and Offices		106,000	0	0
Advances for Greenwich Hospital and School		127,608	0	0
Total of Supplies chargeable upon the above Ways and Means—		£47,983,148	19	9

SURTEES, Mr. C. FREVILLE-, *Durham, S.*
Boundary, Comm. Schedule, [192] 1443
Egypt—Claims on the Viceroy, [192] 924
Roman Catholic Oath, [191] 1582, 1583

SURTEES, Mr. H. E., *Hertfordshire*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 97
East Worcestershire Election, [192] 1123
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 470
India—Officers of the late Indian Navy, [190] 1980
Poor Relief, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1886

SYKES, Colonel W. H., *Aberdeen City*
Abyssinia—Questions, &c.
  Cameron, Consul, [190] 104
  Correspondence, [190] 1005, 1006
  European Subaltern Officers, [190] 178
  Expedition, The, [191] 1338
  Foreign Office, [190] 611
  Rassam, Mr., Mission of, [190] 679
  Route for the, [190] 336
  Theodore, King, Presents from, [190] 643
Army—Questions, &c.
  Cooking Apparatus, [191] 257
  Fortifications, [191] 260, 1457
  Fortifications at Chatham, [190] 1221
Army — Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 321
Army—Fortifications, Res. [191] 2029, 2030; [193] 1816
Army — Royal Gun Factories, Motion for a Committee, [193] 1256
Army — Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 546, 547
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 28, [191] 677
Canongate Annuity Tax, 2R. [191] 1104
Ceylon—Condition of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 979
China—Ambassador from, [190] 799
  Treaty of Tien-tsin, [191] 1147; [193] 1947
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1620
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 15, [193] 1603
Elementary Education, 2R. [192] 2011
Government of India Act Amendment, 2R. [192] 1599; Comm. 1877; *cl.* 1, 1887, 1891; *cl.* 2, [193] 860
Governor General of India, 2R. [192] 1602
India—Questions, &c.
  East India Canal Company, [190] 990
  Finance, [190] 1982
  Indian Service Medals, [193] 1823
  Municipal Commissioners of Bombay, [192] 1754
India — East India Civil Service, Res. [191] 1850, 1851
India—East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [193] 1842, 1856, 1861
India—Troops and Vessels (Abyssinian Expedition) Res. [190] 373, 407
International Monetary Conference, [190] 601
Japan—Outrages in, [192] 922
Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1528
Local Taxation, [190] 1029
Metropolis—Thames Embankment, [190] 1686
Metropolitan Board of Works, [190] 1980
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. [193] 1303; *cl.* 3, 1760

[*cont.*

SYKES, Colonel W. H.—*cont.*
Military Education, Res. [191] 1837
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [193] 543
  Wages, Amendt. [192] 88, 92
Parliament—Dissolution of, [192] 1076
  Members' Seats in this House, [191] 698
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 13, [192] 1933; *cl.* 20, [193] 813, 814; *add. cl.* 823; Lords Amendts. 1907
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [190] 830; 2R. 1254, 1267; Comm. [192] 470; *cl.* 3, 849; *cl.* 8, 874, 890, 892; *cl.* 10, 986, 987; *add. cl.* 1247, 1250
Scotland—Middle Class Schools, [193] 652
  Railway Property, Assessment of, [193] 911
Slave Bounties, [192] 1130
Storm Warnings, [190] 145
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 291
  Board of Trade, [193] 1204
  Bounties on Slaves, [192] 2170
  British Embassy Houses, [191] 983, 84, 991, 993, 995
  Common Law Courts (Ireland), [192] 1104
  Consular Establishments Abroad, [192] 2171, 2172
  Education, Public, [192] 1154
  Establishments of China, Japan, and Siam, Amendt. [193] 671, 672, 673
  Foreign Office, [193] 1203
  Government Prisons, [192] 1106
  Household of the Lord Lieutenant, [193] 1208
  Houses of Parliament, [192] 306, 310
  Learned Societies, Grants to, [192] 1133
  Mission House, Teheran, [191] 998
  Science and Art, [192] 1167, 1170
  Volunteer Corps, [191] 269
  Works, Buildings, &c. [191] 287
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1175
Weights and Measures, [193] 1929

SYNAN, Mr. E. J., *Limerick Co.*
Burials (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1380
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 757, 761
Ireland—Compulsory Presentments, [193] 828
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1734
Ireland — University Education, Res. [193] 1060
Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [192] 1981; [193] 411
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1422; *cl.* 4, 1605; *cl.* 10, 1873, 1878; Amendt. 1879; *cl.* K, 1884
Prison Ministers Act, Res. [193] 381
Promissory Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 2, [193] 856
Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1488; *cl.* 32, 1498
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. [192] 1579; *cl.* 18, 1589, 1594; *add. cl.* 1769, 1779, 1794

Tain Provisional Order Confirmation Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 224]
Read 2° * *July* 9
Committee *; Report *July* 10
Read 3° * *July* 10

[*cont.*

Tain Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—cont.
l. Read 1^a * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 10
Read 2^a * *July* 17 (No. 242)
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3^a * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 155]

Tancred's Charity Bill (*Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Walpole, Viscount Cranborne*)
c. Ordered; read 1^o * *Mar* 18 [Bill 67]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^o" *Mar* 25, [191] 224
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Shaw-Lefevre*); after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c;" A. 69, N. 83; M. 14; words added; 2R. put off for six months

TAUNTON, Lord
Education, Technical—Whitworth Scholarships, [191] 824
Endowed Grammar Schools, [191] 1782, 1783
France—Coasting Trade, Address for a Paper, [193] 981
Gambling in Hong Kong and Heligoland, [190] 523
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [191] 692
Public Offices, The New, [191] 1684
Railway Bills—Increase of Rates, Res. [193] 1069, 1078
Ritual Commission, [190] 1877
Reports of the, [192] 335
Sea Fisheries, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 240
South Coast Railways, 2R. [192] 1459; 3R. [193] 360

TAYLOR, Mr. P. A., *Leicester*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 86
Burial Societies, Frauds upon, [192] 920
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 980
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 46, [193] 1371; *add. cl.* 1442; Consid. *add. cl.* 1690
Eyre, Ex-Governor, and his Expenses, [192] 1477
Ireland—Prisons, Regulation of, [193] 912
Religion of Convicts, [192] 423
Leominster Magistrates, [193] 304
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1342
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [193] 1421, 1422; *add. cl.* 1886
Postal—Mr. Churchward, [190] 1072
Queensland—Polynesian Labourers, [190] 1590; [191] 1882; [192] 816
Sunday Trading, 2R. [191] 1085
United States—Case of the "Lizzie Lina," [190] 1219

TEMPLETOWN, Viscount
Contagious Diseases Act, [192] 326

Tenure and Improvement of Land, &c. (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Rearden, Mr. Michael Bass*)
c. Ordered; read 1^o * *July* 18 [Bill 244]

Tenure (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)
l. Presented; read 1^a, after short debate *Feb* 24, [190] 1039 (No. 23)
Question, The Earl of Malmesbury; Answer, The Marquess of Clanricarde *Mar* 5, 1108
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a" *Mar* 12, 1432; after debate, Bill read 2^a, and referred to a Select Committee
And, on *Mar* 13, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—D. Devonshire, M. Bath, E. Devon, E. Clarendon, E. Lucan, E. Grey, E. Stradbroke, E. Kimberley, V. Lifford, L. Clifton, L. Somerhill, L. Chaworth, L. Stratheden, L. Clandeboye, L. Churston, L. Westbury
Report of Select Committee *May* 28 (*Parl. P.* No. 129)
Report * *May* 28 (No. 130)

Thames Embankment
Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 16, [190] 1686
Life Chains, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Tite *May* 15, [192] 341
Steamboat Piers, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Tite *April* 27, [191] 1332
Thames, Obstructions in the, Questions, Mr. Hardcastle, Lord Otho Fitzgerald; Answers, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 30, [191] 1775

Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans) Act Amendment Bill (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1^o * *May* 21 [Bill 133]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^o" *June* 5, [192] 1212; after short debate, [House counted out]
Read 2^o * *June* 9
Committee *; Report *June* 11
Considered * *June* 12
Read 3^o * *June* 15
l. Read 1^a * (*The Lord Clinton*) *June* 16
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a" *June* 23, 1917; Bill read 2^a (No. 152)
Committee *; Report *June* 26 (No. 156)
Read 3^a * *June* 29
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 43]

The Queen, Her Majesty
Notice, Mr. Rearden; Reply, Mr. Speaker *May* 22, [192] 711

Thetford, Member for—Titles of Dignity
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Disraeli *April* 3, [191] 831

THYNNE, Lord H. F., *Wiltshire, S.*
Established Church (Ireland), 1R. [192] 322

TITE, Mr. W., *Bath*
Courts of Justice, New, Motion for a Committee, [193] 335
Metropolis—Questions, &c.
Finsbury Park, [193] 718
Iron Gates in Devonshire Place, &c. [192] 243

[*cont.*

Tite, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Park Lane, [193] 1283
Thames Embankment, Steamboat Piers, [191] 1332; [192] 341
Thames Embankment, &c. Amendment, 2R. [192] 1217

Tithe Commutation, &c. Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 7 [Bill 218]
Read 2° * *July* 10
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3° * *July* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 16
Read 2ª * *July* 20 (No. 256)
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 89]

Titles to Land Consolidation (Scotland) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Graham Montgomery*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *Mar* 9, [190] 1283
Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 57]
Read 2° * *April* 20
Committee *; Report *June* 4 [Bill 151]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 15
Considered * *July* 16
Read 3° * *July* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 17
Read 2ª * *July* 21 (No. 268)
Committee *; Report *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 24
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 101]

Torrens, Mr. W. T. McCullagh, *Finsbury*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 6, [191] 673; *cl.* 24, 676; *cl.* 27, 677; *add. cl.* 1064; Consid. 1565; *add. cl.* 1875, 1876, 1877
Coldbath Fields Prison, Deaths in, [193] 1945
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. [193] 1642
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 608
Finsbury Park, [193] 717
Ireland—Irish Church Commissioners, [190] 1457
Parliament—Public Business, [192] 1130
Registration (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 22, [193] 1496
United States — Library Committee, Philadelphia, [193] 1902

Totnes, &c. Writs Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Dec* 2, [190] 522
Bill ordered, after debate; read 1° * [Bill 20]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Dec* 3, 546; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee; Report *Dec* 3
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *Dec* 3; after short debate, Bill read 3°
[*cont.*

Totnes, &c. Writs Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Derby*) *Dec* 3 (No. 7)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Dec* 4, 573; after short debate, Bill read 2ª; Committee negatived
Read 3ª * *Dec* 5
Royal Assent *Dec* 7 [31 *Vict.* c. 6]

Tottenham, Colonel C. G., *New Ross*
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1590

Townshend, Marquess of
Lodgers' Property Protection, 2R. [193] 976, 978
Poor, Relief of the, Address for a Commission, [192] 1462

Tracy, Hon. C. R. D. Hanbury-, *Montgomery*
Army—Report of Ordnance Select Committee, [190] 1456
Ceylon—Great Basses Lighthouse, [193] 309
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, [193] 542
Salaries of Officers, [193] 536

Trades Societies and Combinations of Workmen Bill
(*Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Mr. Richard Young*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 7 [Bill 219]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 21

Transubstantiation—Declaration against
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 29, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Declaration against Transubstantiation, &c. taken by the Sovereign of this Realm at his first Parliament or at his Coronation, whichever shall first happen after his Accession" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*), [192] 1098; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Treeby, Mr. J. W., *Lyme Regis*
Assessed Taxes—Appeal Courts, [190] 2050; [193] 1199
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 17, [193] 1168
Railways, Res. [190] 1884, 1886

Trevelyan, Mr. G. O., *Tynemouth*
Army — Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 514, 545, 578
Cattle, Importation of Foreign, [192] 424
India—East India Civil Service, Res. Amendt. [191] 1843
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [191] 324

Trevor, Lord A. E. Hill-, *Downshire*
Party Processions Act (Ireland), [192] 1228
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [192] 1538

Truro, Lord
  Army—Organization of the Reserved Forces, [193] 1350, 1353
    Volunteer Review at Windsor, [192] 1557; [193] 990

Turkey
  Brigandage near Smyrna, Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 29, [192] 1040
  Consular Courts in Turkey and Egypt, Observations, Mr. Layard; Reply, Lord Stanley; short debate thereon *July* 10, [193] 1024
  Crete, Insurrection in—Correspondence, Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 25, [190] 165; Question, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe Answer, The Earl of Derby *Nov* 28, 314—*Vice Consul at*, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 5, 1116; Question, Mr. Kennedy; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 2, [191] 705
   Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copy of the Instructions to the British Representative at Paris in reference to the identic Note proposed to be communicated to the Porte by Russia, France, Italy, and Prussia" (*Lord Campbell*) *April* 3, 803; after debate, Motion withdrawn
   Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 23, 1149
   Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 24, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy of any Despatches or Correspondence between the Russian Government and the Foreign Office on the subjects of the Insurrection in Crete and of the condition of the Christians in Turkey in the years 1866 and 1867" (*Mr. Monk*), 1225; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
   Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 24, [193] 1747
      Parl. Papers—
    Correspondence . . . . [3965-I, II]
  Embassy House at Constantinople, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 18, [192] 1753; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth, *ib.*
  Embassy House at Therapia, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 16, [193] 1289
  Epirus and Thessaly, Annexation of, to Greece, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 28, [190] 328; Question, Lord John Hay; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 2, 512
  Maintenance of the Ottoman Empire—France and Austria, Question, Mr. Goldney; Answer, Lord Stanley *Dec* 6, [190] 642
  Railways in, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 6, [193] 718
  Sanitary Regulations—The Cholera Congress, Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 17, [190] 1811
  Servia, National Assembly of, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 25, [192] 2135
  Wiseman, Sir William, Appointment of, Question, Captain Mackinnon; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 24, [190] 1071

Turner, Mr. C., *Lancashire, S.*
  Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 15, [193] 1602

Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. Bill
(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*)
c. Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 28, [192] 956
  Ordered; read 1° * *May* 29 [Bill 149]
  Read 2° * *June* 8
  Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 9, [193] 968
  Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Colonel William Stuart*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P.
  Committee *; Report *July* 13
  Considered * *July* 14
  Read 3° * *July* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 16
  Read 2ª * *July* 20 (No. 253)
  Committee *July* 21, 1549
  Report * *July* 23
  Read 3ª * *July* 28
  Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 199]

Turnpike Tolls Legislation
  Question, Mr. More; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 28, [191] 1461

Turnpike Trusts Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. George Clive, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Nov* 26 [Bill 9]
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 17, [192] 1699
  Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Knight*); Question, "That now, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Turnpike Trusts Act—Dunstable Road
  Question, Colonel W. Stuart; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 11, [192] 1399

Turnpike Trusts Arrangements Bill
(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 29 [Bill 200]
  Read 2° * *June* 30
  Committee *; Report *July* 1
  Read 3° * *July* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 3
  Read 2ª * *July* 10 (No. 206)
  Committee *; Report *July* 14
  Read 3ª * *July* 16
  Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 66]

Turnpike Trusts Legislation
  Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 3, [191] 833
  Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give direc-

[*cont.*

Turnpike Trusts Legislation—cont.
tions that there be laid before this House, Copy of all the Communications received in reply to the Circular sent in February 1866 to certain Turnpike Trustees referred to in p. 9 of the Seventeenth Report on Turnpike Trusts, of which Extracts are therein given, together with the names of the Correspondents" (*Mr. Clive*), [191] 2012; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Unclaimed Prize Money (India) Bill
(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered * *May* 14
Read 1° * *May* 18 [Bill 122]
Read 2° * *May* 21
Committee *; Report *May* 22
Read 3° * *May* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *May* 26
Read 2ª * *June* 15 (No. 121)
Committee *; Report *June* 18
Read 3ª * *June* 19
Royal Assent *June* 25 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 38]

Uniformity of Public Worship Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Shaftesbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 23 (No. 173)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 9, [193] 868
Debate thereon; then a Question being stated thereupon, the Question was put, Whether the said Question shall be now put; resolved in the negative

United Parishes (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie, Major Walker, Mr. Wellwood Maxwell, Mr. M'Lagan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 1 [Bill 81]
Read 2° * *April* 23
Committee *; Report *April* 24
Considered * *April* 27
Read 3° * *April* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Colonsay*) *April* 30
Read 2ª * *May* 12 (No. 84)
Committee *; Report *May* 19
Read 3ª * *May* 22
Royal Assent *May* 29 [31 *Vict.* c. 30]

United States
"*Alabama*" *Claims, The*, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copy of any further Papers relative to the Negotiations with the United States Government for Arbitration of the Alabama Claims" (*Mr. Shaw-Lefevre*), [190] 1150; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Motion for an Address for "Copies or Extracts of any further Correspondence that may have taken place between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States in reference to the Alabama and other claims" (*The Earl Russell*) *Mar* 27, [191] 333; after debate, Motion withdrawn

[*cont.*

United States—cont.
Iron-Clads, Sale of, to South American States, Question, Lord John Hay; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 21, [192] 655
"*Lizzie Lina,*" *Case of the*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 9, [190] 1219
Philadelphia, Library Committee, Questions, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 28, [193] 1901
Postal Convention, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 20, [190] 987; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 25, [192] 2132
(See title *Post Office*)
President Lincoln, Assassination of, Observations, Mr. Speaker *July* 31, [193] 1946
Moved, That this House accepts, with much gratification, the Volume transmitted to them in pursuance of the Resolution of the Congress of the United States, and hereby directs that the said Volume be placed in the Library of the House; and that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to Mr. Secretary Seward with a request that he will communicate the same to the Congress of the United States (*Lord Stanley*) *July* 31; Resolution agreed to
Relations with the, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Lord Stanley *Nov* 28, [190] 330; *Feb* 13, 690
"*Springbok,*" *Case of the*, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 17, [190] 1812; *May* 8, [191] 2002

University Elections (Voting Papers) Bill
(*Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 24 [Bill 187]
Read 2° * *June* 25
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Considered * *June* 30
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 1
Considered * *July* 1
Read 3° * *July* 1
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 2
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 10, [193] 981; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 201)
Committee *; Report *July* 14
Read 3ª * *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 65]

University Tests
Petitions presented (*The Earl of Kimberley*); debate thereon *May* 29, [192] 1012

Vaccination (Ireland) Bill
(*The Earl of Mayo, Mr. Att. Gen. for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 7 [Bill 217]
Read 2° * *July* 10
Committee *; Report *July* 13
Considered * *July* 14
Read 3° * *July* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 16
Read 2ª * *July* 17 (No. 254)
Committee *; Report *July* 21
Read 3ª * *July* 23
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 87]

Vaccination—Small-pox at Woolwich
Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *April* 2, [191] 701

Vagrant Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Pease, Mr. Akroyd, Mr. Liddell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 30 [Bill 102]
Read 2° * *May* 7
Committee *—R.P. *May* 19
Committee *; Report *May* 21
Considered * *May* 28
Read 3° * *May* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Cleveland*) *June* 9
Read 2ª * *June* 30 (No. 138)
Committee *; Report *July* 6
Read 3ª * *July* 7
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 52]

Valuation of Property Bill
Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Dec* 5, [190] 602

VANCE, Mr. J., *Armagh City*
"Bubulina," Explosion of the, [190] 518
Burials (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [192] 1381, 1382, 1383
Ecclesiastical Titles, Leave, [190] 992, 994; 2R. [192] 1696
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 2180
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1494
Established Church (Ireland), Leave, [192] 319; Consid. Amendt. 1529
Grand Jury Presentments (Ireland), Nomination of Committee, [191] 101, 102, 238
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. Amendt. [191] 217, 221; *cl.* 11, 223
Ireland—Questions, &c.
Convicts Warren and Costello, [193] 1556, 1557
Coroner's Inquest at Monaghan, [193] 1482
Regium Donum, [191] 835
Ireland—State of, Motion for a Committee, [190] 1507
Landed Property Improvement (Ireland), Leave, [190] 930
Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [192] 172, 175
Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1488; *cl.* 32, 1497; *cl.* 34, 1510, 1512
Representation of the People (Ireland), 2R. [191] 1955; Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1584; *cl.* 18, 1591, 1594; *add. cl.* 1779, 1781, 1789; Consid. *add. cl.* 1899, 1901, 1902, 1904
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 882
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers, [192] 2169

Vancouver's Island and British Columbia—Postal Communication with
Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth; short debate thereon *July* 13, [193] 1140; Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 16, 1289

VANDERBYL, Mr. P., *Bridgwater*
Army—Shorncliffe Camp, [193] 301
Baby Farming in the Metropolis, [190] 1449

VAUX OF HARROWDEN, Lord
Sale of Poisons and Pharmacy, Comm. [192] 1555

VERNER, Mr. E. W., *Lisburn*
Edinburgh, Duke of, Attempted Assassination of, [192] 1230
Established Church (Ireland), [191] 1462;—Meeting at St. James's Hall, 1886
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 764
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. [191] 220
Postal—Australian Mails, [190] 1979
Representation of the People (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [192] 1901

VERNEY, Sir H., *Buckingham*
Abyssinia—Consul Cameron, [190] 180
Army—Employment of old Soldiers, [193] 520
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1959
Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. [192] 557
Army—Wooden Huts for Troops, Motion for an Address, [190] 983
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 70
Lake Superior and the Pacific, &c. Motion for a Commission, [192] 1336, 1350
Ministerial Statement, [192] 645
Public Schools, 2R. [190] 761; Re-comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. [192] 1933
Revenue Officers Disabilities Removal, Comm. [193] 393
Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 238
British Embassy Houses, [191] 992
Prosecutions, [192] 499
Works, Buildings, &c. [191] 290, 294

VERNON, Lord
South Coast Railways, 3R. [193] 358

Victoria, Despatches from the Governor
Question, Sir Roundell Palmer; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 26, [192] 925
The Appropriation Act—Vote to Sir C. Darling, Address moved for, Copy or Extract of further Correspondence respecting and arising from the Non-enactment of the Appropriation Act in Victoria and the Recall of the Governor of the Colony, since the Letter from the Right Honourable C. B. Adderley, M.P., to Sir C. Darling, K.C.B., dated 7th March 1867, with the Enclosure (*The Lord Lyveden*) *Mar* 5, [190] 1108; Motion agreed to
Postponement of Motion, Observations, The Earl of Malmesbury *May* 1, [191] 1682; short debate thereon
Observations, Lord Lyveden; Reply, The Duke of Buckingham *May* 8, [191] 1963; long debate thereon; Question, Sir Robert Collier; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 11, [192] 1397
Parl. Papers—
Correspondence . . . . No. 157
Do. . . . Nos. [4014, 4014-I]

VILLIERS, Right Hon. C. P., *Wolverhampton*
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 4, [193] 1607; *cl.* 6, 1612; *cl.* 10, 1872; Amendt. 1874; *cl.* K, 1882, 1885
Registration, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 569

Vivian, Hon. Captain J. C. W., *Truro*
- Abyssinian Expedition, The, [192] 716
  - Expenditure, [190] 1683, 1684
  - Mules, Purchase of, [190] 145
- Abyssinian Expedition—Contract with Messrs. Wetherell, Motion for an Address, [190] 336
- Army—Questions, &c.
  - Brooke, Captain, Case of, [192] 1855
  - Distinguished Service Majors, [190] 798
  - Fortifications, [190] 1937
  - Military Expenditure, [193] 909
  - Non-Combatant Officers, [193] 608
  - Promotion, [190] 1887
- Army—Control Department, Motion for Papers, [193] 1269
- Army—Controller-in-Chief, Res. [193] 924
- Army—Discharged Soldiers, Employment of, Res. [193] 317
- Army—Royal Gun Factories, Motion for a Committee, Amendt. [193] 1256
- Army—Sale and Purchase of Commissions, Res. Amendt. [192] 533
- Army Estimates, [190] 1982 ;—Land Forces, [191] 91
- India—Telegraphic Communication, [190] 1008
- Mutiny, [190] 1815 ; Comm. *cl.* 22, [191] 323
- Portland Convict Prison, [190] 179
- Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 16, [192] 1940
- Regulation of Railways, Consid. [193] 1790
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday, 2R. [190] 1850
- Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 235
  - Portpatrick Railway Company Compensation, [193] 1211
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [191] 288 ; *cl.* 67, 325

Vivian, Mr. H. H., *Glamorganshire*
- Mines, Accidents in, [192] 1506
- Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1870

Volunteer Review at Windsor

Question, Lord Truro ; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *June* 15, [192] 1557 ; Question, Lord Elcho ; Answer, Mr. Disraeli, 1566 ;
193] Question, Lord Elcho ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 29, 310 ; *July* 9, 911 ; Question, Earl Spencer ; Answer, Lord Truro ; short debate thereon *July* 10, 988 ; Question, Lord Elcho ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 31, 1945

7th Surrey Volunteers, Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 27, [193] 1823

Voters in Disfranchised Boroughs Bill
(*Mr. Kekewich, Mr. Jardine, Mr. Alfred Seymour*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 20 [Bill 128]
Read 2° * *May* 25
Committee * ; Report *June* 10
Considered * *June* 11
Read 3° * *June* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *June* 16
Read 2ª * *June* 23 (No. 153)
Committee * ; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª * *June* 26
Royal Assent *July* 13 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 41]

Walcott, Admiral J. E., *Christchurch*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [190] 93

Waldegrave-Leslie, Hon. G., *Hastings*
- Board of Trade—Private Bills, [191] 831
- Boundary, Comm. [192] 284 ;—Amended Plans, 1230
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 980 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1419
- Contagious Diseases, [190] 1286
- Courts of Justice, New, [192] 1563
- India—The Budget, [190] 1680
- Land Writs Registration (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [192] 1525
- London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [191] 205
- Metropolis—Lambeth Library, [190] 602
- Passenger Steamers, Overloading of, [191] 451
- Poor Law—Vagrancy, [190] 1450
- Railway and Gas Shares, Leave, [190] 572
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *add. cl.* Amendt. [192] 1238
- Ritual Question, The, [192] 112
- Scotland—Roads, [191] 357
  - Supreme Civil Courts, [190] 536
- Sea Fisheries, Comm. [190] 1275 ; *cl.* 6, 1276 ; Lords Amendts. [192] 1861
- Supply—Board of Trade, [193] 1204, 1206
  - Board of Works, [193] 1208
  - Home Office, [193] 1202
  - Register House (Edinburgh), Report, [192] 1175
- Totnes, &c. Writs, 2R. [190] 546

Walker, Major G. G., *Dumfriesshire*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 68
- Army Reserve and Militia Reserve, [192] 512

Walpole, Right Hon. S. H., *Cambridge University*
- Boundaries of Boroughs, Report, [192] 1044
- Boundary, Comm. [192] 284 ; Preamble, 1263
- Capital Punishment within Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 4, [191] 1059
- Church Rates Regulation, 2R. [190] 1414
- Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, Comm. *cl.* 4, [190] 1417, 1983
- District Church Tithes Act Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [193] 1917
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [191] 317 ; *cl.* 5, [192] 691
- Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1632
- Marriage, Law of, [190] 886
- Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. Amendt. [192] 220
- Public Schools, Leave, [190] 634 ; 2R. 742, 760, 774, 1074, 1101, 1982 ; Motion for a Select Committee, 2052, 2053 ; Re-comm. [192] 1648 ; *cl.* 1, 1649 ; *cl.* 2, 1650 ; *cl.* 3, 1654 ; *cl.* 5, 1657 ; *cl.* 6, 1926, 1927, 1930, 1931, 1932 ; *cl.* 12, 1933 ; *cl.* 15, 1939 ; *cl.* 16, 1940 ; *cl.* 20, [193] 813 ; *cl.* 21, 816 ; *add. cl.* 820, 826 ; Lords Amendts. Amendt. 1903
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 878, 884

Walrond, Mr. J. W., *Tiverton*
Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [190] 981
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1359
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [192] 879
Stone, Police Sergeant, Case of, [192] 1482

Warner, Mr. E., *Norwich*
Army—Knapsacks for the Troops, [193] 1827
Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1919
Parliamentary Boroughs — Payment of Rates, [190] 443

Warren, Right Hon. R. R. (Attorney General for Ireland), *Dublin University*
Bankruptcy (Ireland), [191] 831
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1640; Res. 1905, 1927
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 775
Grand Jury Cess (Ireland), 2R. [191] 214
Ireland—Questions, &c.
  Alleged Seditious Speaking, [190] 1683
  Small Debts Recovery, [190] 1679
  Sullivan and Pigott, Messrs., Imprisonment of, [191] 448
  Tower of Ardfert — Kerry Grand Jury, [191] 209
Ireland — Writs of Error in Criminal Cases, Res. [193] 658, 664, 665
Libel, Comm. [192] 601
Military at Elections (Ireland), 2R. [193] 416
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 67, [191] 325
Petit Juries (Ireland), [191] 263
Registration (Ireland), Comm. [193] 1489; *cl.* 25, 1497; *cl.* 32, 1498; *cl.* 34, 1509; *add. cl.* 1514
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 1585; *add. cl.* 1776, 1779

Water Supply Bill

(*Mr. Clive, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Neate, Mr. Wyld*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 21 [Bill 131]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 8

Water Supply Commission

Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 16, [190] 1685

Watkin, Mr. E. W., *Stockport*
Boundary, [191] 706; Comm. *cl.* 6, [192] 1441; Schedule, 1443
Ceylon—Questions, &c.
  Affairs of, [190] 2025, 2030
  Crops in, [192] 1755
  Unauthorized Publication of a Despatch, [192] 1015
Ceylon—Condition of, Motion for a Committee, [191] 971, 976, 977, 982
Edinburgh, Duke of, Address to Her Majesty, [191] 1336
Electric Telegraphs, Comm. *cl.* 15, [193] 1602; Amendt. 1603
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1339
London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, Comm. [191] 199; *cl.* 2, 203

[*cont.*

Watkin, Mr. E. W.—*cont.*
Maguire, Convict, Case of the, [190] 107
Metropolis—Thames Embankment, Steamboat Piers, [191] 1332
Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, Comm. *cl.* 3, Motion for Adjournment, [193] 1537
Parliament — Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1809
  Standing Order 131 Repeal, [191] 145
Railways (Extension of Time), Leave, [190] 1001
South Eastern, &c. Railway, Lords Amendts. [193] 1248
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [191] 996
  Metropolitan Police, Motion for Adjournment, [192] 504
United States—Relations with the, [190] 330, 690

WAYS AND MEANS

190] Considered in Committee—*Abyssinian Expedition—Financial Statement and Resolution — Income Tax* (*Mr. Hunt*) *Nov* 28, 339; after long debate, Resolution agreed to; Resolution reported and agreed to; Bill ordered *Nov* 29
Considered in Committee—£2,000,000, Consolidated Fund *Nov* 28, 359; Resolution reported and agreed to; Bill ordered *Nov* 29
£362,398, 19*s.* 9*d.*, Consolidated Fund *Mar* 17, 1827; Resolution reported and agreed to; Bill ordered *Mar* 18, 1872
Resolution [March 23] reported, and agreed to Consolidated Fund (£6,000,000); Bill ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 24
Considered in Committee *April* 23
191] Financial Statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on moving the First Resolution, That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Duty of Customs now charged on Tea shall continue to be levied and charged on and after the 1st day of August 1868 until the 1st day of August 1869, on the importation thereof into Great Britain and Ireland: viz.—Tea, the lb.—0*s.* 6*d.*, 1149; after long debate, Resolution agreed to; Resolution reported
Considered in Committee *May* 4, 1746
Property and Income Tax; Resolution, 1746
£1,000,000, Exchequer Bonds *May* 4, 1773
Resolutions reported *May* 6
Considered in Committee—£600,000, Exchequer Bonds *May* 7, 2062
Resolutions reported *May* 8

SUMMARY.

Ways and Means.

Schedule of Ways and Means referred to in Section 5 of the Consolidated Fund (Appropriation Act—viz.:	£	s.	d.
Granted per Act 31 *Vict.* c. 1, for the Service of the Year ending 31st March 1868 ...	2,000,000	0	0
Granted per Act 31 *Vict.* c. 10, for the Service of the Years ending 31st March 1867 and 31st March 1868 ...	362,398	19	9
Granted for the Service of the Year ending 31st March 1869 —viz.:			

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—Summary—cont.

	£	*s.*	*d.*
Per Act 31 *Vict.* c. 13 ...	6,000,000	0	0
Per Act 31 *Vict.* c. 16 ...	17,000,000	0	0
Per Section 1 of this Act	22,083,532	9	5
Per Section 4 of this Act (being Surplus Ways and Means granted for the Service of preceding Years)	537,217	10	7

Total Grants of Ways and Means to meet the following Supplies:—

1867-8	£2,362,398	19	9	£47,983,148	19	9
1868-9	45,620,750	0	0			

Weguelin, Mr. T. M., *Wolverhampton*
Merchant Ships, Overloading of, [193] 372
Postal—India, China, and Japan Mails, Res. [190] 456
Spain and Chile, [190] 1458

Weights and Measures
Observations, Mr. Thomas Hughes; Reply, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 29, [193] 1924
Report of Commission on False, Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 30, [191] 467

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill (*Mr. Ewart, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Baines, Mr. John Benjamin Smith, Mr. Graves*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Ewart*) *Feb* 24, [190] 1074; Bill ordered, after short debate; read 1°* [Bill 44]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 13, [192] 176
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 217, N. 65; M. 152; Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn *July* 1, [193] 425

Weights and Measures (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Craufurd, Sir Edward Colebrooke*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 8 [Bill 109]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 18

Wellington, Monument to the Duke of
Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 19, [192] 512

Westbury, Lord
Bankruptcy Act Amendment, 2R. [193] 867; Comm. 1158, 1161
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, 2R. [191] 19
Courts of Justiciary (Scotland), 2R. [193] 1164
Liquidation, 2R. [193] 366
Promissory Oaths, 2R. [190] 858; Commons Amendts. [193] 1231, 1233
Regulation of Railways, 2R. [190] 1971
United States—The "Alabama" claims, Motion for Papers, [191] 346, 350

West Indies
Ecclesiastical Establishments in the, Question, Mr. R. Mills; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Feb* 21, [190] 1003
Hurricane in the, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Nov* 29, [190] 421
Tortola, Alleged Submersion of, Question, Mr. C. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Nov* 20, [190] 92
(*Postal Communication with*—See *Post Office*)

West Indies Bill
(*Mr. Adderley, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 19 [Bill 124]
Read 2°* *May* 21
Committee*; Report *May* 22
Considered* *May* 25
Read 3°* *May* 28
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*) *May* 29 (No. 135)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 7, [193] 784; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *July* 13, 1101
Report* *July* 16 (No. 249)
Read 3ª* *July* 17
c. Lords Amendts. considered *July* 27, 1886
Moved, To leave out "as such coadjutor, continue to act in the same manner as at present as Archdeacon of Middlesex," and insert "and exercises episcopal functions therein, continue to receive out of the Consolidated Fund the annual payment of two thousand pounds which has been hitherto made to him in part by the Bishop of Jamaica out of the stipend of three thousand pounds paid to the said Bishop from the Consolidated Fund under the before recited Acts, and in part out of the stipend appropriated to his Archdeaconry of Middlesex out of the Consolidated Fund, under the said Acts: Provided, That during his receipt of such annual payment no payment shall be made to him out of the Consolidated Fund in respect of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex" (*Mr. Russell Gurney*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *July* 28, 1918; after short debate, A. 30, N. 29; M. 1; Lords Amendt. agreed to
Royal Assent *July* 31 [31 & 32 *Vict.* c. 120]

Westmeath, Marquess of
Burials (Ireland), 2R. [193] 1097; Report, *cl.* 4, 1474
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [190] 1068
Lodgers' Property Protection, 2R. [193] 977
Poor Relief, Report, [192] 1743, 1744

Whalley, Mr. G. H., *Peterborough*
Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 988
Address in Answer to the Speech, [190] 89; Report, 96, 103
Agriculture, Motion for a Committee, [192] 580
Army—7th Surrey Volunteers, [193] 1823, 1824
Army—Military Education, Res. [191] 1838
[*cont.*

WHALLEY, Mr. G. H.—*cont.*
Coal Mines, [192] 1085
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1554
Established Church (Ireland), [191] 708; Comm. 1424; Res. 1, 1533; Res. 2, 1897, 1907, 1926; Motion for Adjournment, 1940
Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [192] 766
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [190] 939
Ireland—Maynooth Grant, [191] 836
Libel, 2R. [191] 664; Comm. [192] 599; *cl.* 1, 605, 607; *cl.* 3, 611, 617
Mauritius, Fever at the, [190] 991, 992, 1006; [191] 661, 1460, 1461
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1818
Navy—School and Training Ships, [191] 1785
Parliament, Dissolution of, [192] 1065
Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 10, [193] 1875; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1880
Regulation of Railways, Consid. [193] 1789
Riots at Ashton, Staleybridge, &c. [192] 827, 829, 830, 1042, 1085, 1086, 1092, 1093, 1096
Supply—Common Law Courts (Ireland), [192] 1104
  Government Prisons, [192] 1107
  Legal Charges (Ireland), [192] 1104
Turnpike Trusts, [191] 833; Motion for an Address, 2016

WHARNCLIFFE, Lord
South Coast Railways, 2R. [192] 1451

WHITBREAD, Mr. S., *Bedford*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 81
Boundary, Comm. Preamble, [192] 1291, 1292
Cambridge University Election—Interference of Peers, [190] 801
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [190] 705; Comm. [191] 298; *cl.* 5, [193] 738; *cl.* 6, 741; *cl.* 10, 759; *cl.* 17, 1170; *cl.* 37, 1174; *cl.* 46, 1371; *add. cl.* 1378, 1453
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 1421; Res. Amendt. 1923, 1931
Ministerial Statement, [191] 1810
Parliament—Business of the House, [191] 1681
  Easter Vacation, [190] 1892
Parliament—Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1801
Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 6, [192] 1931
Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 440

WHITE, Hon. Capt. C. W., *Tipperary Co.*
Established Church (Ireland), Comm. [191] 637

WHITE, Mr. J., *Brighton*
Army—Expenditure, [190] 1687
  Officers holding Civil Appointments, [191] 1333
Compounding for Rates, Res. [190] 1893, 1908, 1922
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1450; Consid. 1615; *add. cl.* 1686
India—Commission on Currency Laws, [190] 1112, 1113
Navy—Naval Commissions, [190] 1680

WHITE, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Poor Rate Assessment, [193] 999
Public Accounts, Res. [192] 124
Representation of the People (Scotland), Consid. *add. cl.* [192] 1445
Ways and Means—Abyssinian Expedition, Res. [190] 351
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [191] 1180

WHITWORTH, Mr. B., *Drogheda*
Representation of the People (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [192] 1891

WICKLOW, Earl of
Sea Fisheries, Comm. *cl.* 5, [192] 238

WILLIAMS, Colonel T. P., *Marlow*
Army Reserve, Motion for a Commission, [192] 1969

WILLIAMSON, Sir H., *Durham, N.*
Boundary, Comm. *cl.* 4, [192] 1424

WINTERBOTHAM, Mr. H. S. P., *Stroud*
Courts of Justice, New, Motion for a Committee, [193] 336
Oxford and Cambridge Universities, 2R. [192] 225; [193] 441, 457

Witnesses, Expenses of
Question, Mr. Beach; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 27, [193] 1819

WOODD, Mr. B. T., *Knaresborough*
Parliament—Private Bill Legislation, Res. [190] 1809

Woods and Game Assessment Bill
(*Mr. Read, Mr. Jasper More*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 16 [Bill 242]
Read 2° * *July* 27

Workshop Regulation Act (1867)
Questions, Mr. Powell, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 2, [193] 517

Wreck Registers, British and Foreign
Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Dec* 2, [190] 507—*Wreck Register for* 1867, Question, Mr. Miller; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 16, 1687

WYLD, Mr. J., *Bodmin*
Abyssinia—Foreign Office, The, [190] 606, 628
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [191] 68
  Surveys, [193] 962, 965
Army—Staff Officers of Pensioners, Senior, [193] 1922
Circular Delivery Company and the Commissionaires, [193] 1200
County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1542, 1558

WYLD, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. *add. cl.* [193] 1453
  Metropolis Gas, 2R. [191] 798
  Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1871
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 6, [193] 1613
  Spain—Case of the "Tornado," [190] 1103
  Supply—Abyssinian Expedition, [190] 305
    Compensation — Explosion at Clerkenwell, [193] 1212
    Post Office, [193] 833
    Post Office Packet Service, [193] 840
  Turkey—Brigandage near Smyrna, [192] 1040

WYNDHAM, Hon. P. S., *Cumberland, W.*
  Army, Administration of the, Res. [191] 2003, 2004
  Boundary, Comm. Preamble, [192] 1281
  County Financial Boards, 2R. [191] 1547
  Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections, Consid. *add. cl.* [193] 1685
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. [191] 1913
  Illegal Publications, [192] 512
  Metropolis—Lambeth Workhouse—The New Master, Motion for Papers, [190] 2046
  Mines Assessment, 2R. [191] 1864, 1872; Comm. *cl.* 1, [193] 848, 849, 851, 853; Consid. 1221, 1224
  Ministerial Statement, [192] 623
  Poor Relief, Comm. *cl.* 3, [193] 1425; *cl.* 6, 1610
  Public Schools, Re-comm. *add. cl.* [193] 821
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [192] 985; Schedule A, 1254
  Salmon Fisheries in the Solway, [190] 429

WYNN, Mr. C. W. W., *Montgomeryshire*
  Public Schools, Re-comm. *cl.* 21, Amendt. [193] 814

York
  Circuits in Yorkshire, The, Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *July* 27, [193] 1823; *July* 31, 1942
  High Sheriff for the East Riding, Question, Admiral Duncombe; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 2, [193] 515; Question, Viscount Milton; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 3, 609

YORK, Archbishop of
  Army Chaplains, Comm. [192] 1387, 1389, 1392
  Compulsory Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [191] 1129; Comm. [193] 602; Report, *cl.* 8, 899
  Established Church (Ireland), 2R. [193] 43
  Union Workhouses and Infirmaries, Motion for Papers, [190] 322

YORKE, Mr. J. R., *Tewkesbury*
  Boundaries of Boroughs, Comm. [192] 431; Amendt. 433
  Established Church (Ireland), [191] 706
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. [192] 458, 954; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 982; *cl.* 20, Motion for Adjournment, 1009

YOUNG, Mr. G., *Wigton, &c.*
  Abyssinian Expedition—Return of Merchant Ships, [190] 420
  Established Church (Ireland), Comm. Res. 1, [191] 1627
  Representation of the People (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [192] 480, 481, 493, 847, 851, 852; *cl.* 10, 986

Zanzibar—Slave Trade in
  Question, Sir T. F. Buxton; Answer Lord Stanley *April* 30, [191] 1578

ERRATA:

In Volume [191] p. 853, line 27 from bottom, *for* substantia amor *read* substantive union.

In Volume [191] p. 853, line 28 from bottom, *for* cautionary *read* reactionary.

In Volume [192] p. 503, line 20 from bottom, *for* unopposed Vote, *read* opposed Vote.

END OF VOLUME CXCIII., AND FOURTH AND LAST VOLUME
OF SESSION 1867-8.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, PRINTER, 23, PATERNOSTER ROW.

0 SEP 1963